

Task: Compare 2 methods of the given psychological treatment.

Topic: Psychological Treatment

Type: Compare and Contrast Essay

Length: 7 pages

Formatting: APA

Requirements: Describe both methods of psychological treatment and compare their strong and weak suits.

Psychological Treatments

Name

Subject

Instructor

Date

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy

Social anxiety is one of the leading issues among young people. The central aspect of social anxiety disorder is denoted by fear of adverse evaluation by others. Thus, social anxiety disorder is directly associated with role expectations and social standards. The main focus on SAD by researchers is why certain factors differ by culture, which leads to a varying trajectory of social anxiety disorder. There have been solutions that have been suggested that can be applied to alleviate this as a psychological disorder, one of them being acceptance and commitment theory or ACT. According to Dewane (2008), the acceptance and commitment theory “is a contextual approach challenging clients to accept their thoughts and feelings and still commit to change”. It seeks to shift the mindset of the people who suffer this psychological disorder from one that sees the anxiety as an obstacle, to one that understands that anxiety is only a minor bump that should be accepted in order for one to commit to change. However, the application for this treatment will be different and so will the results be depending on the culture that the individual has been raised in. For instance, the theory has an elaborate way of how the client should view and understand pain, and further, how they would apply it effectively in their healing process. However, the same issue of handling pain and interactions with painful events is understood and explained differently in different cultures. This will definitely be an issue during the therapy since the therapist will have to understand the perceptions on various issues before applying the treatment method. Similarly, the six core tenets or processes of the acceptance and commitment theory, which are acceptance, being present, valuing, cognitive defusion, self as context, and committed action, have different perceptions in the different cultures of the world, and thus they would be impacted differently by the treatment option or method. However, the

treatment method can still work, with subtle shifts and applications in the different cultures in question.

Efficacy versus Effectiveness Studies

Several authors have taken the step to describe and differentiate between effectiveness and efficiency within the study of the treatment options and methods. Marley (2000) clearly defines efficacy as the working of a treatment method in a real life situation. This means that efficacy studies will have to be in the real world without any controls and constant monitoring. However, effectiveness is very different from efficacy since it will have to be in a controlled environment. Gartlehner, et al., (2006) support this perspective and add that these distinguishable differences between the two approaches to treatments can be extrapolated to present the probability of the studies to work and to work with minimal failure probability. In application, efficacy studies are more intense since they are in the real world. When treating a patient or an adolescent patient for depression in the real world, there are more challenges that show or expose the loopholes that the treatment has and the probability of its failure. However, these are not present in the effectiveness studies since they will be in a controlled environment. A very essential aspect of difference between the two approaches to study and treat depression in youth and adolescents, is the fact that there is a difference in the extent of interactions between the patient and the doctor, which can have an effect in the delivery of results of the treatments.

From these major aspects, it is possible to conclude that while there are different validity issues in the application of these two treatment issues, each has its own merits and areas of possible increased effectiveness. For instance, efficacy studies have the external validity, where the interaction with the external environment can be made to work in favor of the treatment and the continued well-being even after the conclusion of the treatment. Effectiveness studies, on the

other hand, can have the increased doctor- patient face time, which can be made to work in favor of the patient since he can be exposed to the most delicate and detailed scrutiny and treatment options possible. The treatment options in these two studies and approaches can be easily scrutinized to show the ideas that stand out most in comparison of an ideal environment and the ‘ideal environment’ as envisioned by the clinicians, doctors and psychologists.

The results of these two methods or approaches will also differ in a huge way since they will be reflected by the tenets of the two approaches. For instance, the approach that shows or utilizes the ideals that allows the patient to heal and recover while interacting in their natural environment will be deemed more effective and more efficient in comparison to those that are applied in a clinical environment. Many authors and professionals have identified the fact that for a treatment to be effective, it has to work on the patient even in their natural environment since they will have to be integrated into these environments after they are done with the treatment. On the contrary, there is a very high possibility of a treatment failing to work, if it is applied in a clinical environment and then the healed patient released into their normal environment. However, Gartlehner, et al., (2006) advise that “an ideal definition would balance this equilibrium at a point at which satisfactory internal validity accompanies a high degree of generalizability”.

Works Cited

Dewane, C. (2008, September/ October). The ABCs of ACT — Acceptance and Commitment

Therapy. *Social Work Today* 8(5), p. 34. Retrieved From

<http://www.socialworktoday.com/archive/090208p36.shtml>.

Gartlehner, G., Hansen, R., Nissman, D., & al., e. (2006 Apr). Introduction: Technical Reviews

No. 12. In G. Gartlehner, R. Hansen, D. Nissman, & e. al., *Criteria for Distinguishing*

Effectiveness From Efficacy Trials in Systematic Reviews. Rockville, MD: Agency for

Healthcare Research and Quality (US). Available from:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK44024/>.

Marley, J. (2000). Efficacy, effectiveness, efficiency. *Australian Prescriber* 23, 114-115.

Retrieved From <http://www.australianprescriber.com/magazine/23/6/114/5>.

Overall Impression

My most frequent qualm with people writing garbage is awkward phrasing. For some reason, many writers believe that if they look up a word that is rarely used, bizarre, complicated, or inappropriate for a certain context, it will automatically improve the overall quality of their writing. You, as I can see, are not an exception of this rule. If I had to describe your whole paper in three words, I'd say: "Disappointing word misuse." You have saturated this essay with clever-sounding words, forgetting about common sense and meaning, which resulted in a sometimes incomprehensible blabbering.

Besides, your grammar and sentence construction sucks too. Like, what is this, "There have been solutions that have been suggested that can be applied" in the very beginning? And the rest of the paper is not better.

Anyways, dude, take a break from writing, or something. Relax, drink some pina coladas, go surfing. Writing essays is not for you, sorry.