Psychological flexibility and the moderating role of the therapeutic working alliance in Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Daily Life (ACT-DL) in an early psychosis sample.

Evelyne van Aubel, MSc. ^{*,a}

evelyne.vanaubel@kuleuven.be

ONV Herestraat 49 – mailbox 1029

3000 Leuven

BE – Belgium

Thomas Vaessen, PhD. ^{a,b}

thomas.vaessen@kuleuven.be

Prof. Ruud van Winkel, PhD. ^c

ruud.vanwinkel@kuleuven.be

Ginette Lafit, PhD. ^{a,d}

ginette.lafit@kuleuven.be

Annelie Beijer-Klippel, PhD. ^{a,e,f}

annelie.beijer@ou.nl

Prof. Wolfgang Viechtbauer, PhD. ^e

wolfgang.biechtbauer@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Tim Batink, PhD. ^f

tim@batink.nl

Mark van der Gaag, PhD. ^g

m.vander.gaag@vu.nl

Therese van Amelsvoort, PhD. ^e

t.vanamelsvoort@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Machteld Marcelis, PhD. ^{e,h}

Machteld.Marcelis@ggze.nl

Frederike Schirmbeck, PhD. ⁱ

n.f.schirmbeck@amsterdamumc.nl

Prof. Lieuwe de Haan, PhD. ⁱ

l.dehaan@amsterdamumc.nl

Prof. Ulrich Reininghaus, PhD. ^{j,k**}

ulrich.reininghaus@zi-mannheim.de

Prof. Inez Myin-Germeys^{a**}

inez.germeys@kuleuven.be

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

* Corresponding author

**Joint senior authors

^a Department of Neurosciences, Psychiatry Research Group, Center for Contextual Psychiatry (CCP), University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

^b Center for eHealth and Well-being Research, Department of Psychology, Health, and Technology, University of Twente

^c Department of Neurosciences, Psychiatry Research Group, Center for Clinical Psychiatry (CLIPS), KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

^d Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Research Group of Quantitative Psychology and Individual Differences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

^e Department of Psychiatry and Neuropsychology, School for Mental Health and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands

^f Faculty of Psychology, Open University, Heerlen, The Netherlands

^g Department of Clinical Psychology, VU Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^h Institute for Mental Health Care Eindhoven (GGzE), Eindhoven, The Netherlands

ⁱ Department of Psychiatry, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^j Department of Public Mental Health, Central Institute of Mental Health, Medical Faculty Mannheim, University of Heidelberg, Mannheim, Germany

^k ESRC Centre for Society and Mental Health and Centre for Epidemiology and Public Health, Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

Abstract

Background: We investigated treatment effects of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Daily Life (ACT-DL) on psychological flexibility (PF) and the moderating role of the therapeutic working alliance on these effects in patients with early psychosis. **Methods:** ACT-DL is an ecological momentary intervention (EMI) combining face-to-face ACT with a smartphone app. In the multi-center INTERACT randomized controlled trial, n=148 early psychosis individuals were randomized to either treatment as usual (TAU as the control condition, n=77) or to ACT-DL in addition to TAU (ACT-DL + TAU as the experimental condition, n=71). We assessed global PF and the therapeutic alliance with self-report questionnaires. In addition, we used the experience sampling methodology (ESM) to assess PF with a momentary (in-the-moment and since-the-previous-beep openness) and an evening (daily PF) questionnaire. Assessments took place at baseline, post-intervention (POST), six (FU6), and twelve months (FU12) follow-up. **Results:** Global (B=19.49 to 33.14; all P-values<.001) and daily PF (B=0.68; P-value<.001) improved equally in both conditions at each time point. Individuals in the ACT-DL condition improved more than those in TAU on momentary openness (in-the-moment openness at POST (B=0.32; P-value=0.007) and since-the-previous-beep openness at POST (B=0.33; P<.001) and FU6 (B=0.23; P-value=0.025). Client-perceived working alliance moderated in-the-moment openness such that larger improvements in openness at POST (B=0.05; P-value<.001) were found in ACT-DL in individuals with higher working alliance scores. **Conclusion:** Our results provide partial support for the capability of ACT-DL to improve daily life measures of openness, and emphasize the importance of the therapeutic relationship in supporting processes of change.

Keywords

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT); experience sampling method (ESM); ecological momentary intervention (EMI); psychological flexibility; early psychosis; therapeutic alliance.

1 Introduction

Psychological inflexibility, defined as the rigid dominance of psychological reactions over chosen values and contingencies in guiding action (Bond et al., 2011), has been associated with poor mental health in various populations and clinical diagnoses (Chawla & Ostafin, 2007; Hayes et al., 2006; Kashdan & Rottenberg, 2010; Levin et al., 2013). Psychological inflexibility has also been linked to psychotic experiences and associated distress (Pankey & Hayes, 2003), and may therefore be an interesting psychotherapeutic target in the treatment of psychosis (Pankey & Hayes, 2003).

Psychological inflexibility consists of various sub-processes of which two have received the most attention in the psychosis literature. First, experiential avoidance, defined as those strategies to avoid painful thoughts, emotions, or sensations, has been associated with higher levels of depression, anxiety, and distress in individuals with a psychotic disorder (Morris et al., 2014; Perry et al., 2011; White et al., 2013). Second, cognitive fusion, defined as the tendency to see thoughts as reality, has been found to play a role in aggravating delusions, auditory hallucinations, and their associated impact and distress (Goldstone et al., 2011; Morris et al., 2014; Peters et al., 2012; Varese et al., 2016). Studies making use of the Experience Sampling Method (ESM), a technique to assess symptoms, emotions, and their context multiple times a day in the flow of daily life (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Myin-Germeys et al., 2018) found that psychological inflexibility and experiential avoidance more specifically are not only maladaptive at the trait level, but also at the state level, when used in daily life as a coping strategy to deal with difficult experiences. In this respect, two ESM studies showed that momentary experiential avoidance is associated with momentary paranoia, both concurrently and at the next time point, in college students (Udachina et al., 2009) as well as in individuals with a psychotic disorder (Udachina et al., 2014).

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) is a third wave behavioral therapy that aims to increase *psychological flexibility* (PF) (Hayes et al., 2006). For individuals with a psychotic disorder, this means that they will learn to take a more open, aware, and active stance towards aversive experiences (Pankey & Hayes, 2003). In turn, an improvement in these processes is expected to positively affect various outcomes including symptom-related distress and functioning. This may also be relevant for individuals in the early stages of psychosis, including individuals at *ultra-high-risk* (UHR) for psychosis (Yung et al., 2005)^a and individuals with a *first episode of psychosis* (FEP) (Fusar-

^a Given the multifinality of psychiatric outcomes in UHR individuals (Beck et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2015), along with the finding that transition rates to a psychotic disorder were lower in more recent samples (Hartmann et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2016), the last couple of years the term clinical high risk (CHR) has also been used to

Poli et al., 2013; Linscott & Van Os, 2013; Van Os & Linscott, 2012; Van Os & Reininghaus, 2016), given that these individuals suffer from high levels of psychotic symptom distress (Birchwood, 2003; Rapado-Castro et al., 2015; Rekhi et al., 2019; Steel et al., 2007; R. S. Wilson et al., 2020), and struggle with negative symptoms and related impairments in functioning and quality of life (Devoe et al., 2020; Fusar-Poli et al., 2015; Schlosser et al., 2014).

However, only few clinical trials of ACT for psychosis have looked into treatment effects on PF and its related sub-processes, and have only looked into trait outcomes measured with global self-report questionnaires. While some studies found significant effects favoring ACT over TAU on acceptance (Gumley et al., 2017; Spidel et al., 2018) and mindfulness (Gumley et al., 2017; White et al., 2011), other trials did not find larger differences between conditions on acceptance (Shawyer et al., 2012, 2017; White et al., 2011). In more recent studies, ACT has been offered in a blended care approach (Batink et al., 2016; Levin et al., 2017; Ly et al., 2014) combining face-to-face ACT sessions with an *Ecological Momentary Intervention* (EMI). EMIs deliver real-time momentary psychological interventions in daily life, tailored to what individuals need in a given context, making use of mobile technologies including smartphone *applications* (apps) or other mobile devices (Heron & Smyth, 2010; Myin-Germeys et al., 2016). To our knowledge, only one study investigated treatment effects of an ACT-based EMI (ACT Daily) on daily life PF in a small sample of individuals with depression and/or anxiety who were following ACT treatment. Interestingly, this study found significant improvements after 2 weeks use of the EMI on momentary acceptance, defusion, valued living, and mindfulness as measured in daily life (Levin et al., 2017).

In our group, we have developed the ACT in Daily Life intervention, a blended care intervention combining face-to-face ACT sessions with an EMI delivered via a mobile application (the ACT-DL app) (Vaessen et al., 2019). It is expected that ACT-DL will optimize treatment effects by capitalizing on the benefits of both EMIs and of standard face-to-face psychotherapy. As for the ACT-DL app, individuals receive notifications with short questionnaires containing items on their current mood, symptoms, and context to increase mindful awareness, followed by a visual cue of an ACT metaphor or a short ACT exercise. The use of the app may therefore facilitate the real-world acquisition and generalization of new coping skills learned within therapy, which may eventually lead to sustainable changes in intended outcomes under real-world (ecological) conditions (Reininghaus et al., 2016).

refer to individuals in the UHR group (McGorry & Mei, 2018; Nelson & McGorry, 2020). We chose the term UHR for consistency with the INTERACT study protocol (Reininghaus et al., 2019) and main outcome paper (Myin-Germeys et al., 2021).

As to the face-to-face sessions, they allow patients to benefit from the working alliance they can build with their psychotherapist. Indeed, the therapeutic working alliance has been identified as a predictor of treatment engagement and outcome (Bourke et al., 2021; Browne et al., 2021; Shattock et al., 2018), as well as a moderator of improvement in clinical and functional outcomes (Chen et al., 2018; Kay-Lambkin et al., 2017). However, no research to date has investigated the moderating role of the alliance on ACT processes measures. Investigating the role of the therapeutic alliance may be especially important within ACT, given that the therapist needs to be aware of and function as a role model of these PF processes within the session itself (Vilardaga & Hayes, 2009; K. G. Wilson & Sandoz, 2010). These therapeutic qualities are needed to avoid therapeutic ruptures or impediments of therapeutic processes to unfold (for a case example, please see (Walser & O'Connell, 2021)). For that reason, we believe that a good therapeutic alliance may support the improvement of PF.

As such, in the current paper, we will evaluate whether ACT-DL improves psychological flexibility both measured with a global self-report questionnaire as well as in daily life. In addition, we will evaluate whether the therapeutic working alliance moderates this improvement. We hypothesize that:

- (1) ACT-DL, in comparison to TAU, will lead to larger global and daily life improvements in PF at post-intervention, 6-month, and 12-month follow-up.
- (2) Improvements in global and daily life PF will be moderated by the client-perceived and/or the therapist-perceived working alliance, such that those participating in ACT-DL with better alliances will improve most on these processes.

2 Methods

2.1 Study design and participants

In the multi-center INTERACT *randomized controlled trial* (RCT) (Dutch Trial Register, ID: NTR4252), participants were recruited from secondary mental health services at clinical sites within five regions in The Netherlands and Belgium. Inclusion criteria were: 1) aged 15-65, 2) UHR (without prior use of antipsychotic medication) or FEP (onset within last 3 years) as assessed by the Comprehensive Assessment of an At Risk Mental State (CAARMS) (Yung et al., 2005) or Nottingham Onset Schedule (NOS) (Singh et al., 2005), and 3) sufficient command of the Dutch language. Exclusion criteria were: 1) a primary diagnosis of alcohol/substance abuse and dependence, assessed with the Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) (Sheehan et al., 1998), and 2) severe endocrine, cardiovascular, or brain disease. After informed consent was signed and baseline assessment finalized,

participants were randomly allocated (50:50) to a control condition of *treatment as usual* (TAU) or to an experimental condition of ACT-DL in addition to TAU (ACT-DL+TAU). The trial received ethical approval from the *Medical Ethics Review Committees* (MERC) at Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC), the Netherlands (reference: NL46439.068.13) and the University Clinic Leuven, Belgium (reference: B322201629214). The full study methodology is detailed in the study protocol (Reininghaus et al., 2019).

2.2 Interventions

Participants allocated to TAU continued to receive all the treatment they received prior to the start of the study, which we assessed using a study-specific service-use checklist. TAU consisted of good standard care delivered according to local and national service guidelines and protocols, and included cognitive behavioral therapy for psychosis (CBTp) in some sites.

Participants allocated to ACT-DL received, in addition to TAU, eight weekly individual face-to-face ACT sessions with a trained ACT clinician, including one psycho-education session followed by a session on a new ACT component every week. In a final session, all previous components were integrated into the topic of PF. Participants used the ACT-DL EMI in between the therapy sessions. The EMI was delivered via the PsyMate™ (www.psymate.eu) app (hereafter: the ACT-DL app), which participants were instructed to use for three subsequent days starting from the first day after therapy had taken place. During these three days, participants received eight notifications ('beeps') a day, prompting them to fill in a short ESM questionnaire with various items on mood, symptoms, and their current context to help increase present awareness. Every beep questionnaire was followed by either an ACT-exercise or a visual cue of an ACT-metaphor (50:50 ratio). Finally, participants could initiate an on-demand ACT exercise whenever they were struggling with difficult thoughts or emotions. Please see Vaessen et al. (2019) for a more detailed description of the intervention.

2.3 Measures and procedures

2.3.1 Retrospective measures

Global psychological flexibility and its related sub-processes were measured with the self-reported Flexibility Index Test 60 (FIT-60) (Batink et al., 2012; Batink & Delespaul, 2015) total score and the scores on its subscales (i.e., acceptance, defusion, mindfulness, self as context, values, and committed action) (Cronbach's α between .70 and .89) at baseline, post-intervention, 6-, and 12-month follow-up. The FIT-60 measures PF on a trait level, asking participants to reflect on how they behave in general.

Therapeutic Working Alliance was assessed with the self-reported Working Alliance Inventory – Short Form (WAI-SF) (Hatcher & Gillaspay, 2006; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989) at post-intervention. Whereas the client-rated version asked clients to reflect on the contacts they had with their ACT therapist (in ACT-DL) or with the clinician who they saw and talked to most frequently (in TAU), the therapist-rated version asked either the ACT therapist or the main clinician to reflect on their working alliance with the participant. In the current study, we used the total WAI-SF scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha=.92$ for client-perceived and $\alpha=.87$ for therapist-perceived alliance).

Symptom severity was assessed at baseline with the total score of the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) (Ventura et al., 1993), reflecting the previous two weeks before the interview (Cronbach’s $\alpha=.67$). We controlled for baseline symptom severity in all analyses given persistent findings of associations with lower levels of PF (Chawla & Ostafin, 2007; Kashdan et al., 2006; Kashdan & Rottenberg, 2010; Levin et al., 2013).

2.3.2 Daily life ESM measures

The Experience Sampling Method (ESM) (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Myin-Germeys et al., 2018) is a structured, random time-sampling diary technique to measure moment-to-moment as well as daily variability in several ACT psychological flexibility processes, in the real world and in real time, with high ecological validity. ESM measures were assessed at baseline, post-intervention, and 6-month follow-up.

During each ESM assessment period, participants received 10 notifications per day during a period of six consecutive days on the PsyMate™ app, making use of a stratified random sampling technique with ESM assessments scheduled at random within set blocks of time between 7:30 AM and 10:30 PM. In addition, participants were asked to self-initiate an evening questionnaire that was available between 8:00 PM and 11:00 PM.

Momentary openness. Each ESM questionnaire prompted participants with Likert scale items (1: not at all; 7: very much) on how open (versus experientially avoidant) they were towards difficult experiences. We operationalized **in-the-moment openness** with the item “*I wish I could get rid of my negative feelings (reverse scored)*”. Second, **since-the-previous-beep openness** was operationalized averaging the two items “*I tried not to think about [negative emotions or thoughts] (reverse scored)*” and “*I let my thoughts be without reacting to them*” when individuals responded >2 on the item “*Since the last beep, I’ve had negative emotions or thoughts*”, and set to missing if <3 , discarding these observations.

Daily PF. Daily PF was operationalized as the average of five items on the evening questionnaire (scored on 7-point Likert scale - 1: not at all; 7: very much) including items on open (“*Today, I could let go of my negative feelings without acting upon them*”, “*In general I have ruminated a lot today (reverse scored)*”), aware (“*Today, I was consciously aware of the activities that I did*”), and engaged (“*Today, I have invested in what I find important in my life*”) processes. Please refer to Figure 1 for more details on the timing of the various daily life ACT processes.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

We reported information on ESM compliance and its psychometric properties in Supplement 1 and Supplementary Table 1.

2.4 Statistical analysis

2.4.1 Changes in psychological flexibility

Differences in treatment effects over time on global, momentary, and daily psychological flexibility were tested with separate repeated measures mixed-effects models using the MIXED command in Stata (StataCorp, 2015), with the FIT-60 total score, in-the-moment openness, since-the-previous-beep openness, and daily psychological flexibility as the dependent variable. Independent variables in these models were time (as a four-level factor, for baseline, post-intervention, and the 6- and 12-month follow-ups), condition (dichotomous: ACT-DL + TAU vs. TAU only), and the time × condition interaction. We controlled for region (as a five-level factor) and group status (dichotomous: UHR vs. FEP) in all models, as well as for baseline BPRS scores by including them as covariates in the models. In the analysis of the FIT-60 total scores, we took into account within-subject clustering of the repeated measures by allowing the models’ level-1 residuals to be correlated making use of a completely unstructured error variance-covariance matrix. In our models with ESM outcomes, multilevel mixed-effects models were used with multiple ESM observations (level-1) nested within time points (now as a three-level factor, for baseline, post-intervention, and the 6-month follow-up) (level-2) and time points nested within subjects (level-3). We added level-3 random intercepts to the models. In addition, for the errors at level 1, we assumed an autoregressive error variance-covariance matrix of the exponential type for momentary measures and of the autoregressive type for daily measures, which allowed our models to account for unequally spaced time values in the ESM data.

In addition to our model on global PF, we used the nlme package (Pinheiro et al., 2021) in R (RStudio Team, 2015) to fit a related outcomes model, with all FIT-60 subscales as six dependent variables in

one model. The independent variables were the same as the ones described above. This model included a random intercept for each outcome and assumed that the residual errors of each outcome were multivariate normally distributed and uncorrelated over time. Given the assumption that the six ACT sub-processes were not independent from each other, all variances of and co-variances between random intercepts (one for each dependent variable within subjects), as well as of and between the residual errors of these outcomes were estimated. This model was similar to our univariate model described above, except that all six outcomes were measured simultaneously rather than sequentially, which makes comparison of the sub-scales possible (Baldwin et al., 2014).

Within our univariate models, we used the TEST command in Stata to perform a joint omnibus test of no difference between the two conditions at all three time points after baseline (Wald-type test with $df=3$ and $\alpha=.05$), and if statistically significant, at each time point separately (each tested at $\alpha=.05$). The same command was used to assess the main effect of time at all three time points simultaneously. To aid interpretability of our findings, we calculated the predicted margins, SE, and estimated differences between conditions for these outcomes using the MARGINS and the CONTRAST command respectively.

Within our multivariate model, the linearHypothesis command using the car package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019) in R was used to perform these same tests for each ACT process individually. To date, it is not possible to calculate predicted margins in R after having fit a related outcomes model. We therefore based the margins for the FIT-60 subscales on six univariate repeated measures mixed-effects models on these outcomes, as described for the FIT-60 total score (above). These predicted margins therefore need to be interpreted with caution because they do not reflect the post estimations of the joint multivariate model.

2.4.2 Therapeutic working alliance as a moderator

To test whether the therapeutic working alliance moderated treatment effects on psychological flexibility, we added client-perceived and therapist-perceived WAI-SF total scores (separately) as moderators to the repeated measures mixed-effects models outlined above. Within each model, this meant that we added the condition $\times$ working alliance, the time $\times$ working alliance interaction, and finally the condition $\times$ time $\times$ working alliance interaction.

After each model fit, we performed a joint omnibus test over all time points of the three-way interaction effects with the TEST command, followed by time-specific contrasts if statistically

significant at $\alpha=0.05$. All models were fitted using *restricted maximum likelihood estimation* (REML). For the full statistical analysis plan, please refer to our post-registration report^b.

3 Results

The final sample included 70 participants with UHR and 78 with FEP, and was nearly equally divided between men and women (49% for the latter). Participants had a mean age of 25.1 (SD=5.9, range 15 to 47). Detailed information on the INTERACT sample can be found in the study's main outcome paper (Myin-Germeys et al., 2021). Descriptive statistics for baseline FIT-60, WAI-SF, BPRS symptom severity scores, and ESM measures are reported in Table 1. For more details on data availability in the current study, please refer to Supplementary Figure 1.

[Insert Table 1 here]

3.1 Changes in psychological flexibility

3.1.1 Global psychological flexibility

As can be seen in Table 2 and Figure 2, the repeated measures mixed-effects model on the FIT-60 total score did not support our hypothesis of increased scores in the ACT-DL+TAU compared to the TAU condition. Yet, the main effect of time was significant (P-value <.001) and time-specific contrasts showed increased mean levels of FIT-60 total scores in comparison to baseline for both conditions at post-intervention (P-value <.001), 6-month (P-value <.001), and 12-month follow-up (P-value <.001).

The results of our multivariate related outcomes model were similar. While there was no support for our hypothesis of increased FIT-60 scores in ACT-DL+TAU compared to TAU on any subscale, we found main effects of time for every subscale (P-values all <.01), including acceptance, defusion, here and now, self as context, values, and committed action (see Table 2). These results suggest that, in both conditions, in comparison to baseline, all ACT skills significantly increased over time in both conditions (P-values all <.05), and did so at each follow-up time point, except for changes in here and now scores, which only reached significance at the 12-month follow-up (P-value<.001).

[Insert Table 2 / Figure 2 here]

^b The current study was post-registered on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/>), meaning that we registered our analysis plan after we had collected data, however before we had any access to the data. The main post-registration for the INTERACT study is available here https://osf.io/du2bn/?view_only=ec22ed02651441349e1bb1242cfc712c. The post-registration for the current study is embedded as a file within the main registration and can be accessed here https://osf.io/jzyp2/?view_only=9672553dd8fd461ebe10e592ed42c707.

Similarly, when we plotted the predicted scores on ACT hexaflex radar charts and compared them to norm scores based on a clinical population with heterogeneous psychopathology (Batink & Delespaul, 2015) (Figure 3), we found that FIT-60 scores transitioned from the lower-average range at baseline to the average-upper range at the 12-month follow-up, which may suggest clinically relevant changes in both conditions.

[Insert Figure 3 here]

Finally, in line with the lack of significant Condition x Time interactions in both models, simple post-estimation contrasts did not show any significant differences in FIT-60 scores between ACT-DL and TAU at any time point (see Table 3).

[Insert Table 3 here]

3.1.2 Daily life psychological flexibility

As is shown in Table 4 and Figure 4, the results of the three repeated measures mixed-effects models provided partial support for the hypothesis that reveal that individuals who followed ACT-DL+TAU showed increased improvement of daily life openness as measured with ESM outcomes, in comparison to those in the TAU condition.

A significant Condition x Time interaction effect (P -value=.026) was found for in-the-moment openness, with time-specific contrasts indicating that individuals in ACT-DL+TAU, on average, were less inclined to avoid their negative feelings at post-intervention (P -value=.007), reflected by a steeper increase from baseline to post-intervention in in-the-moment openness as visualised in Figure 4. However, as shown in Table 5, these scores were not significantly different from each other at any other time point in the study as tested with simple post-hoc contrasts. While the increase in these scores was thus largest for ACT-DL individuals at post-intervention, a main effect of Time (P -value<.001) did indicate an increase in in-the-moment openness for the full sample, at both post-intervention (P -value<.001) and 6-month follow-up (P -value<.001).

Since-the-previous-beep openness scores also increased more in the ACT-D+TAU condition as opposed to TAU (P -value<.001) and did so at both post-intervention (P -value<.001) and 6-month follow-up (P -value=.025). Post-hoc simple contrasts equally showed significant differences in scores at post-intervention favoring ACT-DL+TAU (P -value=.011). The main effect of Time disappeared when

introducing the Condition x Time interaction term, which suggests that the significant increases in these scores in the ACT-DL+TAU condition explained this effect.

Our hypothesis of a steeper increase in ACT-DL+TAU versus TAU was unconfirmed for daily PF scores. Yet, a significant main effect of Time was found at 6-month follow-up (P -value<.001). Finally, post-hoc contrasts showed that there were no significant differences between conditions at any time point for this outcome.

[Insert Tables 4-5 / Figure 4 here]

3.2 The moderating role of the therapeutic working alliance

3.2.1 WAI-SF as a moderator of global psychological flexibility

As can be seen in Table 6 and Figure 5, the results of our moderation analysis did not provide support for the hypothesis that better client-perceived, or therapist-perceived WAI-SF would lead to larger increases in mean levels of FIT-60 total scores.

[Insert Table 6 / Figure 5 here]

3.2.2 WAI-SF as a moderator of daily life psychological flexibility

Table 7 and Figure 6 show the moderating effects of client-perceived (left) and therapist-perceived (right) WAI-SF on ESM outcomes.

Client-perceived working alliance moderated treatment effects of ACT-DL+TAU versus TAU on in-the-moment openness (P -value=.002), confirming our hypothesis that the largest increases in in-the-moment openness would be found for ACT-DL individuals who reported a better therapeutic working alliance and smallest increases for TAU individuals who reported worse working alliance, at least at post-intervention (P -value<.001). At the same time, there was a significant Time x WAI effect at 6-month follow-up, (P -value<.001), indicating that the increase in this ESM outcome from baseline to 6-month follow-up was steeper for those individuals who reported a better therapeutic working alliance in both conditions (see Table 7 and Figure 5). Therapist-perceived WAI-SF scores on the other hand did not moderate treatment effects on in-the-moment openness.

Furthermore, both client-perceived (P -value=.004) and therapist-perceived (P -value<.001) working alliance moderated the change in since-the-previous-beep openness in both conditions, from

baseline to 6-month follow-up (P -value=.001) for the former, and from baseline to both post-intervention (P -value=.001) and 6-month follow-up (P -value<.001) for the latter.

Finally, a main effect of client-perceived WAI-SF was found on daily psychological flexibility scores (P -value=.021), indicating that those individuals who reported a better working alliance, also reported better scores on this outcome in general.

[Insert Table 7 / Figure 6 here]

3.3 Service use checklist analysis (post-hoc analysis)

Analysis of our service use checklist ($n=65$) shows that 89% of the participants who were randomized to TAU did get some form of therapy at post-intervention, 81% at 6-month follow-up, and 89% at 12-month follow-up. Further inspection of this checklist informed us that TAU most commonly consisted of (various forms of) cognitive behavior therapy (CBT). Twenty-four participants received structured CBT for UHR or FEP (CBTp) (van der Gaag et al., 2012). Mindfulness-based group sessions, EMDR, and individual counseling sessions were also reported. Please refer to Table 8 for more details.

[Insert Table 8 here]

4 Discussion

This study was the first to investigate the effect of ACT-DL+TAU in comparison to TAU on both a global as well as daily life measures of psychological flexibility, including a long-term follow-up in a large sample size. We found that global and daily PF and its related sub-processes measured with the FIT-60 did improve to an equal extent in both the ACT-DL+TAU and TAU condition. In contrast, in-the-moment openness and since-the-previous-beep openness did increase more in ACT-DL+TAU in comparison to TAU (at post-intervention for in-the-moment openness, and at post-intervention and 6-month follow-up for since-the-previous-beep openness). Those participants in the ACT-DL+TAU condition reporting the best client-perceived working alliance showed the largest increases in in-the-moment openness, at least at post-intervention. In both treatment conditions, those participants with the best therapist-perceived working alliance had the largest increases in since-the-previous-beep openness at both post-intervention and 6-month follow-up.

4.1 Global psychological flexibility

Although in line with results from some prior clinical trials (Shawyer et al., 2012, 2017; White et al., 2011), the lack of a between-condition difference on PF improvement contrasts with other trials that

found significant effects favoring ACT over TAU on acceptance (Gumley et al., 2017; Spidel et al., 2018) and mindfulness (Gumley et al., 2017; White et al., 2011). However, individuals in the ACT-DL+TAU condition improved significantly over time on all PF processes, and our hexaflex analysis suggest that these improvements were also clinically relevant when comparing scores to those based on a clinical population with heterogeneous psychopathology (Batink & Delespaul, 2015).

Whereas in a previous study from our group, ACT-DL failed to have significant effects on PF (van Aubel et al., 2020), in the current study, PF increased in both conditions, meaning that PF improved in TAU as well. We did not have full control over the specific therapeutic elements received in TAU and there might have been similar elements in both conditions, explaining the increase in PF scores in this condition. A majority of participants in the control condition received either individual or group counselling/psychotherapy, including various forms of CBT (e.g., schema therapy), as well as more recent forms of behavior therapy (e.g., mindfulness-based group intervention), which may explain the effect in the TAU condition. Indeed, ACT is similar to other (contextual) behavioral therapies in the sense that it incorporates experiential exercises to increase mindful awareness and acceptance, self-compassion, value clarification, and behavior activation (Hayes et al., 2011). Nonetheless, it is also argued to be specific in its effect on PF, given that all ACT-processes are integrated with a specific focus on the *willingness* to contact difficult experiences (acceptance) within the context of commitment to important personal values (Hayes et al., 2006). As such, the flexible use of the various coping skills to stay committed to personal values despite difficult experiences is ACT-specific and it remains unclear why there was no larger increase found in ACT-DL+TAU versus TAU on any of the FIT-60 subscales.

4.2 Momentary processes

Our findings on increased momentary openness in the ACT-DL+TAU condition are in line with results from another study that demonstrated significant improvements on momentary acceptance, defusion, valued living, and mindfulness (Levin et al., 2017). It is of note that, although of similar magnitude to previous ESM studies (Klippel et al., 2017), the observed increases in ESM openness measures were relatively small. However, in ESM studies, even small increases in therapeutic effects may be relevant given that they occur in the flow of daily life, and, over time, may accumulate into larger relevant effects (Kramer et al., 2014). In addition, the significant interaction effect did not hold for daily psychological flexibility as measured with ESM evening questionnaires. A limitation of the current study was that we did not have daily ESM data available at post-intervention due to technical issues. One possible explanation for this null-result is therefore that, similar to in-the-moment openness, the effect occurred at post-intervention but did not persist until the 6-month follow-up.

Yet, the effects for daily life openness are promising, given that multiple studies showed that low openness towards aversive mood states and cognitions is associated with reduced wellbeing and other negative outcomes including social anxiety and paranoia (Hershenberg et al., 2017; Levin et al., 2018; Machell et al., 2015; O'Toole et al., 2017; Udachina et al., 2009, 2014; Wenzel et al., 2018). That is, low openness towards unwanted experiences may paradoxically exhaust the cognitive and emotional strategies needed to engage effectively in valued activities or important social interactions (Kashdan et al., 2014). This may be underscored by the fact that we found significant treatment effects in the INTERACT study on functioning, negative symptoms, and momentary symptom-related distress (Myin-Germeys et al., 2021). A next step will now be to test whether momentary openness is the actual process of change within ACT-DL making use of multilevel mediation models.

The results on daily life openness are in contrast with the results on global measures. A similar contrast emerged in our efficacy data (Myin-Germeys et al., 2021), where we found a significant effect on momentary psychotic distress, but not general psychotic distress as measured with a clinical interview. These results thus seem to suggest that the assessment of psychologically flexible behavior at the micro-level may be much more sensitive to subtle therapy-induced changes than assessment of more abstract metacognitive conceptualizations of this behavior at the macro-level. Nonetheless, it remains poorly understood how to operationalize psychologically flexible behavior at the micro-level with most studies to date, including ours, focusing exclusively on items assessing momentary (Udachina et al., 2009, 2014) and daily (Kashdan et al., 2014) acceptance, while neglecting other important ACT processes as well as their integration into PF. Future work is now necessary to capture this concept as a state in individuals' daily lives.

4.3 Therapeutic alliance

Although inconsistent across the two measures of momentary openness and across time points, our results showing that a better client-perceived therapeutic alliance amplified effects on momentary openness, especially in ACT-DL+TAU at 6-month follow-up, add to previous studies that have repeatedly linked the quality of the therapeutic relationship to higher therapy engagement as well as improvements in overall psychotic, global, and negative symptoms (Bourke et al., 2021; Browne et al., 2021; Shattock et al., 2018). Our results underscore that a positively perceived working alliance is important for changing both therapeutic processes as well as outcomes, at least in daily life. This may even be more so due to the nature of the therapeutic relationship within ACT, where the various ACT processes need to become evident in the relationship between therapist and client itself. That is, ACT therapists themselves need to be vulnerable and open towards difficult experiences within the therapeutic process (Vilardaga & Hayes, 2009; K. G. Wilson & Sandoz, 2010).

4.4 Limitations

The current study needs to be interpreted within the context of some limitations. A first limitation was that we did not have data available on client-perceived working alliance for all participants. Although speculative, this could mean that we excluded those participants from our analyses that were the least engaged within their therapeutic trajectory, potentially biasing our moderation analysis. Second, the alliance was measured at post-intervention. As such, we cannot preclude that the therapeutic alliance was not a moderator of improvements in PF, but that it was actually an outcome of improved PF in itself, given that previous process literature has shown that improvements in symptoms throughout therapy may lead to a better perceived therapeutic alliance (Ardito & Rabellino, 2011; Folmo et al., 2021). Third, the operationalization of our daily life PF measures consisted only of a limited number of ESM items, and our momentary measures focused solely on the open ACT processes. Including the aware and active components of the PF model on the momentary level would have provided us with a more complete picture on daily life PF. Fourth, we cannot rule out that improved global PF within the ACT-DL condition was a result of increased familiarity with the concepts within the FIT-60 questionnaires thereby increasing social desirability to rate oneself higher on the questionnaire items, rather than the result of improvements in actual PF. Nevertheless, our finding that global PF improved to an equal extent in both conditions seems to point into the direction of an actual increase in PF over time.

4.5 Conclusions

In conclusion, while we did not find any significant treatment differences on global psychological flexibility, we did find improvements in PF in both conditions, as well as treatment effects favoring ACT-DL on two momentary measures. In addition, our results provide further support for the importance of a good therapeutic relationship between client and therapist. The therapeutic effects were visible there where we provided therapeutic support by making use of our ACT-DL EMI, that is, in the daily lives of our participants. Next steps are now to unravel the mediating role of daily life openness of ACT-DL on important therapeutic targets in early psychosis. In addition, future work is now needed to improve our understanding of daily life PF and how to operationalize it.

Table 1. Baseline descriptive mean (SD) scores.												
Measure	N	Total sample (n=148)			N	ACT-DL+TAU (n=71)			N	TAU only (n=77)		
		Mean	SD (_b; _w)			Mean	SD (_b; _w)			Mean	SD (_b; _w)	
Global PF												
FIT-60 (total)		170.0										
	140	7	50.67		66	172.24	52.56		74	168.14	49.20	
FIT-60 (acceptance)	139	25.48	11.71		66	24.72	11.69		73	26.18	11.76	
FIT-60 (defusion)	139	22.43	13.41		66	21.90	13.51		73	22.90	13.39	
FIT-60 (self as context)	140	25.07	9.11		66	24.76	9.29		74	25.35	9.00	
FIT-60 (here and now)	139	28.05	10.49		66	28.66	10.78		73	27.51	10.25	
FIT-60 (values)	140	37.33	10.19		66	38.61	10.23		74	36.19	10.09	
FIT-60 (committed action)	139	31.67	11.71		65	33.89	11.25		74	29.71	11.83	
Momentary and daily PF												
In-the-moment openness	147	4.10	1.83	1.34	71	4.17	1.83	1.35	76	4.03	1.84	1.33
Since-the-previous-beep												
openness	135	3.83	0.62	0.82	64	3.92	0.67	0.87	71	3.75	0.57	0.77
Daily PF	126	4.22	1.04	0.82	63	4.14	0.88	0.82	63	4.29	1.17	0.82
Working alliance												
WAI-SF (client)	94	43.14	9.90		46	43.25	10.42		48	43.03	9.49	
WAI-SF (therapist)	68	38.15	5.53		41	38.02	5.21		27	38.33	6.10	
Symptom severity												
BPRS (total)	148	40.81	8.43		71	39.50	7.76		77	42.02	8.88	
Notes. Data represent baseline descriptive mean (SD) scores of trait psychological flexibility (FIT-60 scores), perceived working alliance (WAI-SF), daily life (ESM) measures, and symptom severity (BPRS total scores). For ESM outcomes, we report both the standard deviation between (SD_b) and the standard deviation within (SD_w).												

Table 2. Results of a repeated measures mixed-effects model (FIT-60 total score) and a multivariate related outcomes model (FIT-60 subscale scores) of treatment effects on global psychological flexibility and its six sub-processes.

Treatment effects on global psychological flexibility and its six sub processes							Omnibus test of fixed effects				
FIT-60 outcome	Fixed effects			B	SE	95% CI	P-value	df	χ^2	P-value	
Total ¹	Condition		-2.48	7.07	-16.35 to 11.38	.726	Condition	1	0.12	.726	
		Time	Post	19.49	4.52	10.63 to 28.36	<.001	Time	3	34.80	<.001
		FU6	25.81	5.78	14.48 to 37.14	<.001	Condition x Time	3	1.13	.769	
		FU12	33.14	7.09	19.24 to 47.04	<.001					
	Condition x Time	Post	1.68	6.69	-11.43 to 14.78	.802					
		FU6	-5.74	8.42	-22.24 to 10.76	.496					
		FU12	-0.99	9.96	-20.51 to 18.53	.921					
	Acceptance ²	Condition		-2.70	1.77	-6.18 to 0.78	.128	Condition	1	2.32	.128
			Time	Post	4.63	1.29	2.10 to 7.15	<.001	Time	3	27.99
		FU6	4.77	1.47	1.89 to 7.65	.001	Condition x Time	3	0.27	.965	
		FU12	7.23	1.50	4.29 to 10.17	<.001					
Condition x Time		Post	0.69	1.89	-3.01 to 4.40	.714					
		FU6	-0.12	2.13	-4.29 to 4.05	.955					
		FU12	0.75	2.11	-3.39 to 4.90	.721					
Defusion ²		Condition		-2.47	2.09	-6.58 to 1.63	.238	Condition	1	1.39	.238
			Time	Post	4.29	1.40	1.54 to 7.04	.002	Time	3	21.62
		FU6	5.23	1.60	2.09 to 8.36	.001	Condition x Time	3	0.12	.989	
		FU12	6.73	1.63	3.53 to 9.93	<.001					
	Condition x Time	Post	0.28	2.06	-3.75 to 4.31	.892					
		FU6	-0.47	2.33	-5.04 to 4.09	.839					
		FU12	0.27	2.30	-4.24 to 4.78	.907					
	Here and now ²	Condition		-0.05	1.63	-3.25 to 3.15	.974	Condition	1	0.00	.974
			Time	Post	1.99	1.11	-0.19 to 4.16	.074	Time	3	13.10
		FU6	2.32	1.27	-0.17 to 4.80	.068	Condition x Time	3	0.05	.997	
		FU12	4.61	1.29	2.08 to 7.15	<.001					
Condition x Time		Post	-0.07	1.63	-3.27 to 3.12	.964					
		FU6	0.33	1.84	-3.28 to 3.93	.858					
		FU12	-0.01	1.82	-3.59 to 3.56	.994					

Table 2 continues on next page.

Table 2 (continued).

		Fixed effects				Omnibus test of fixed effects				
FIT-60 outcome			B	SE	95% CI	P-value		df	χ^2	P-value
Self as context ²	Condition		-1.39	1.41	-4.16 to 1.38	.325	Condition	1	0.97	.325
	Time	Post	2.56	1.07	0.46 to 4.66	.017	Time	3	17.40	.001
		FU6	3.65	1.22	1.25 to 6.04	.003	Condition x Time	3	0.86	.835
		FU12	4.67	1.25	2.23 to 7.12	<.001				
	Condition x Time	Post	1.15	1.57	-1.94 to 4.23	.465				
		FU6	-0.34	1.77	-3.82 to 3.13	.847				
		FU12	-0.04	1.76	-3.49 to 3.41	.982				
Values ²	Condition		1.77	1.59	-1.34 to 4.88	.265	Condition	1	1.25	.264
	Time	Post	2.31	1.06	0.23 to 4.39	.030	Time	3	16.79	.001
		FU6	4.43	1.21	2.05 to 6.80	<.001	Condition x Time	3	1.24	.742
		FU12	3.81	1.24	1.37 to 6.24	.002				
	Condition x Time	Post	0.72	1.56	-2.35 to 3.78	.646				
		FU6	-1.24	1.76	-4.69 to 2.22	.482				
		FU12	-0.53	1.75	-3.96 to 2.91	.763				
Committed action ²	Condition		3.41	1.90	-0.31 to 7.14	.073	Condition	1	3.23	.072
	Time	Post	3.88	1.25	1.43 to 6.33	.002	Time	3	22.95	<.001
		FU6	4.70	1.42	1.92 to 7.49	.001	Condition x Time	3	1.75	.626
		FU12	6.32	1.47	3.44 to 9.20	<.001				
	Condition x Time	Post	-0.78	1.84	-4.39 to 2.83	.671				
		FU6	-2.47	2.07	-6.53 to 1.58	.232				
		FU12	-1.94	2.07	-6.00 to 2.11	.348				

Notes. Data represent unstandardized b-coefficients and their corresponding standard errors, 95% confidence interval, and p-value, as well as a Wald-type omnibus test of no effect at any time point versus an effect at at least one time point ($\alpha=.05$). ¹ Results for the repeated measures mixed-effects model; ² Results for the multivariate related outcomes model; FIT-60 = Flexibility Index Test 60 (Batink et al., 2012; Batink & Delespaul, 2015).

Table 3. Predicted margins, SEs, and estimated differences between treatment conditions for global psychological flexibility and its six sub-processes.

FIT-60 outcome		TAU only		ACT-DL+TAU		Estimated difference with 95% CI and p-value			
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Δ	95% CI		P-value
Total	Baseline	170.86	4.84	168.38	5.12	-2.48	-16.35	11.38	.726
	Post-intervention	190.36	6.03	189.55	6.46	-0.80	-18.18	16.57	.928
	6-month follow-up	196.67	6.81	188.45	7.19	-8.22	-27.68	11.24	.408
	12-month follow-up	204.01	7.58	200.54	7.54	-3.47	-24.47	17.53	.746
Acceptance	Baseline	26.71	1.18	23.95	1.25	-2.76	-6.15	0.62	.110
	Post-intervention	31.19	1.31	29.22	1.41	-1.97	-5.75	1.81	.307
	6-month follow-up	31.48	1.64	28.94	1.73	-2.55	-7.24	2.15	.288
	12-month follow-up	33.61	1.54	32.17	1.54	-1.45	-5.72	2.83	.508
Defusion	Baseline	23.63	1.32	20.88	1.39	-2.75	-6.53	1.03	.154
	Post-intervention	28.20	1.61	25.57	1.73	-2.63	-7.28	2.02	.267
	6-month follow-up	29.42	1.79	25.10	1.90	-4.33	-9.46	0.80	.098
	12-month follow-up	30.56	2.04	27.85	2.03	-2.72	-8.37	2.94	.346
Here and now	Baseline	28.06	1.04	27.87	1.09	-0.19	-3.15	2.77	.900
	Post-intervention	30.00	1.21	29.76	1.29	-0.25	-3.72	3.23	.890
	6-month follow-up	30.49	1.44	30.45	1.52	-0.04	-4.15	4.07	.985
	12-month follow-up	32.30	1.59	32.56	1.58	0.26	-4.16	4.67	.910

Table 3 continues on next page.

Table 3 (continued).

		TAU only		ACT-DL+TAU		Estimated difference with 95% CI and p-value			
FIT-60 outcome		Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Δ	95% CI	P-value	
Self as context	Baseline	25.63	0.95	24.27	1.01	-1.35	-4.07	1.37	.330
	Post-intervention	28.08	1.04	28.00	1.12	-0.08	-3.09	2.92	.957
	6-month follow-up	29.29	1.25	27.85	1.31	-1.44	-5.00	2.13	.429
	12-month follow-up	30.08	1.33	29.07	1.32	-1.00	-4.68	2.67	.592
Values	Baseline	36.40	1.14	38.28	1.21	1.87	-1.40	5.15	.262
	Post-intervention	38.74	1.14	41.29	1.23	2.55	-0.75	5.85	.130
	6-month follow-up	40.99	1.31	41.63	1.38	0.64	-3.09	4.37	.737
	12-month follow-up	40.01	1.29	41.75	1.29	1.73	-1.85	5.32	.343
Committed action	Baseline	29.97	1.31	33.62	1.40	3.65	-0.13	7.44	.058
	Post-intervention	33.98	1.37	36.67	1.48	2.69	-1.29	6.66	.185
	6-month follow-up	34.98	1.52	36.04	1.62	1.05	-3.32	5.42	.636
	12-month follow-up	35.72	1.71	37.88	1.69	2.16	-2.56	6.88	.370

Notes. Data represent predicted margins at sample mean BPRS total baseline scores, based on seven separate univariate repeated measures mixed models. Note that the predicted margins of the FIT-60 subscales should be interpreted with caution, given that they are not directly comparable to the results of the joint multivariate model.

Table 4. Results of repeated measures mixed-effects models of treatment effects on daily life psychological flexibility processes.

ESM outcome	Fixed effects					Omnibus test of fixed effects			
			B	SD	95% CI	P-value		df	χ^2 P-value
In-the-moment openness	Condition		-0.14	0.29	-0.71 to 0.42	.614	Condition	1	0.25 .615
	Time	Post	0.49	0.08	0.33 to 0.64	<.001	Time	2	53.86 <.001
		FU6	0.54	0.09	0.36 to 0.72	<.001	Condition x Time	2	7.30 .026
	Condition x Time	Post	0.32	0.12	0.09 to 0.56	.007			
		FU6	0.10	0.14	-0.18 to 0.37	.487			
Since-the-previous- beep openness	Condition		-0.02	0.11	-0.23 to 0.19	.853	Condition	1	0.03 .853
	Time	Post	-0.07	0.06	-0.18 to 0.04	.222	Time	2	1.67 .434
		FU6	0.00	0.06	-0.13 to 0.13	.998	Condition x Time	2	16.36 <.001
	Condition x Time	Post	0.33	0.08	0.16 to 0.49	<.001			
		FU6	0.23	0.10	0.03 to 0.43	.025			
Daily psychological flexibility	Condition		0.02	0.17	-0.32 to 0.36	.924	Condition	1	0.01 .924
	Time	Post					Time	1	22.82 <.001
		FU6	0.68	0.14	0.40 to 0.96	<.001	Condition x Time	1	0.50 .478
	Condition x Time	Post							
		FU6	-0.15	0.22	-0.58 to 0.27	.478			

Notes. Data represent unstandardized b-coefficients and their corresponding standard errors, 95% confidence interval, and p-value, as well as a Wald-type omnibus test of no effect at any time point versus an effect at at least one time point ($\alpha=.05$). ESM evening questionnaire data were missing at post-intervention. ESM = Experience Sampling Method (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Myin-Germeys et al., 2018).

Table 5. Predicted margins, SEs, and estimated differences between treatment conditions for daily life psychological flexibility.

ESM Outcome		TAU only		ACT-DL+TAU		Estimated difference with 95% CI and p-value			
		Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Δ	95% CI	P-value	
Momentary openness	Baseline	4.10	0.20	3.95	0.21	-0.14	-0.71	0.42	.614
	Post-intervention	4.59	0.21	4.77	0.22	0.18	-0.41	0.76	.548
	6-month follow-up	4.64	0.21	4.59	0.22	-0.05	-0.65	0.55	.875
Since-the-previous-beep openness	Baseline	3.87	0.08	3.85	0.08	-0.02	-0.23	0.19	.853
	Post-intervention	3.80	0.09	4.11	0.09	0.31	0.07	0.55	.011
	6-month follow-up	3.87	0.09	4.08	0.10	0.21	-0.06	0.47	.122
Daily psychological flexibility	Baseline	4.19	0.12	4.21	0.12	0.02	-0.32	0.36	.924
	Post-intervention								
	6-month follow-up	4.88	0.16	4.74	0.18	-0.14	-0.60	0.33	.566

Notes. Data represent predicted margins at sample mean BPRS total baseline scores. ESM evening questionnaire data were missing at post-intervention. ESM = Experience Sampling Method (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Myin-Germeys et al., 2018).

Table 6. Treatment effect on global psychological flexibility by (a) client-perceived and (b) therapist-perceived working alliance.

			Client-perceived working alliance (n=94)					Therapist-perceived working alliance (n=68)				
Outcome			B (SE)	95% CI	P	Omnibus test		B (SE)	95% CI	P	Omnibus test	
						χ^2	P				χ^2	P
FIT-60 total	ACT		0.00 (7.53)	-14.76 to 14.75	>.999	0.00	>.999	-8.38 (11.99)	-31.89 to 15.13	.485	0.49	.485
	WAI		0.78 (0.57)	-0.33 to 1.90	.170	1.89	.170	-0.38 (1.46)	-3.24 to 2.48	.795	0.07	.795
	ACT × WAI		0.37 (0.76)	-1.12 to 1.85	.628	0.23	.628	1.56 (2.12)	-2.58 to 5.71	.460	0.55	.460
	Time	Post	15.57 (4.69)	6.37 to 24.77	.001			13.30 (7.30)	-1.00 to 27.60	.068		
		FU6	20.41 (5.92)	8.80 to 32.02	.001			15.35 (7.42)	0.80 to 29.90	.039		
		FU12	30.69 (8.01)	14.99 to 46.40	<.001	22.24	<.001	27.35 (11.91)	4.01 to 50.69	.022	6.68	.083
	Time × ACT	Post	5.36 (6.69)	-7.75 to 18.46	.423			3.54 (9.53)	-15.14 to 22.22	.710		
		FU6	-0.60 (8.38)	-17.03 to 15.83	.943			3.81 (9.78)	-15.36 to 22.97	.697		
		FU12	0.81 (11.30)	-21.34 to 22.95	.943	1.15	.766	3.15 (15.04)	-26.32 to 32.62	.834	0.17	.982
	Time × WAI	Post	0.76 (0.56)	-0.34 to 1.87	.177			1.18 (1.19)	-1.15 to 3.51	.323		
		FU6	1.03 (0.72)	-0.38 to 2.43	.153			0.91 (1.28)	-1.59 to 3.42	.475		
		FU12	1.23 (0.99)	-0.71 to 3.16	.214	3.14	.370	-2.37 (2.13)	-6.54 to 1.80	.265	3.95	.267
	Time × ACT × WAI	Post	0.21 (0.73)	-1.22 to 1.64	.773			-0.06 (1.69)	-3.38 to 3.27	.974		
		FU6	0.02 (0.91)	-1.75 to 1.79	.983			-0.56 (1.77)	-4.04 to 2.91	.751		
		FU12	-0.97 (1.24)	-3.40 to 1.46	.433	0.90	.826	1.94 (2.74)	-3.44 to 7.31	.480	0.98	.807

Notes. Data represent unstandardized b-coefficients and their corresponding standard errors, 95% confidence interval, and p-values, for the two-way and three-way interactions between condition by study period by working alliance. FIT-60 = Flexibility Index Test 60 (Batink et al., 2012; Batink & Delespaul, 2015).

Table 7. Treatment effect on daily life psychological flexibility by (a) client-perceived and (b) therapist-perceived working alliance.

			Client-perceived working alliance (n=94)					Therapist-perceived working alliance (n=68)				
Outcome			B (SE)	95% CI	P	Omnibus test		B (SE)	95% CI	P	Omnibus test	
						χ^2	P				χ^2	P
In-the-moment openness	ACT		0.16 (0.34)	-0.52 to 0.83	.650	0.21	.650	0.19 (0.46)	-0.72 to 1.09	.689	0.16	.689
	WAI		0.01 (0.03)	-0.04 to 0.07	.605	0.27	.605	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.14 to 0.08	.563	0.33	.563
	ACT × WAI		0.00 (0.03)	-0.07 to 0.06	.926	0.01	.926	0.01 (0.08)	-0.15 to 0.17	.901	0.02	.901
	Time	Post	0.50 (0.09)	0.33 to 0.67	<.001	43.32	<.001	0.28 (0.12)	0.05 to 0.51	.019	11.47	.003
		FU6	0.51 (0.10)	0.32 to 0.70	<.001			0.41 (0.13)	0.15 to 0.66	.002		
	Time × ACT	Post	0.34 (0.13)	0.09 to 0.59	.008	7.07	.029	0.34 (0.16)	0.03 to 0.65	.033	4.65	.098
		FU6	0.15 (0.15)	-0.13 to 0.44	.294			0.19 (0.18)	-0.16 to 0.54	.299		
	Time × WAI	Post	0.02 (0.01)	-0.01 to 0.04	.169	17.11	<.001	0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 to 0.06	.196	4.35	.114
		FU6	0.05 (0.01)	0.03 to 0.07	<.001			0.04 (0.02)	0.00 to 0.09	.046		
	Time × ACT × WAI	Post	0.05 (0.01)	0.02 to 0.08	<.001	12.73	.002	0.05 (0.03)	-0.01 to 0.11	.077	4.60	.101
Since-the-previous-beep openness		FU6	0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 to 0.05	.137			0.06 (0.03)	-0.01 to 0.12	.083		
	ACT		0.13 (0.12)	-0.10 to 0.35	.265	1.24	.266	0.22 (0.16)	-0.10 to 0.54	.169	1.89	.169
	WAI		-0.01 (0.01)	-0.02 to 0.01	.455	0.56	.456	0.00 (0.02)	-0.03 to 0.04	.946	0.00	.946
	ACT × WAI		0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 to 0.04	.209	1.58	.209	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.06 to 0.04	.726	0.12	.726
	Time	Post	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.15 to 0.09	.610	0.29	.867	0.13 (0.08)	-0.02 to 0.28	.097	3.64	.162
		FU6	-0.02 (0.07)	-0.15 to 0.11	.745			0.12 (0.08)	-0.04 to 0.29	.146		
	Time × ACT	Post	0.30 (0.09)	0.13 to 0.48	.001	13.58	.001	0.11 (0.10)	-0.09 to 0.31	.277	2.30	.317
		FU6	0.24 (0.10)	0.03 to 0.44	.025			0.16 (0.12)	-0.08 to 0.40	.179		
	Time × WAI	Post	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 to 0.03	.104	11.16	.004	0.03 (0.01)	0.01 to 0.05	.001	19.30	<.001
		FU6	0.03 (0.01)	0.01 to 0.04	.001			0.04 (0.01)	0.02 to 0.07	<.001		
	Time × ACT × WAI	Post	0.00 (0.01)	-0.02 to 0.02	.657	3.28	.194	0.01 (0.02)	-0.03 to 0.04	.768	0.38	.826
		FU6	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.04 to 0.00	.123			-0.01 (0.02)	-0.05 to 0.04	.681		

Table 7 continues on next page.

Table 7 (continued).

			Client-perceived working alliance (n=94)					Therapist-perceived working alliance (n=68)				
Outcome			B (SE)	95% CI	P	Omnibus test		B (SE)	95% CI	P	Omnibus test	
						χ^2	P				χ^2	P
Daily psychological flexibility	ACT		0.00 (0.18)	-0.35 to 0.35	.996	0.00	.996	0.06 (0.28)	-0.50 to 0.61	.842	0.04	.842
	WAI		0.03 (0.01)	0.00 to 0.06	.021	5.31	.021	0.05 (0.03)	-0.02 to 0.12	.138	2.20	.138
	ACT × WAI		-0.01 (0.02)	-0.04 to 0.03	.607	0.26	.607	0.00 (0.05)	-0.10 to 0.10	.956	0.00	.956
	Time	Post										
		FU6	0.58 (0.15)	0.29 to 0.87	<.001	15.15	<.001	0.52 (0.22)	0.09 to 0.94	.017	5.71	.017
	Time × ACT	Post										
		FU6	-0.03 (0.22)	-0.46 to 0.39	.878	0.02	.878	0.09 (0.29)	-0.48 to 0.67	.748	0.10	.748
	Time × WAI	Post										
		FU6	0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 to 0.05	.256	1.29	.256	0.00 (0.04)	-0.07 to 0.07	.940	0.01	.940
	Time × ACT × WAI	Post										
		FU6	0.01 (0.02)	-0.03 to 0.05	.676	0.17	.676	0.04 (0.05)	-0.07 to 0.14	.516	0.42	.516

Notes. Data represent unstandardized b-coefficients and their corresponding standard errors, 95% confidence interval, and p-values, for the two-way and three-way interactions between condition by study period by working alliance. ESM evening questionnaire data were missing at post-intervention. ESM = Experience Sampling Method (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987; Myin-Germeys et al., 2018).

Table 8. Types of interventions within the control condition per study period.

TAU treatment (Freq., %)	Post-intervention	6-month follow-up	12-month follow-up
Individual counseling	39 (64)	22 (52)	24 (57)
Individual psychotherapy	8 (13)	5 (12)	5 (12)
Individual CBTp	24 (39)	17 (40)	17 (40)
Individual EMDR	4 (7)	4 (10)	3 (7)
Group psychotherapy	19 (31)	12 (29)	13 (31)
Systemic therapy	5 (8)	0 (0)	2 (5)
Some form of therapy ¹	54 (89)	34 (81)	36 (86)

Notes. CBTp = cognitive behavioral therapy for psychosis. Some form of therapy indicates that a participant attended at least one of the therapy forms mentioned above.

Figures

Figure 1. Timing of the various daily life psychological flexibility variables. The double arrow represents the ESM assessment window. Momentary and since-the-previous-beep openness are both assessed at beep t. In-the-moment openness reflects the moment right before the beep went off. Since-the-previous-beep openness reflects the time since the previous beep. Daily PF assessed the experience of the previous day.

Figure 2. Global psychological flexibility at baseline, post-intervention, 6-, and 12-month follow-up.

577

578

579 **Figure 3.** ACT hexaflex scores in TAU only (top) and ACT-DL+TAU (bottom) at baseline, post-
580 intervention, and 6-, and 12-month follow-up. The gray areas represent average norm scores for a
581 clinical population sample (Batink & Delespaul, 2015).

Figure 4. Daily life psychological flexibility at baseline, post-intervention, and 6-month follow-up. Data for daily psychological flexibility at post-intervention were unavailable due to technical issues.

Figure 5. Global psychological flexibility by client-perceived working alliance (left) and therapist-perceived working alliance (right).

Figure 6. Daily life psychological flexibility by client-perceived working alliance (left) and therapist-perceived working alliance (right).

Acknowledgements

We thank all the participating health services in Amsterdam (Academic Medical Centre, Arkin Basis GGZ), The Hague (Parnassia, PsyQ), Maastricht/Eindhoven (Mondriaan, Virenze, GGZE), Flemish-Brabant (UPC KU Leuven, VDIP Antwerp, Sint-Annendael, PCM Mortsel), and East/West Flanders (OLV Brugge, Karus Melle, VDIP Sint Niklaas). We thank all research coordinators (Silke Apers, Nele Volbragt, Wendy Beuken), research assistants (Dieuwke Siegmans, Davinia Verhoeven, Anna de Zwart, Iris de Wit, Lore Depraetere, Tessa Biesemans, Lotte Hendriks), and data managers (Martien Wampers, Jolien Bynens) past and present who were involved in the INTERACT trial. We also like to thank all individuals who participated in the study and were essential for its successful completion.

Funding

This work was supported by an ERC Consolidator Grant (ERC – 2012 – StG, project 309767 – INTERACT) and FWO Odysseus Grant (no. G0F8416N) to IMG as well as a NWO VENI Grant (no. 451 – 13 – 022) and DFG Heisenberg professorship (no. 389624707) to UR.

References

- Ardito, R. B., & Rabellino, D. (2011). Therapeutic alliance and outcome of psychotherapy: Historical excursus, measurements, and prospects for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2(OCT), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00270>
- Baldwin, S. A., Imel, Z. E., Braithwaite, S. R., & Atkins, D. C. (2014). Analyzing multiple outcomes in clinical research using multivariate multilevel models. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(5), 920–930. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035628>
- Batink, T., Bakker, J., Vaessen, T., Kasanova, Z., Collip, D., van Os, J., Wichers, M., Germeys, I., & Peeters, F. (2016). Acceptance and commitment therapy in daily life training: A feasibility study of an mhealth intervention. *JMIR MHealth and UHealth*, 4(3), e103. <https://doi.org/10.2196/mhealth.5437>
- Batink, T., & Delespaul, P. (2015). Meten van psychologische flexibiliteit - De flexibiliteits index test (FIT-60). *Tijdschrift Voor Gedragstherapie En Cognitieve Therapie*, 48(4), 310–332. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286929062_Meten_van_psychologische_flexibiliteit_-_De_Flexibiliteits_Index_Test_FIT-60
- Batink, T., Jansen, G., & de Mey, H. (2012). De Flexibiliteits Index Test (FIT-60): Een beknopte beschrijving. *GZ - Psychologie*, 4(5), 18–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41480-012-0043-x>
- Beck, K., Andreou, C., Studerus, E., Heitz, U., Ittig, S., Leanza, L., & Riecher-Rössler, A. (2019). Clinical and functional long-term outcome of patients at clinical high risk (CHR) for psychosis without

- 630 transition to psychosis: A systematic review. *Schizophrenia Research*, 210, 39–47.
- 631 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2018.12.047>
- 632 Birchwood, M. (2003). Pathways to emotional dysfunction in first-episode psychosis. *British Journal*
- 633 *of Psychiatry*, 182, 373–375.
- 634 Bond, F. W., Hayes, S. C., Baer, R. A., Carpenter, K. M., Guenole, N., Orcutt, H. K., Waltz, T., & Zettle,
- 635 R. D. (2011). Preliminary sychometric properties of the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire-II:
- 636 A Revised measure of psychological inflexibility and experiential avoidance. *Behavior Therapy*,
- 637 42(4), 676–688. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2011.03.007>
- 638 Bourke, E., Barker, C., & Fornells-Ambrojo, M. (2021). Systematic review and meta-analysis of
- 639 therapeutic alliance, engagement, and outcome in psychological therapies for psychosis.
- 640 *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 1–32.
- 641 <https://doi.org/10.1111/papt.12330>
- 642 Browne, J., Wright, A. C., Berry, K., Mueser, K. T., Cather, C., Penn, D. L., & Kurtz, M. M. (2021). The
- 643 alliance-outcome relationship in individual psychosocial treatment for schizophrenia and early
- 644 psychosis: A meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 231, 154–163.
- 645 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2021.04.002>
- 646 Chawla, N., & Ostafin, B. (2007). Experiential avoidance as a functional dimensional approach to
- 647 psychopathology: An empirical review. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 63(9), 871–890.
- 648 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp>
- 649 Chen, R., Atzil-Slonim, D., Bar-Kalifa, E., Hasson-Ohayon, I., & Refaeli, E. (2018). Therapists’
- 650 recognition of alliance ruptures as a moderator of change in alliance and symptoms.
- 651 *Psychotherapy Research*, 28(4), 560–570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2016.1227104>
- 652 Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1987). Validity and reliability of the experience-sampling method.
- 653 *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 175(9), 526–536.
- 654 Devoe, D. J., Braun, A., Seredynski, T., & Addington, J. (2020). Negative symptoms and functioning in
- 655 youth at risk of psychosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. In *Harvard Review of*
- 656 *Psychiatry* (Vol. 28, Issue 6, pp. 341–355). <https://doi.org/10.1097/HRP.0000000000000273>
- 657 Folmo, E. J., Stänicke, E., Johansen, M. S., Pedersen, G., & Kvarstein, E. H. (2021). Development of
- 658 therapeutic alliance in mentalization-based treatment—Goals, Bonds, and Tasks in a specialized
- 659 treatment for borderline personality disorder. *Psychotherapy Research*, 31(5), 604–618.
- 660 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2020.1831097>
- 661 Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third). SAGE Publications.
- 662 <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/>
- 663 Fusar-Poli, P., Borgwardt, S., Bechdolf, A., Addington, J., Riecher-Rössler, A., Schultze-Lutter, F.,
- 664 Keshavan, M., Wood, S., Ruhrmann, S., Seidman, L. J., Valmaggia, L., Cannon, T., Velthorst, E.,

De Haan, L., Cornblatt, B., Bonoldi, I., Birchwood, M., McGlashan, T., Carpenter, W., ... Yung, A. (2013). The psychosis high-risk state: a comprehensive state-of-the-art review. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 70(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.269>

Fusar-Poli, P., Rocchetti, M., Sardella, A., Avila, A., Brandizzi, M., Caverzasi, E., Politi, P., Ruhrmann, S., & McGuire, P. (2015). Disorder, not just state of risk: Meta-analysis of functioning and quality of life in people at high risk of psychosis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 207, 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.157115>

Goldstone, E., Farhall, J., & Ong, B. (2011). Synergistic pathways to delusions: Enduring vulnerabilities, proximal life stressors and maladaptive psychological coping. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 5(2), 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7893.2011.00264.x>

Gumley, A., White, R., Briggs, A., Ford, I., Barry, S., Stewart, C., Beedie, S., McTaggart, J., Clarke, C., MacLeod, R., Lidstone, E., Riveros, B. S., Young, R., & McLeod, H. (2017). A parallel group randomised open blinded evaluation of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for depression after psychosis: Pilot trial outcomes (ADAPT). *Schizophrenia Research*, 183, 143–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.11.026>

Hartmann, J. A., Yuen, H. P., McGorry, P. D., Yung, A. R., Lin, A., Wood, S. J., Lavoie, S., & Nelson, B. (2016). Declining transition rates to psychotic disorder in “ultra-high risk” clients: Investigation of a dilution effect. *Schizophrenia Research*, 170, 130–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2015.11.026>

Hatcher, R. L., & Gillasp, J. A. (2006). Development and validation of a revised short version of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Psychotherapy Research*, 16, 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300500352500>

Hayes, S. C., Luoma, J. B., Bond, F. W., Masuda, A., & Lillis, J. (2006). Acceptance and commitment therapy: Model, processes and outcomes. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.06.006>

Hayes, S. C., Villatte, M., Levin, M., & Hildebrandt, M. (2011). Open, Aware, and Active: Contextual Approaches as an Emerging Trend in the Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 7, 141–168. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032210-104449>

Heron, K. E., & Smyth, J. M. (2010). Ecological momentary interventions: Incorporating mobile technology into psychosocial and health behaviour treatments. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 15(1), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135910709X466063>

Hershenberg, R., Mavandadi, S., Wright, E., & Thase, M. E. (2017). Anhedonia in the daily lives of depressed Veterans: A pilot report on experiential avoidance as a moderator of emotional reactivity. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 208, 414–417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.10.011>

- 700 Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1989). Development and validation of the Working Alliance
701 Inventory. In *The American Psychological Association* (Vol. 36, Issue 2, pp. 223–233).
702 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcin.2014.01.154>
- 703 Kashdan, T. B., Barrios, V., Forsyth, J. P., & Steger, M. F. (2006). Experiential avoidance as a
704 generalized psychological vulnerability: Comparisons with coping and emotion regulation
705 strategies. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(9), 1301–1320.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.10.003>
- 707 Kashdan, T. B., Goodman, F. R., Machell, K. A., Kleiman, E. M., Monfort, S. S., Ciarrochi, J., & Nezlek, J.
708 B. (2014). A contextual approach to experiential avoidance and social anxiety: Evidence from an
709 experimental interaction and daily interactions of people with social anxiety disorder. *Emotion*,
710 14(4), 769–781. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035935>
- 711 Kashdan, T. B., & Rottenberg, J. (2010). Psychological flexibility as a fundamental aspect of health. In
712 *Clinical Psychology Review* (Vol. 30, Issue 4, pp. 865–878). Pergamon.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.03.001>
- 714 Kay-Lambkin, F. J., Baker, A. L., Palazzi, K., Lewin, T. J., & Kelly, B. J. (2017). Therapeutic Alliance,
715 Client Need for Approval, and Perfectionism as Differential Moderators of Response to eHealth
716 and Traditionally Delivered Treatments for Comorbid Depression and Substance Use Problems.
717 *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 24(5), 728–739. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-017-9676-x)
718 017-9676-x
- 719 Klippel, A., Myin-Germeys, I., Chavez-Baldini, U. Y., Preacher, K. J., Kempton, M., Valmaggia, L.,
720 Calem, M., So, S., Beards, S., Hubbard, K., Gayer-Anderson, C., Onyejiaka, A., Wichers, M.,
721 McGuire, P., Murray, R., Garety, P., van Os, J., Wykes, T., Morgan, C., & Reininghaus, U. (2017).
722 Modeling the Interplay Between Psychological Processes and Adverse, Stressful Contexts and
723 Experiences in Pathways to Psychosis: An Experience Sampling Study. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*,
724 43(2), 302–315. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw185>
- 725 Kramer, I., Simons, C. J. P., Wigman, J. T. W., Collip, D., Jacobs, N., Derom, C., Thiery, E., Van Os, J.,
726 Myin-Germeys, I., & Wichers, M. (2014). Time-lagged moment-to-moment interplay between
727 negative affect and paranoia: New insights in the affective pathway to psychosis. *Schizophrenia*
728 *Bulletin*, 40(2), 278–286. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbs194>
- 729 Levin, M. E., Haeger, J., Pierce, B., & Cruz, R. A. (2017). Evaluating an adjunctive mobile app to
730 enhance psychological flexibility in acceptance and commitment therapy. *Behavior*
731 *Modification*, 41(6), 846–867. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445517719661>
- 732 Levin, M. E., Krafft, J., Pierce, B., & Potts, S. (2018). When is experiential avoidance harmful in the
733 moment? Examining global experiential avoidance as a moderator. *Journal of Behavior Therapy*
734 *and Experimental Psychiatry*, 61, 158–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2018.07.005>

- Levin, M. E., MacLane, C., Daflos, S., Seeley, J. R., Hayes, S. C., Biglan, A., & Pistorello, J. (2013). Examining psychological inflexibility as a transdiagnostic process across psychological disorders. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 3(3), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2014.06.003>
- Lin, A., Wood, S. J., Nelson, B., Beavan, A., McGorry, P., & Yung, A. R. (2015). Outcomes of nontransitioned cases in a sample at ultra-high risk for psychosis. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 172(3), 249–258. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13030418>
- Linscott, R. J., & Van Os, J. (2013). An updated and conservative systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiological evidence on psychotic experiences in children and adults: on the pathway from proneness to persistence to dimensional expression across mental disorders. *Psychological Medicine*, 43, 1133–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291712001626>
- Ly, K. H., Asplund, K., & Andersson, G. (2014). Stress management for middle managers via an acceptance and commitment-based smartphone application: A randomized controlled trial. *Internet Interventions*, 1(3), 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2014.06.003>
- Machell, K. A., Goodman, F. R., & Kashdan, T. B. (2015). Experiential avoidance and well-being: A daily diary analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 29(2), 351–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.911143>
- McGorry, P. D., & Mei, C. (2018). Ultra-high-risk paradigm: Lessons learnt and new directions. *Evidence-Based Mental Health*, 21(4), 131–133. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebmental-2018-300061>
- Morris, E. M. J., Garety, P., & Peters, E. (2014). Psychological flexibility and nonjudgemental acceptance in voice hearers: Relationships with omnipotence and distress. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 48(12), 1150–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867414535671>
- Myin-Germeys, I., Kasanova, Z., Vaessen, T., Vachon, H., Kirtley, O., Viechtbauer, W., & Reininghaus, U. (2018). Experience sampling methodology in mental health research: New insights and technical developments. *World Psychiatry*, 17(2), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20513>
- Myin-Germeys, I., Klippel, A., Steinhart, H., & Reininghaus, U. (2016). Ecological momentary interventions in psychiatry. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 29(4), 258–263. <https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000255>
- Myin-Germeys, I., van Aubel, E., Vaessen, T., Steinhart, H., Klippel, A., Lafit, G., Viechtbauer, W., Batink, T., van Winkel, R., van der Gaag, M., van Amelsvoort, T., Marcelis, M., Schirmbeck, F., de Haan, L., & Reininghaus, U. (2021). Efficacy of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Daily Life (ACT-DL) in early psychosis: Results from the multi-center INTERACT randomized controlled trial. *MedRxiv*, 2021.05.28.21257986. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.28.21257986>
- Nelson, B., & McGorry, P. (2020). The prodrome of psychotic disorders: Identification, prediction, and

preventive treatment. In *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America* (Vol. 29, Issue 1, pp. 57–69). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2019.08.001>

Nelson, Yuen, H. P., Lin, A., Wood, S. J., McGorry, P. D., Hartmann, J. A., & Yung, A. R. (2016). Further examination of the reducing transition rate in ultra high risk for psychosis samples: The possible role of earlier intervention. *Schizophrenia Research*, 174, 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.04.040>

O'Toole, M. S., Zachariae, R., & Mennin, D. S. (2017). Social anxiety and emotion regulation flexibility: considering emotion intensity and type as contextual factors. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 30(6), 716–724. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2017.1346792>

Pankey, J., & Hayes, S. C. (2003). Acceptance and commitment therapy for psychosis. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 3(2), 311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780199997213.003.0004>

Perry, Y., Henry, J. D., & Grisham, J. R. (2011). The habitual use of emotion regulation strategies in schizophrenia. *The British Psychological Society*, 50, 217–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.2010.02001.x>

Peters, E. R., Williams, S. L., Cooke, M. A., & Kuipers, E. (2012). It's not what you hear, it's the way you think about it: Appraisals as determinants of affect and behaviour in voice hearers. *Psychological Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002650>

Pinheiro, J., Bater, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., & R Core Team. (2021). nlme: Linear and nonlinear mixed effects models. *R Package Version 3.1-149*. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=nlme>

Rapado-Castro, M., McGorry, P. D., Yung, A., Calvo, A., & Nelson, B. (2015). Sources of clinical distress in young people at ultra high risk of psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 165, 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2015.03.022>

Reininghaus, U., Depp, C. A., & Myin-Germeys, I. (2016). Ecological interventionist causal models in psychosis: Targeting psychological mechanisms in daily life. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 42(2), 264–269. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbv193>

Reininghaus, U., Klippel, A., Steinhart, H., Vaessen, T., van Nierop, M., Viechtbauer, W., Batink, T., Kasanova, Z., van Aubel, E., van Winkel, R., Marcelis, M., van Amelsvoort, T., van der Gaag, M., de Haan, L., & Myin-Germeys, I. (2019). Efficacy of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Daily Life (ACT-DL) in early psychosis: Study protocol for a multi-centre randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, 20(769), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-019-3912-4>

Rekhi, G., Rapisarda, A., & Lee, J. (2019). Impact of distress related to attenuated psychotic symptoms in individuals at ultra high risk of psychosis: Findings from the Longitudinal Youth at Risk Study. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 13(1), 73–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12451>

RStudio Team. (2015). *No Title*. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc.

<http://www.rstudio.com/>

- Schlosser, D. A., Fisher, M., Gard, D., Fulford, D., Loewy, R. L., & Vinogradov, S. (2014). Motivational deficits in individuals at-risk for psychosis and across the course of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research*, 158(1–3), 52–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2014.06.024>
- Shattock, L., Berry, K., Degnan, A., & Edge, D. (2018). Therapeutic alliance in psychological therapy for people with schizophrenia and related psychoses: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 25(1), e60–e85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2135>
- Shawyer, F., Farhall, J., Mackinnon, A., Trauer, T., Sims, E., Ratcliff, K., Lerner, C., Thomas, N., Castle, D., Mullen, P., & Copolov, D. (2012). A randomised controlled trial of acceptance-based cognitive behavioural therapy for command hallucinations in psychotic disorders. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 50(2), 110–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2011.11.007>
- Shawyer, F., Farhall, J., Thomas, N., Hayes, S. C., Gallop, R., Copolov, D., & Castle, D. J. (2017). Acceptance and commitment therapy for psychosis: Randomised controlled trial. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 210(2), 140–148. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.116.182865>
- Sheehan, D., Lecrubier, Y., Harnett-Sheehan, K., Janavs, J., Weiller, E., Hergueta, T., Baker, R., & Dunbar, G. (1998). The Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): The Development and Validation of a Structured Diagnostic Psychiatric Interview. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 59(Suppl. 20), 22–23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338\(99\)80239-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(99)80239-9)
- Singh, S. P., Cooper, J. E., Fisher, H. L., Tarrant, C. J., Lloyd, T., Banjo, J., Corfe, S., & Jones, P. (2005). Determining the chronology and components of psychosis onset: The Nottingham Onset Schedule (NOS). *Schizophrenia Research*, 80(1), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2005.04.018>
- Spidel, A., Lecomte, T., Kealy, D., & Daigneault, I. (2018). Acceptance and commitment therapy for psychosis and trauma: Improvement in psychiatric symptoms, emotion regulation, and treatment compliance following a brief group intervention. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 91(2), 248–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/papt.12159>
- StataCorp. (2015). Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. In 2015 (14.2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2234838>
- Steel, C., Garety, P. A., Freeman, D., Craig, E., Kuipers, E., Bebbington, P., Fowler, D., & Dunn, G. (2007). The multidimensional measurement of the positive symptoms of psychosis. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 16(2), 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr>
- Udachina, A., Thewissen, V., Myin-Germeys, I., Fitzpatrick, S., O’Kane, A., & Bentall, R. P. (2009). Understanding the Relationships Between Self-Esteem, Experiential Avoidance, and Paranoia. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 197(9), 661–668.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/nmd.0b013e3181b3b2ef>

- 841 Udachina, A., Varese, F., Myin-Germeys, I., & Bentall, R. P. (2014). The role of experiential avoidance
842 in paranoid delusions: An experience sampling study. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*,
843 53(4), 422–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjc.12054>
- 844 Vaessen, T., Steinhart, H., Batink, T., Klippel, A., Van Nierop, M., Reininghaus, U., & Myin-Germeys, I.
845 (2019). ACT in daily life in early psychosis: An ecological momentary intervention approach.
846 *Psychosis*, 11(2), 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17522439.2019.1578401>
- 847 van Aubel, E., Bakker, J. M., Batink, T., Michielse, S., Goossens, L., Lange, I., Schruers, K., Lieveise, R.,
848 Marcelis, M., van Amelsvoort, T., van Os, J., Wichers, M., Vaessen, T., Reininghaus, U., & Myin-
849 Germeys, I. (2020). Blended care in the treatment of subthreshold symptoms of depression and
850 psychosis in emerging adults: A randomised controlled trial of Acceptance and Commitment
851 Therapy in Daily-Life (ACT-DL). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 128, 103592.
852 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2020.103592>
- 853 van der Gaag, M., Nieman, D. H., Rietdijk, J., Dragt, S., Ising, H. K., Klaassen, R. M. C. C., Koeter, M.,
854 Cuijpers, P., Wunderink, L., & Linszen, D. H. (2012). Cognitive behavioral therapy for subjects at
855 ultrahigh risk for developing psychosis: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *Schizophrenia*
856 *Bulletin*, 38(6), 1180–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbs105>
- 857 Van Os, J., & Linscott, R. J. (2012). Introduction: The extended psychosis phenotype - Relationship
858 with schizophrenia and with ultrahigh risk status for psychosis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 38(2),
859 227–230. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbr188>
- 860 Van Os, J., & Reininghaus, U. (2016). Psychosis as a transdiagnostic and extended phenotype in the
861 general population. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 118–124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20310>
- 862 Varese, F., Morrison, A. P., Beck, R., Heffernan, S., Law, H., & Bentall, R. P. (2016). Experiential
863 avoidance and appraisals of voices as predictors of voice-related distress. *The British Journal of*
864 *Clinical Psychology*, 55(3), 320–331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjc.12102>
- 865 Ventura, J., Lukoff, D., & Nuechterlein, K. H. (1993). Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) Expanded
866 Version (4.0): scales, anchor points and administration manual. *International Journal of*
867 *Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 3, 227–244.
- 868 Vilardaga, R., & Hayes, S. C. (2009). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy and the Therapeutic
869 Relationship Stance. *European Psychotherapy*, 9(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.23114>
- 870 Walser, R. D., & O’Connell, M. (2021). Acceptance and commitment therapy and the therapeutic
871 relationship: Rupture and repair. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, July 2020, 429–440.
872 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.23114>
- 873 Wenze, S. J., Gaugler, T. L., Sheets, E. S., & DeCicco, J. M. (2018). Momentary experiential avoidance:
874 Within-person correlates, antecedents, and consequences and between-person moderators.

Behaviour Research and Therapy, 107(February), 42–52.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2018.05.011>

White, R., Gumley, A. I., McTaggart, J., Rattrie, L., McConville, D., Cleare, S., & Mitchell, G. (2013). Depression and Anxiety Following Psychosis: Associations with Mindfulness and Psychological Flexibility. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 41, 34–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465812000239>

White, R., Gumley, A., McTaggart, J., Rattrie, L., McConville, D., Cleare, S., & Mitchell, G. (2011). A feasibility study of acceptance and commitment therapy for emotional dysfunction following psychosis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 49, 901–907.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2011.09.003>

Wilson, K. G., & Sandoz, E. K. (2010). Mindfulness, values, and therapeutic relationship in Acceptance and Commitment Therapy. *Mindfulness and the Therapeutic Relationship*, November, 89–106.

Wilson, R. S., Shryane, N., Yung, A. R., & Morrison, A. P. (2020). Distress related to psychotic symptoms in individuals at high risk of psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 215, 66–73.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.11.027>

Yung, A. R., Yung, A. R., Pan Yuen, H., McGorry, P. D., Phillips, L. J., Kelly, D., Dell’olio, M., Francey, S. M., Cosgrave, E. M., Killackey, E., Stanford, C., Godfrey, K., & Buckby, J. (2005). Mapping the Onset of Psychosis: The Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 39(11–12), 964–971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01714.x>