Advancements in Agricultural Development
Volume 7, Issue 2, 2026
agdevresearch.org

Single Case Experimental Designs in Agricultural Advisor Training: A Novel Method for Evaluating Capacity Building in Farmer Mental Health Interventions

A. Stapleton[1], B. Moore[2], G. Stynes[3], N. Richardson[4], T. Russell[5], L. McHugh[6]

Abstract

Extant research supporting digital mental health interventions for farmers and the successful delivery of psychological interventions by laypeople is predominantly nomothetic (aggregate, group-level). Since conclusions we draw from inter-individual data may not apply at the intra-individual level, it is important to cultivate a diverse evidence base for these topics. Adding alternative methods, such as idiographic (individual-level) single-case experimental designs is imperative. Akin to a pilot randomized-controlled trial, the present study examined the feasibility and suitability of a quasi-randomized multiple-baseline single-case experimental design for testing agricultural advisors' experiences of training in a digital acceptance and commitment therapy intervention. 18 agricultural advisors enrolled in the study and were asked to (i) complete a three-item measure daily for 55 days, (ii) attend two 2.5-hour training sessions via Zoom, and (iii) complete three longer surveys preintervention (Time 1), immediately after the intervention (Time 2), and three months postintervention (Time 3). Appropriate participant retention, data missingness, and errors were observed, suggesting that the present method is feasible and suitable. In addition, outcomes were generally consistent with expectations at the nomothetic level at Times 2 and 3. Future research should employ single-case experimental designs and target various levels of analysis (psychological, sociocultural, and biophysiological).

Article History

Received: August 12, 2025
Accepted: September 9, 2025
Published: January 26, 2026

Keywords

wellbeing; Ireland; agricultural advisor; SDG 3: Good Health and Well-being

1. Alison Stapleton, Assistant Professor, School of Psychology, John Henry Newman Building, University College Dublin, Stillorgan Rd, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland, alison.stapleton@ucd.ie, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5719-3657
2. Barbara Moore, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, South East Technological University, Kilkenny Road, Carlow, Ireland, Barbara.Moore@setu.ie, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1890-2737
3. Greg Stynes, PhD Candidate, School of Psychology, John Henry Newman Building, University College Dublin, Stillorgan Rd, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland, gregory.stynes@ucdconnect.ie
4. Noel Richardson, Senior Lecturer, South East Technological University, Kilkenny Road, Carlow, Ireland, noel.richardson@setu.ie, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2060-2338
5. Tomás Russell, School of Agriculture and Food Science, Agriculture and Food Science Centre, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland, tomas.russell@ucd.ie, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0799-360X
6. Louise McHugh, Professor, School of Psychology, John Henry Newman Building, University College Dublin, Stillorgan Rd, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland, louise.mchugh@ucd.ie, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2526-4649

Introduction and Problem Statement

Recently, Cox et al. (2025) reported that male farmers and agricultural workers accounted for 8% of all male probable suicides in Ireland (2015-2018), with significantly more male farmers and agricultural workers aged over 65 years dying by probable suicide compared to non-farmer non-agricultural workers. In terms of mental health, O'Connor et al. (2025) reported that members of the farming community in Ireland experience moderate work–family conflict, with distress and psychological skills significantly contributing to work–family conflict. As noted by Hammersley et al. (2025, p. 92), "an effective and supportive response [for supporting farm-related mental health] must be integrative, intersectional, and culturally appropriate ... One such (potential) resource of support – as evaluated in this study – is farm advisors."

In addition to programs such as On Feirm Ground (Hammersley et al., 2025), interventions informed by acceptance and commitment therapy that teach psychological skills are a viable option for building advisors' capacity to support farmer mental health without extending beyond the scope of their competency. In support of the utility of this approach, digital acceptance and commitment therapy interventions, such as ifarmwell, have been evidenced to decrease distress and increase mental wellbeing (with gains maintained at 6-month follow-up) in a sample of farmers (Gunn et al., 2023). In support of advisors learning and delivering these skills to their farmers, a recent systematic review reported that acceptance and commitment therapy interventions can be successfully delivered by a variety of laypeople (non-mental health professionals; Arnold et al., 2022).

At present, the evidence for digital acceptance and commitment therapy and advisors being able to deliver such interventions to their farmers seems promising. And yet, extant evidence is predominantly nomothetic (aggregate, group-level). Although useful in some contexts, it is important to ensure a diverse evidence base underlies this kind of work. Adding alternative methods, such as idiographic (individual-level) single-case experimental designs or idionomic approaches that blend nomothetic and idiographic, is imperative. This is especially important given that an intervention may be effective on average (at the group level) but not beneficial or even harmful for some individuals (Lavelle et al., 2022). In other words, conclusions we draw from inter-individual data may not apply at the intra-individual level (Hayes et al., 2020). Therefore, researchers and other professionals wanting to gain an in-depth understanding of an individual's experience must leverage idiographic methods.

Conceptual Framework and Purpose

Single-case experimental designs involve testing an intervention on a small sample, often maintaining statistical power by using high temporal density measurements and successively administering the intervention over time (i.e., having multiple-baselines). To illustrate this, imagine comparing 60 people three times (e.g., a typical randomized controlled trial) versus zooming in on three people's daily experience (ecological momentary assessment) for three months. Each participant in a single-case experimental design acts as their own control,

meaning these approaches are, in theory, well-suited for work with underserved populations where recruitment may prove challenging. And yet, to date, no published research has attempted to use a single-case experimental design with agricultural advisors.

Aligning with pilot randomized-controlled trials (Abbott, 2014), to determine whether the necessary components of the present approaches will work together, the present study examined the feasibility and suitability of a quasi-randomized multiple-baseline single-case experimental design for testing agricultural advisors' experiences of training in a digital acceptance and commitment therapy intervention. Specifically, participant retention, data completeness, and challenges faced by the lead researcher were recorded. In addition, data from standardized measures were analyzed to examine whether outcomes were consistent with expectations at the nomothetic level (i.e., on average, descriptive increases in wellbeing, psychological flexibility, "positive" behaviors and outcomes, and knowledge, capacity, and willingness, in addition to descriptive decreases in "negative" behaviors and outcomes). Analyses were pre-registered on the Open Science Framework: https://osf.io/634h8/overview. Ethical approval was granted by the University College Dublin Human Research Ethics Committee (Humanities).

Methods

Participants

Eighteen agricultural advisors returned completed consent forms and opted in to the study. Of these, 1 advisor withdrew on Day 11 (no reason provided), and therefore did not provide demographic data. The remaining 17 advisors were aged 25 to 60 years (Mean age = 36.6 years), farmers (*n* = 15), and self-described as 11 males and six females working in the public (*n* = 14) and private (*n* = 3) sectors (see Table 1).

Procedure

Recruitment ran from November 2024 to February 2025. In addition to social media posts and outreach to relevant organizations, advisors were recruited via a targeted email campaign using publicly available contact details for Farm Advisory System advisors (https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-agriculture-food-and-the-marine/publications/farm-advisory-system-fas/). Eligible participants were adult (i.e., aged 18+ years) farm advisors in the Republic of Ireland who had internet access and were currently working with a minimum of 15 farmers as a group. Advisors were informed that, as part of their participation, they would be asked to (a) complete a three-item measure daily for 55 days, (b) attend two 2.5-hour training sessions via Zoom, and (c) complete three longer surveys preintervention, immediately after the intervention, and three months postintervention. All 18 advisors who returned a completed consent form were enrolled in the study. To ensure participants understood the nature of the present study and its measures, all participants received an onboarding call from a member of

the research team, in addition to a dated calendar of key study events. No compensation was provided for participation.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

ID	Age	Gender	Highest qualification	Mental health	Advisor	Farmer
P1	41	Male	Undergraduate degree	Good	Public	Yes
P2	54	Male	Master's degree	Very good	Private	Yes
P3	33	Male	Master's degree	Very good	Public	No
P5	28	Female	Master's degree	Good	Public	Yes
P6	32	Female	Master's degree	Very good	Public	Yes
P7	25	Female	Master's degree	Good	Public	Yes
P8	34	Male	Master's degree	Very good	Public	Yes
P9	43	Male	Undergraduate degree	Good	Private	Yes
P10	28	Male	Master's degree	Very good	Public	Yes
P11	32	Female	Master's degree	Very good	Public	Yes
P12	35	Male	Master's degree	Very good	Public	Yes
P13	31	Female	Master's degree	Very good	Public	Yes
P14	55	Male	Master's degree	Good	Public	Yes
P15	60	Male	Undergraduate degree	Good	Private	Yes
P16	25	Male	Master's degree	Excellent	Public	Yes
P17	32	Female	Master's degree	Good	Public	No
P18	34	Male	Master's degree	Very good	Private	Yes

Note. P4 withdrew from the study before providing demographic data; Participants self-rated their mental health by responding to the question: "In general, would you say your mental health is Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor."

Study Design

The present study employed a quasi-randomized staggered multiple-baseline across participants single-case experimental design, with ecological momentary assessment data collected daily for 55 days. Phase A (preintervention) ranged between 19 and 28 days across participants, and Phase B ranged between 27 and 36 days, depending on the order in which participants' groups completed the intervention. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three groups, with Sessions 1 and 2 spaced one week apart and all groups scheduled to complete both parts of the intervention within a period of 17 days (i.e., groups began the intervention between two and 10 days apart). If participants indicated that they were not available during their randomly allocated intervention sessions, they were offered to join the other two sessions, hence "quasi-randomized". The final groups contained 4 to 8 advisors. Of study completers, due to scheduling issues, only Participant 10 attended Session 2 longer than one week after Session 1 (15 days).

Traditional questionnaires were used to nomothetically assess participant-reported wellbeing, psychological flexibility, "positive"/"negative" behaviors and outcomes, and knowledge of

farmer mental health, capacity to support farmers and identify concerns, and willingness to signpost, raise awareness, and promote farmer wellbeing to others. These measures were administered on Day 1 (deadline: before Session 1 attendance), after participants' Session 2 (deadline: one week postintervention), and three months postintervention (deadline: two weeks).

All data were gathered using links to participant-specific Google Forms that were sent manually via a text message (prompt) by the first author (AS). Across the study, each participant had a total of four unique links: (i) daily items, (ii) traditional survey Time 1, (iii) traditional survey Time 2, and (iv) traditional survey Time 3. Although labor-intensive for the researchers, this approach was used to reduce the burden on the participants (i.e., they did not need to link their own data over time). Ecological momentary assessments were sent at approximately 8 am each day. Participants who had not submitted their daily items by 7 pm received a reminder text.

Intervention

A two-session online acceptance and commitment therapy program was designed to build advisors' capacity for supporting farmer mental health. Sessions were co-facilitated by the senior author (LM), a peer-reviewed acceptance and commitment therapy trainer, and the fifth author (TR), a farmer and professional working in Agricultural Extension. The purpose of these sessions was to train advisors in delivering content on psychological flexibility to farmers in small group settings (e.g., discussion groups). Advisors were guided through ways to signpost and start discussions about relevant psychological skills and were further guided in clarifying the nature and scope of their roles as advisors (e.g., they are not counselors). Live training sessions were supplemented with seven video recordings totaling approximately 23 minutes, in addition to a booklet for farmers and a protocol for ways these skills could be delivered to farmers in a 90-minute session.

Measures

Ecological Momentary Assessments: Brief Acceptance Measure (BAM; Assmann et al., 2018)
The 3-item daily-use BAM measured psychological flexibility, with participants rating their openness to thoughts, feelings, and sensations, the extent to which they acted with awareness, and the extent to which they pursued things of importance on scales from 1 (e.g., Today I am… acting without awareness=1) to 10 (e.g., Today I am… acting with awareness=10). Higher scores indicated greater psychological flexibility. Per Francis et al. (2016), the BAM had acceptable internal consistency and a moderate correlation with an established measure of psychological flexibility.

Measures for Nomothetic Analysis
The Mental Health Continuum-Short Form (MHC-SF; Keyes et al., 2008). The 14-item MHC-SF measured emotional, psychological, and social wellbeing. Items (e.g., "Satisfied with life") were rated on a scale of 0 (never) to 5 (every day). Higher scores indicated higher wellbeing. Per Lamers et al. (2011), the MHC-SF had good internal consistency.

Psy-Flex (Gloster et al., 2021). The 6-item Psy-Flex measured psychological flexibility. Items (e.g., "I determine what's important for me and decide what I want to use my energy for") were rated on a scale of 1 (very seldom) to 5 (very often). Higher scores indicated higher psychological flexibility. Gloster et al. (2021) report that Psy-Flex has excellent reliability.

Process-Based Assessment Tool (PBAT; Ciarrochi et al., 2022). An adapted version of the PBAT was used to measure 9 "positive" and 9 "negative" behaviors, with participants rating items (e.g., "I acted in ways that helped my physical health") on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree; see Stynes et al. [2025], for a description of the present PBAT adaptation). For each subscale, higher scores indicated higher occurrences of "positive" or "negative" behaviors. Consistent with Ciarrochi et al. (2022), the present study also included outcome items on distress (STOP-D; Young et al., 2007), health (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992), vitality (Ryan & Frederick, 1997), life satisfaction (adapted from Cheung & Lucas, 2014), and burnout (adapted from West et al., 2009). See Ciarrochi et al. (2022) for a complete overview of these PBAT supplements.

Knowledge of Farmer Mental Health, Capacity to Support Farmers and Identify Concerns, and Willingness to Signpost, Raise Awareness, and Promote Farmer Wellbeing to Others (Hammersley et al., 2025). Hammersley et al.'s (2025) 7-item measure of knowledge, capacity, and willingness measured participants' perceived competency in key intervention areas. Items (e.g., "How would you rate your capacity to support farmer wellbeing?") were rated on a scale from 1 (e.g., very poor/no competence) to 10 (e.g., excellent/fully competent), with higher scores indicating higher competence.

Data Analysis Strategy

The present study examined participant retention (i.e., withdrawal status), data completeness (i.e., missing data or participant errors), and challenges faced by the lead researcher (e.g., incorrect links being sent). As part of this analysis, the total number of prompts and reminders sent by the first author (AS) were recorded, in addition to the number of ecological momentary assessments submitted by the participant, the number of missing ecological momentary assessments, and the number of errors made by the participant and researcher. For the purposes of this study, a participant error meant that a participant submitted more than one ecological momentary assessment entry in a single day (to manage this error, only the first entry was deemed eligible because BAM items specify that a response relate to "Today…"). Similarly, a researcher error meant that the researcher sent the wrong link to a participant (recall that each participant had a total of four unique links). All researcher errors were corrected within one minute and did not result in a data collection error (i.e., all participants entered data into their own unique forms given the speed of the corrections).

The present study also examined whether observed outcomes were consistent with expectations at the nomothetic level (i.e., on average, descriptive increases in wellbeing, psychological flexibility, "positive" behaviors and outcomes, and knowledge, capacity, and

willingness, in addition to descriptive decreases in “negative” behaviors and outcomes). For this analysis, data were coded and scored per coding instructions outlined by the measures’ authors. These data were then analyzed descriptively (due to the limited sample size and low temporal density preventing inferential statistics), with individual change scores calculated by subtracting Time 1 values from Time 2/3 values and then calculating the Mean (average) of these to yield an average change.

Findings

Participant Retention, Data Completeness, and Errors

Of the 18 advisors enrolled in the study, Participant 4 withdrew on Day 11 (no reason provided), having received 11 prompts and submitted 7 ecological momentary assessment entries. Participants 9 (Day 35), 12 (Day 39), and 16 (Day 42) also withdrew from the study, citing changes in scheduling and health as reasons for withdrawal. Of these, only Participant 16 did not attend any intervention sessions, with Participants 9 and 12 both attending Session 1. The remaining 14 advisors attended both their intervention sessions and received 55 prompts, with reminders ranging from 0 to 31, missingness ranging from 0 to 18, and participant errors ranging from 0 to 10. Therefore, participant retention was consistent with recommendations for idiographic methods, and missingness was overall acceptable. A total of 4 researcher errors were recorded. Each of these were corrected within 1 minute and did not result in a data collection error (see Table 2).

https://doi.org/10.37433/aad.v7i2.657

Table 2

Participant Retention (i.e., Withdrawal Status), Data Completeness (i.e., Missing Data or Participant Errors), and Researcher Errors (i.e., Incorrect Links Being Sent).

ID	Prompts	Received	Eligible	Missing	Reminders	Participant Error	Researcher Error	Study Completion Status
P1	55	56	55	0	12	1	0	Completed
P2	55	57	55	0	3	2	0	Completed
P3	55	56	48	7	11	8	1	Completed
P4	11	7	0	48	4	0	0	Withdrawn - No reason
P5	55	50	49	6	13	1	1	Completed
P6	55	55	55	0	0	0	0	Completed
P7	55	55	54	1	5	1	0	Completed
P8	55	53	52	3	24	1	0	Completed
P9	35	30	0	30	13	7	0	Withdrawn due to health
P10	55	38	37	18	22	1	0	Completed
P11	55	55	52	3	0	3	2	Completed
P12	40	31	0	32	16	6	0	Withdrawn due to health
P13	55	51	50	5	21	1	0	Completed
P14	55	54	54	1	2	0	0	Completed
P15	55	48	38	17	18	10	0	Completed
P16	41	41	0	14	0	0	0	Withdrawn - Scheduling
P17	55	53	52	3	5	1	0	Completed
P18	55	48	45	10	31	3	0	Completed

Notes. Prompts = Number of times the participant-specific Google Form was sent via text by the researcher to the participant; Received = Number of ecological momentary assessment entries submitted by the participant; Eligible = Number of ecological momentary assessment entries deemed relevant to a single day (for days with >1 entries, only the first was eligible); Missing = Number of days with no ecological momentary assessment entries; Reminder = Number of times the participant-specific Google Form was resent via text by the researcher to the participant; Participant error = Number of times the participant submitted >1 entries; Researcher error = Number of times an incorrect link was sent to a participant (all corrected in <1 minute).

Standardized Measures and Expectations at the Nomothetic Level

In terms of outcomes being consistent with expectations at the nomothetic level, between Time 1 and Time 2, on average, desired changes were observed for all variables except distress and life satisfaction (see Table 3). At Time 2, all participants reported improvements or no change in their "capacity to support farmer wellbeing." Excluding Participant 17, at Time 2, all participants reported improvements or no change in their "capacity to identify mental wellbeing concerns." For mental health knowledge, capacity to identify physical wellbeing concerns, willingness to signpost, willingness to raise awareness, "positive" behaviors, health, and burnout, all but two participants reported improvements or no change at Time 2. Findings for other outcome measures at Time 2 were less consistent across individuals, although still generally consistent with expectations, except for distress and life satisfaction (see Table 3). Looking to distress, seven participants reported an increase, five reported a decrease, and two reported no change, averaging out to a small increase overall. Looking to life satisfaction, four participants reported a decrease, six reported an increase, and four reported no change, averaging out to a small decrease overall.

Comparing Time 3 to Time 1, on average, desired changes were observed for all variables except life satisfaction (see Table 4). At Time 3, compared to Time 1, all participants reported improvements in "positive" behaviors, and all reported improvements or no change in their "capacity to identify mental wellbeing concerns." As with Time 2, comparing Time 3 to Time 1, findings were less consistent across individuals, yet still generally aligned with expectations, except for life satisfaction (see Table 4). Looking to life satisfaction, four participants reported a decrease, five reported an increase, and five reported no change, averaging out to no change overall.

Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations

The present study examined the feasibility and suitability of a quasi-randomized multiple-baseline single-case experimental design for testing agricultural advisors' experiences of training in a digital mental health intervention. In terms of participant retention, 14/18 completed the study, which is consistent with recommended participant numbers for high temporal density approaches. Overall missingness was ~9.6% across participants, ranging from 0 to ~33%. Given that missing data are common in these experimental designs (Peng & Chen, 2021), and given that the present missingness is on par with similar observed in the area (e.g., 12.90% across six farmer participants; Stynes et al., 2025), the present method seems feasible and suitable. Further supporting the present approaches, the number of participant and researcher errors was low, totalling 46 and 4, respectively, and all study completers attended the full intervention.

Table 3

Participants' Change Scores (Time 2 minus Time 1) for Measures of Wellbeing, Psychological Flexibility, "Positive"/"Negative" Behaviors And Outcomes, Knowledge, Capacity, and Willingness

ID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wellbeing	Psychological Flexibility	Positive Behaviours	Negative Behaviours	Distress	Health	Vitality	Life Satisfaction	Burnout
P1	-1	1	-1	2	0	1	0	-3	2	6	-6	-6	1	1	1	3
P2	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	-3	2	5	-2	0	2	18	1	-5
P3	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	4	-1	7	1	0	0	0
P4																
P5	0	2	2	2	4	2	4	15	6	11	-14	-15	0	4	1	-3
P6	3	3	2	4	-3	-1	-1	-2	2	6	-3	-3	1	9	2	-4
P7	1	1	1	0	-1	0	0	-2	-2	2	-2	2	0	4	0	0
P8	1	1	1	1	0	-3	-4	16	-2	5	2	5	-1	5	1	-2
P9																
P10	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	-10	-3	7	7	0	-1	-12	-4	-3
P11	1	1	-1	1	0	0	-1	-3	2	-4	-10	-6	0	1	1	0
P12																
P13	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	3	-1	-6	14	2	0	3	-1	-6
P14	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-3	1	1	-10	-9	0	2	0	-2
P15	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	9	0	13	-36	13	0	1	-2	0
P16																
P17	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-5	0	13	-8	10	0	-1	-1	1
P18	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	-2	-4	3	-12	4	1	-1	0	0
Mean	0.79	1.14	0.64	1.36	0.50	0.14	0.29	0.79	0.29	4.71	-5.79	0.29	0.29	2.43	-0.07	-1.50

Notes. Heading 1 = Knowledge of farmer mental health; 2 = Capacity to support farmer wellbeing; 3 = Capacity to identify physical wellbeing concerns; 4 = Capacity to identify mental wellbeing concerns; 5 = Willingness to signpost farmers to support services; 6 = Willingness to raise awareness of the issue of farmer mental health to others; 7 = Willingness to promote farmer wellbeing to others in your regional and national network; Mean = Mean/average of individual change scores calculated by subtracting Time 1 values from Time 2.

Table 4

Participants' Change Scores (Time 3 minus Time 1) for Measures of Wellbeing, Psychological Flexibility, "Positive"/"Negative" Behaviors And Outcomes, Knowledge, Capacity, and Willingness

ID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wellbeing	Psychological Flexibility	Positive Behaviours	Negative Behaviours	Distress	Health	Vitality	Life Satisfaction	Burnout
P1	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	-11	2	12	-5	0	1	4	0	1
P2	1	2	2	0	2	0	0	-6	3	20	-29	-13	3	20	2	-7
P3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	-2	1	0	2	0	-4	-1	-4
P4																
P5	1	2	3	2	5	2	4	17	2	12	-7	-4	0	2	1	0
P6	3	3	4	3	0	0	0	-1	1	13	-23	-6	2	10	0	-9
P7	1	0	1	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	4	-2	-2	0	0	0	-2
P8	3	1	2	1	5	3	1	8	1	11	-2	2	-1	5	1	-7
P9																
P10	0	1	1	4	-1	1	1	-12	0	11	23	0	-1	-9	-3	-2
P11	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	-8	-8	0	-2	1	-1
P12																
P13	1	4	2	3	1	2	1	9	5	3	1	3	-1	-2	-1	-5
P14	-1	1	0	0	-1	-1	-1	0	1	7	-9	-10	0	2	0	-2
P15	1	-3	1	1	0	-1	-1	5	-1	9	-38	-2	1	0	-1	1
P16																
P17	1	1	3	1	0	1	1	3	0	18	-10	1	-1	3	1	-1
P18	0	0	-1	0	3	-1	2	2	-5	3	-16	1	1	1	0	-4
Mean	0.93	1.00	1.43	1.43	1.00	0.50	0.57	1.00	0.50	9.14	-8.93	-2.57	0.29	2.14	0.00	-3.00

Notes. Heading 1 = Knowledge of farmer mental health; 2 = Capacity to support farmer wellbeing; 3 = Capacity to identify physical wellbeing concerns; 4 = Capacity to identify mental wellbeing concerns; 5 = Willingness to signpost farmers to support services; 6 = Willingness to raise awareness of the issue of farmer mental health to others; 7 = Willingness to promote farmer wellbeing to others in your regional and national network; Mean = Mean/average of individual change scores calculated by subtracting Time 1 values from Time 3.

In terms of outcomes being consistent with expectations at the nomothetic level (i.e., on average, descriptive increases in wellbeing, psychological flexibility, “positive” behaviors and outcomes, and knowledge, capacity, and willingness, in addition to descriptive decreases in “negative” behaviors and outcomes), at Time 2, improvements were observed on average for all variables except distress and life satisfaction. These gains generally seemed to be maintained since by Time 3, compared to Time 1, improvements were observed on average for all variables except life satisfaction.

In terms of potential explanations for the observed deviations from expectations, it is possible that the acceptance and commitment therapy program increased distress (Lavelle et al., 2022), or that the Time 2 test battery was administered during a stressful time for advisors (March/April 2025). Another potential explanation relates to the measure of distress used, i.e., one that assesses symptom presence rather than functioning. Acceptance and commitment therapy does not aim to eliminate unwanted emotions. Instead, acceptance and commitment therapy teaches people to drop their struggle against unwanted emotions. This means that someone could experience distress (i.e., have symptoms present) and respond to that distress in psychologically flexible or inflexible ways (i.e., function in adaptive or maladaptive ways). As such, the chosen measure of distress may not have been appropriate. Future studies should employ measures that examine functioning, not just symptom presence. Similarly, for life satisfaction, it is possible that the present program decreased life satisfaction, however, given that no change was reported on average at Time 3, this seems unlikely. Future research should incorporate other levels of analysis to extend beyond the psychological level. This would likely be important to further our understanding of life satisfaction given that top stressors for the farming community relate to systemic issues (Russell et al., 2023).

Importantly, the magnitude of observed changes was small for some variables due to variability across participants. For example, although wellbeing improved by 0.79 on average, nine participants reported worse wellbeing at Time 2. This finding highlights the importance of idionomic approaches. Said another way, these results highlight the importance of analyzing individual-level data in a way that it may then be extended to the group-level without losing the individual’s experience. Practically, this finding supports how many professionals work with members of the farming community. For example, Hammersley et al. (2025) reported that advisors used their knowledge of their farmers to guide approaches to health promotion. In this way, advisors are already blending idiographic and nomothetic approaches, i.e., knowing what works on average and balancing that with their knowledge of what the person in front of them needs.

The present study represents an important part of the shift towards idionomic approaches; exploring whether such methods are feasible and suitable for research with farming community members. Limitations include the lack of measurement of advisor recruitment rates per week, the lack of systematic assessment of potential selection biases, and the non-inclusion of other metrics that could inform future single-case experimental designs (e.g., barriers to participation). Future research could address this by asking people that decline to participate to share their reason(s) for declining. This would allow researchers to reduce barriers to

participation and identify bias parameters which could inform sensitivity analyses. Further limitations include the present focus on psychological skills alone. Although psychological skills may resource members of the farming community to explore opportunities and supports, other levels of analysis, such as the biophysiological and sociocultural levels, are also important to consider. As the field moves to address these levels, it is important to cultivate a diverse evidence base, which, per the present study, should include single-case experimental designs given the present observed feasibility and suitability.

Acknowledgments

Funding Information: This work was funded by the Department of Agriculture Food and Marine project number 2023RP1057, Title 'Farming Minds: Developing evidence based interventions to enhance farmer mental health'.

Conflict of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

Previous Dissemination: n/a.

Artificial Intelligence: n/a.

Author Contribution Statement: **Alison Stapleton –** conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing, visualization, project administration; **Barbara Moore –** writing – original draft, writing – review & editing; **Greg Stynes –** validation, formal analysis, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing, visualization; **Noel Richardson –** conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing, supervision, project administration, funding acquisition; **Tomás Russell –** conceptualization, methodology, investigation, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing, supervision, project administration, funding acquisition; **Louise McHugh –** conceptualization, methodology, validation, investigation, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing, supervision, project administration, funding acquisition.

References

Abbott, J. H. (2014). The distinction between randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and preliminary feasibility and pilot studies: What they are and are not. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy, 44*(8), 555-558. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2014.0110

Arnold, T., Haubrick, K. K., Klasko-Foster, L. B., Rogers, B. G., Barnett, A., Ramirez-Sanchez, N. A., Bertone, Z., & Gaudiano, B. A. (2022). Acceptance and commitment therapy informed behavioral health interventions delivered by non-mental health professionals: A systematic review. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 24*(1), 185-196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2022.05.005

Assmann, L., Pasi, H. J., Gillanders, D. T.& Mottus, R. (August 28-29, 2018). *The brief acceptance measure: Development and initial validation of an ultra-brief measure of psychological flexibility, suitable for daily use* [Paper presentation]. The Chester Contextual Behavioural Science Research Colloquium, University of Chester, United Kingdom.

Cheung, F., & Lucas, R. E. (2014). Assessing the validity of single-item life satisfaction measures: Results from three large samples. *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care, and Rehabilitation, 23*(10), 2809–2818. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-014-0726-4

Ciarrochi, J., Sahdra, B., Hofmann, S. G., & Hayes, S. C. (2022). Developing an item pool to assess processes of change in psychological interventions: The process-based assessment tool (PBAT). *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 23*(1), 200–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2022.02.001

Cox, G., Stapleton, A., Russell, T., McHugh, L., & Kavalidou, K. (2025). Probable suicide among men in farming- and agricultural-related occupations in the Republic of Ireland: Exploring coronial data. *Journal of Agromedicine*, *30*(4), 801–811. https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2025.2498339

Francis, A. W., Dawson, D. L., & Golijani-Moghaddam, N. (2016). The development and validation of the comprehensive assessment of acceptance and commitment therapy processes (CompACT). *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 5*(3), 134–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2016.05.003

Gloster, A. T., Block, V. J., Klotsche, J., Villanueva, J., Rinner, M. T. B., Benoy, C., Walter, M., Karekla, M., & Bader, K. (2021). Psy-flex: A contextually sensitive measure of psychological flexibility. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 22,* 13–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2021.09.001

Gunn, K. M., Skaczkowski, G., Dollman, J., Vincent, A. D., Brumby, S., Short, C. E., & Turnbull, D. (2023). A self-help online intervention is associated with reduced distress and improved mental wellbeing in Australian farmers: The evaluation and key mechanisms of www. ifarmwell.com.au. *Journal of Agromedicine, 28*(3), 378–392. https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2022.2156642

Hammersley, C., Richardson, N., Meredith, D., McNamara, J., Carroll, P., & Jenkins, P. (2025). On Feirm ground, supporting farmer mental health: Analysing the effectiveness of a bespoke farmer mental health training programme targeted at farm advisors in Ireland. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension, 31*(1), 90–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/1389224X.2024.2339801

Hayes, S. C., Hofmann, S. G., & Ciarrochi, J. (2020). A process-based approach to psychological diagnosis and treatment: The conceptual and treatment utility of an extended evolutionary meta model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 82*(1), 101908. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101908

Keyes, C. L. M., Wissing, M., Potgieter, J., Temane, M., Kruger, A., & van Rooy, S. (2008). Evaluation of the mental health continuum-short form (MHC-SF) in Setswana-speaking South Africans. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, *15*, 181–192. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.572

Lamers, S. M., Westerhof, G. J., Bohlmeijer, E. T., ten Klooster, P. M., & Keyes, C. L. (2011). Evaluating the psychometric properties of the mental health continuum-short form (MHC-SF). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *67*(1), 99–110. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20741

Lavelle, J., Storan, D., Eswara Murthy, V., De Dominicis, N., Mulcahy, H. E., & McHugh, L. (2022). Brief and telehealth acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT) interventions for stress in inflammatory bowel disease (IBD): A series of single case experimental design (SCED) studies. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 11*(10), 2757. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11102757

O'Connor, S., O'Hagan, A. D., Casey, H., O'Connor, A., Creegan, M., Stapleton, A., McHugh, L., Russell, T., & O'Keeffe, S. (2025). Between the farm and family: A cross-sectional survey on work–family conflict in farmers in Ireland. *Agriculture, 15*(15), 1587. https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture15151587

Peng, C.-Y. J., & Chen, L.-T. (2021). Assessing intervention effects in the presence of missing scores. *Education Sciences, 11*(2), 76. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11020076

Russell, T., Stapleton, A., Markey, A., & McHugh, L. (2023). *Dying to farm: Developing a suicide prevention intervention for farmers in Ireland*. Health Service Executive National Office for Suicide Prevention. https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/list/4/mental-health-services/connecting-for-life/publications/grant-scheme-paper-11.pdf

Ryan, R. M., & Frederick, C. (1997). On energy, personality, and health: Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, *65*(3), 529–565. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1997.tb00326.x

Stynes, G., Stapleton, A., Moore, B., Russell, T., O'Connor, M., Richardson, N., Ruiz, F. J., & McHugh, L. (2025). Effectiveness of a process-based approach to farmer wellbeing: A randomized multiple baseline single-case experimental design. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 100932. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2025.100932

Ware, J. E., Jr., & Sherbourne, C. D. (1992). The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care, 30*(6), 473–483.

West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., Sloan, J. A., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2009). Single-item measures of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are useful for assessing burnout in medical professionals. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 24*(12), 1318–1321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-009-1129-z

Young, Q. R., Ignaszewski, A., Fofonoff, D., & Kaan, A. (2007). Brief screen to identify 5 of the most common forms of psychosocial distress in cardiac patients: Validation of the screening tool for psychological distress. *The Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, 22*(6), 525–534. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.JCN.0000297383.29250.14