

*Citation for published version:*

Hillman, SR, Lomax, CL, Khaleel, N, Smith, TR & Gregory, JD 2022, 'The roles of intolerance of uncertainty, anxiety sensitivity and distress tolerance in hoarding disorder compared with OCD and healthy controls', *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 392-403.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465822000108>

*DOI:*

[10.1017/S1352465822000108](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465822000108)

*Publication date:*

2022

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

## University of Bath

### Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Title:** The Roles of Intolerance of Uncertainty, Anxiety Sensitivity and Distress Tolerance in Hoarding Disorder Compared to OCD and Healthy Controls

Shemariah R. Hillman<sup>1</sup>

Claire L. Lomax<sup>2</sup>

Nadeen Khaleel<sup>3</sup>

Theresa R. Smith<sup>3</sup>

James D. Gregory<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Bath, Department of Psychology,

<sup>2</sup>Newcastle University, Department of Psychology, Newcastle University, UK

<sup>3</sup>University of Bath, Department of Mathematical Sciences, UK

<sup>4</sup>Cardiff University, School of Psychology, UK

Corresponding author: Dr Shemariah Hillman, University of Bath, Department of Psychology, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK. Email: [shem.hillman@bath.edu](mailto:shem.hillman@bath.edu)

## Abstract

### Background

It is suggested that the different psychological vulnerability factors of intolerance of uncertainty (IU), anxiety sensitivity (AS) and distress tolerance (DT) may be important in Hoarding Disorder (HD). However, the extent to which these factors are specific to HD compared to other disorders remains unclear.

### Aims

The current study aimed to investigate differences in IU, AS and DT in three groups: HD ( $n = 66$ ), Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD) ( $n = 59$ ) and Healthy Controls (HCs) ( $n = 63$ ).

### Methods

Participants completed an online battery of standardised self-report measures to establish the independent variable of group membership (HD, OCD and HC) and the dependent variables (IU, AS and DT).

### Results

A MANOVA analysis indicated statistically significant differences in IU, AS and DT between the clinical groups and HCs. Follow up analyses showed no statistically significant differences between the HD and OCD group for any of the three constructs. The results remained the same when examining the effects of co-morbid HD and OCD. An unexpected finding was the trend for IU, AS and DT to be more severe when HD and OCD were co-morbid.

### Conclusions

The evidence suggests the absence of a specific relationship between IU, AS or DT in HD and instead is consistent with existing research which suggests that these psychological vulnerability

factors are transdiagnostic constructs across anxiety disorders. The implications of the findings are discussed.

*Keywords:* Hoarding Disorder, OCD, Intolerance of Uncertainty, Anxiety Sensitivity, Distress Tolerance, Emotional Vulnerability

## **Introduction**

Hoarding Disorder (HD) is recognised as a distinct diagnosis in the DSM-5 and is classified amongst the Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders (APA, 2013). Diagnostic criteria include a perceived need to save possessions and a persistent difficulty and associated distress when discarding possessions. This results in an accumulation of possessions preventing the use of living spaces for their intended purpose, often compromising safety and resulting in significant impairment in social and occupational functioning. Recent epidemiological research indicates a prevalence rate of 1.5% in adults of working age (Postlethwaite et al, 2019).

The cognitive behavioural model of HD (Frost & Hartl, 1996) proposes that beliefs about the meaning and utility of possessions lead to individuals having significant difficulties in making decisions **about the** acquisition and discarding of possessions. Furthermore, behavioural avoidance is thought to contribute to HD, with decisions being avoided to prevent negative and undesirable emotional states often associated with loss (Steketee & Frost, 2003). It has been suggested that multiple emotional vulnerability factors may underlie avoidance behaviours, including Intolerance of Uncertainty (IU; Mathes et al., 2017), anxiety sensitivity (AS; Timpano et al, 2009) and distress tolerance (DT; Norberg et al, 2015). Whilst sharing similarities, there are conceptual distinctions between them (Schmidt et al, 2007). IU is defined as a negative cognitive bias that affects how a person perceives, interprets and responds to uncertain situations on cognitive, emotional and

behavioural levels (Dugas et al, 2004; Freeston et al, 1994). Those high in IU experience uncertainty about the future as stressful and upsetting, which results in impairments in functioning and subsequent avoidance (Buhr & Dugas, 2002). AS is defined as a distinct fear of anxiety related to bodily sensations and associated harmful consequences (Timpano et al., 2009), with low DT (an aspect of emotional dysregulation) being defined as the inability to withstand any negative emotional state and feelings of distress being interpreted as uncontrollable, unbearable and unacceptable (Simons & Gaher, 2005). Although these constructs have not been explicitly included in Frost and Hartl's model, their relationship with HD has been investigated in preliminary research.

There is emerging evidence from cross-sectional studies using student samples for the relationship between HD and emotional vulnerability factors. IU has been shown to predict HD symptoms, with replication using a clinical HD sample in the same study providing comparable results (Wheaton et al, 2016). Furthermore, the HD sample had higher levels of IU compared to HCs (Healthy controls) and other anxiety disorders, as well as comparable levels to those with OCD (Wheaton et al., 2016). IU has also been found to be a significant predictor of HD symptom severity after controlling for general levels of worry, depression and non-hoarding obsessive-compulsive symptoms (Oglesby et al., 2013). More recently, IU has been found to be significantly positively associated with the HD components of acquisition and difficulties discarding, independent of anxiety and depression (Castrionta et al, 2019). Similarly, AS has also been shown to have a strong relationship with hoarding symptoms (Medley et al, 2013). In both student and mixed anxiety clinical samples, AS was significantly associated with HD behaviours. In addition, through a hypothetical behavioural HD paradigm, DT was found to predict saving behaviours in HD (Shaw & Timpano, 2016).

Evidence suggests that people with HD may experience multiple emotional vulnerabilities. Both IU and DT have been shown to be significantly associated with HD, with these factors independently predicting HD symptoms in a clinical outpatient and community sample (Mathes et al, 2017). IU was the only significant predictor of HD, with DT not predicting symptoms of HD. This contrasts with previous research using non-clinical samples in which HD was associated with DT, as well as a being robustly associated with AS (Timpano et al., 2009). Furthermore, an interaction between AS and DT suggested that DT may play a less important role among individuals with low AS. Conversely, DT appeared to increase vulnerability to symptoms of hoarding among individuals with higher levels of AS. The role of AS, DT and IU as predictors of hoarding symptoms have only been investigated together in one cross-sectional study using a treatment-seeking clinical HD sample, which found that only DT predicted HD symptoms (Grisham et al., 2018). Whilst having important theoretical and clinical implications, this study lacked a clinical comparison or an HC group.

The next logical step is to ascertain the specificity of emotional vulnerability constructs to HD. This is important because although the trial outcome data indicates positive decreases in HD symptoms following psychological treatment, most people remain closer to the HD range than the non-clinical range at the end of treatment (see Tolin et al, 2015). Research into disorder-specific psychological constructs has led to the significant advancement of treatments outcomes (see Clark, 1986; Clark & Wells, 1995; Ehlers & Clark, 2000). Given that the current trial data for HD symptoms following psychological treatment indicates modest outcomes at best, it is important to identify the psychological constructs that are specific HD to identify treatment targets.

The aim of the present study was therefore to further understand the roles and relative importance of emotional psychological vulnerability factors within HD, and how this compares to

their occurrence in OCD and HCs. It was hypothesised that there would be differences in AS, DT and IU across the three groups of HD, OCD and HC. Based on the evidence discussed above, it was expected that there would be increased AS and IU, and lower DT, in the clinical groups compared to the non-clinical group. Furthermore, if these psychological constructs have greater specificity to HD, it was expected that IU and AS would be significantly higher, and DT significantly lower, in the HD group relative to the OCD group.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

A total of 188 participants (HD  $n = 66$ ; OCD  $n = 59$ ; HC  $n = 63$ ) were recruited and participated in the study. Thirty-four respondents did not meet group criteria and were excluded at the screening stage. Participants were recruited through advertisements on relevant charity and recruitment websites and databases of participants from previous research studies.

Participants were excluded if they were <18 years of age, disclosed a mental health diagnosis (aside from HD or OCD) or a brain injury or neurological disorder. For inclusion in the HD group, participants were required to score 14 or above on the Hoarding Rating Scale Self-Report (HRS-SR; Tolin et al, 2010) or to score above 41 on the Saving Inventory Revised (SI-R; Frost et al, 2004). For inclusion in the OCD group, participants were required to score above the clinical cut-off of 21 on the OCI-R (Foa et al., 2002). If participants scored above clinical thresholds on the HD and OCD measures participants were asked to self-report on which difficulty was primary. Inclusion criteria for HC participants was scoring 10 or below on the Generalised Anxiety Disorder measure (GAD-7; Spitzer et al, 2006) or the Patient Health Questionnaire

measure of depression (PHQ-9; Kroenke et al, 2001), scoring below clinical cut-offs on the HD and OCD measures and not self-reporting a current mental health problem.

The study was approved by the Psychology Department Ethics Review Board, and the authors abided by the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct as set out by the BABCP and BPS.

## **Diagnostic Measures**

### ***Hoarding Disorder Rating Scale-Self Report (HRS-SR; Tolin et al., 2010)***

The HRS-SR is a 5-item questionnaire. Participants rate their experience of excessive acquisition, difficulty discarding, clutter, impairment and distress on a 0 (no problem) to 8 (extreme) scale. Scores of 14 and above indicate clinically significant symptoms. The scale has excellent test-retest reliability and internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.96$ ; Tolin et al., 2010). There was excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ).

### ***Saving Inventory-Revised (SI-R; Frost et al., 2004)***

The SI-R is a self-report questionnaire containing 23 items assessing the severity of acquisition, difficulty discarding, and clutter based on scores ranging from 0 (no problem) to 4 (very severe). Scores of 41 and above indicates clinically significant symptoms. The scale has been shown to have high test-retest reliability (0.86; Frost et al., 2004) and internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.94$ ). There was excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.97$ ).

### ***Obsessive Compulsive Inventory Revised (OCI-R; Foa et al., 2002)***

The OCI-R is an 18-item measure of obsessive-compulsive symptoms with a clinical cut-off score of 21 and over. Research indicates that the OCI-R has good test-retest reliability (0.82) and internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.72$ ). There was excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ).



***Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9; Kroenke et al., 2001)***

The PHQ-9 is a 9-item measure of depression symptoms, with scores ranging from 0 (not at all) to 3 (nearly every day). Scores below ten indicates mild depression not requiring intervention. The PHQ-9 has good test-retest reliability, criterion and construct validity (Kroenke et al., 2001) and internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ). There was excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.92$ ).

***Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7; Spitzer et al., 2006)***

The GAD-7 is a 7-item questionnaire measuring anxiety symptoms. Scores range from 0 (not at all) to 3 (nearly every day). Scores below 10 indicates mild levels of anxiety. The GAD-7 has good test-retest reliability (0.83), criterion, construct, factorial, and procedural validity (0.83; Spitzer et al., 2006) and excellent internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.92$ ). There was excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.92$ ).

**Emotional Vulnerability Factors*****Anxiety Sensitivity Index-3 (ASI-3; Taylor et al., 2007)***

The ASI-3 is an 18-item self-report measure of fear of arousal-related sensations. Scores range from 0 (very little) to 4 (very much). The ASI-3 has good test-retest and internal reliability ( $\alpha = 0.73 - 0.91$ ), as well as discriminant, convergent and criterion validity (Taylor et al., 2007). The ASI-3 demonstrated excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.96$ ).

***Distress tolerance scale (DTS; Simons & Gaher, 2005)***

The DTS is a 15-item self-report measure of ability to tolerate psychological distress. It contains four subscales: tolerance, absorption, appraisal, and regulation, as well as an overall measure of DT. Items are scored from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), with lower scores reflecting low distress tolerance. The scale showed good internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ) in the

present study and has previously demonstrated both good internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ) and test-retest reliability (0.61; Simons & Gaher, 2005).

***Intolerance of uncertainty scale (IUS; Freeston et al., 1994)***

The IUS is a 27-item self-report measure of ability to tolerate the uncertainty of ambiguous situations, behavioural and cognitive responses to uncertainty, along with attempts to control the future. Scales range from 1 (not at all characteristic of me) to 5 (entirely characteristic of me). The measure has been shown to have good test-retest reliability (0.78) and internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.94$ ; Buhr & Dugas, 2002). There was excellent internal consistency in the present study ( $\alpha = 0.97$ ).

**Procedure**

Participants received a secure, single-use link to access the study materials online. After providing informed consent participants completed the diagnostic questionnaires. Eligible participants then completed the remaining questionnaires, which were presented in a random order to prevent a response order effect. All participants received a £5 voucher.

**Data analytic plan**

The study was powered to detect a medium effect size ( $\beta = .95$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ). Approximately 45 participants were needed for each of the three groups (total = 134). GPower was used for this calculation.

Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices and multicollinearity. Four univariate outliers from the HD group on DTS were imputed using the mean (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices were violated. Consequently, two

extreme multivariate outliers were removed from the data, one from the HD and one from the OCD group (see Pallant, 2010). No other serious violations were observed.

To test the study hypotheses, a one-way between-groups Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed with group (HD, OCD, and HC) as the independent variable and IU, AS and DT as the dependent variables. Follow up Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post-hoc tests were used to investigate group differences.

## Results

### Descriptive statistics

Demographic and sample description details are presented in Table 1. There were no significant group differences in respect of age ( $F(2, 185) = 0.15, p = 0.86$ ), gender ( $\chi(2) = 3.841, p = .147$ ) or education ( $\chi(6) = 10.280, p = .113$ ). Multiple one-way ANOVA's indicated significant difference for all diagnostic measures. Tukey's post hoc tests indicated that the control group was significantly different from the clinical groups for all diagnostic measures. The HD and OCD groups were significantly different on the HRS, SI-R and OCI-R but not on the PHQ-9 or GAD-7.

[INSERT Table 1. Group Characteristics]

### Main Analysis

The means and standard deviations for the dependent variables are shown in Table 2. A MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate effect of group on the dependent variables,  $F(6, 368) = 24.16, p < .01$ ; Pillai's Trace = 0.565, partial  $\eta^2 = .28$ . Univariate between subjects ANOVAs

showed that group had a statistically significant effect on IU ( $F(2, 185) = 88.96; p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.49$ ), AS ( $F(2, 185) = 52.11; p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.36$ ) and DT ( $F(2, 185) = 50.78; p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .35$ ).

Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post-hoc tests indicated mean scores for both IU and AS were significantly higher, and DT was statistically significantly lower, in both the HD and OCD groups compared to HCs (Table 3). There was no statistically significant difference between the HD and OCD groups for IU, AS or DT.

[INSERT Table 2 - Means and standard deviations for groups involved in three, four and five-way ANOVAs Means and standard deviations for five-way ANOVA]

[INSERT Table 3 - Mean differences and 95% confidence intervals from three group comparisons using Tukey HSD.

### Group Sensitivity analysis

To explore any confounding effect of the presence of OCD in the HD group and vice versa on the findings, a one-way MANOVA was conducted with four groups: Pure HD (meeting criteria for HD only), Pure OCD (meeting criteria for OCD only), HD/OCD Comorbid (meeting criteria for both HD and OCD) and Healthy Controls. The MANOVA across groups remained significant  $F(9, 552) = 19.04, p < .01$ ; Pillai's Trace = 0.711, partial  $\eta^2 = .24$ . Univariate between-subjects ANOVAs showed that group had a statistically significant effect on IU ( $F(3, 184) = 65.32; p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.52$ ), AS ( $F(3, 184) = 60.16 p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.50$ ) and DT ( $F(3, 184) = 36.76; p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.38$ ).

Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests (see Table 4) indicated that the clinical groups were significantly different from controls in the same direction as the main analysis for all dependent measures. Similarly, there were no significant differences between the Pure HD and Pure OCD groups for IU, AS and DT. The HD and Co-morbid groups did not differ significantly in respect of either IU or DT, but AS was significantly higher in the Comorbid group. Further, the analysis suggested that IU and AT were significantly higher, and DT significantly lower, in the Comorbid group compared to the Pure OCD group.

[INSERT Table 4 - Mean differences and 95% confidence intervals from four group multi comparisons using Tukey HSD.

To investigate any unique effects that the Primary HD (those meeting criteria for both HD and OCD but self-reporting HD as their primary problem) and Primary OCD (those meeting criteria for both HD and OCD but self-reporting OCD as their primary problem) groups might have, an additional five-group one-way MANOVA (Pure HD; Pure OCD; Primary HD; Primary OCD; Healthy Controls) was run. As with the previous two analyses, the MANOVA across groups remained significant  $F(12, 549) = 16.05, p < .01$ ; Pillai's Trace = 0.779, partial  $\eta^2 = .26$ . Univariate between-subjects ANOVAs showed that group had a statistically significant effect on IU ( $F(4, 183) = 52.92; p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.54$ ), AS ( $F(4, 183) = 52.86 p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.54$ ) and DT ( $F(4, 183) = 28.91, p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.39$ ).

Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests (see Table 5) identified the same pattern of significant differences found in the previous analyses between the clinical groups and the healthy controls for all of the dependent measures. There were also no significant differences between the pure

HD and pure OCD groups for IU, AS and DT. There was no significant difference between pure HD and both the Primary HD and Primary OCD groups for IU and DT but there was a significant difference between Pure HD and these two groups for AS. There were significant differences between the Pure OCD and the Primary HD group for IU and AS but not DT. Whereas there were significant differences between Pure OCD and Primary OCD for all the dependent measures. Finally, the HD primary and the OCD primary groups did not differ significantly from each other in respect of IU and DT but they did differ significantly for AS.

[Insert Table 5 - Mean differences and 95% confidence intervals from five group multi comparisons using Tukey HSD]

### Discussion

The current study compared IU, AS and DT across HD, OCD and HCs. As hypothesised, there were significant differences between the clinical and non-clinical groups across the three constructs. We investigated whether IU and AS would be significantly higher, and DT significantly lower, in the HD group relative to the OCD group, but no evidence was found to support this hypothesis. Further, these results remained the same when examining the potential confounding effect of comorbidity. The findings also suggest that emotional vulnerability factors **may be** more severe when there are multiple diagnoses.

Previous research has produced mixed findings regarding the nature of the relationship of emotional vulnerability factors and HD, with some research suggesting that DT has greater specificity in HD than AS and IU (Grisham et al., 2018) and other studies finding IU to be a more unique predictor of HD symptomology (Mathes et al., 2017; Shaw & Timpano, 2016). The present

findings indicate that whatever differences there may be in the relationships between the investigated constructs and HD, there was no evidence to indicate that these relationships are unique to HD when compared to OCD, which replicates and extends the findings of Wheaton et al (2016), who also found IU to be comparable in HD and OCD.

Our findings are also consistent with the conclusions of previous research that IU, AS and DT are important transdiagnostic constructs that can be identified in a range of anxiety disorders. For example, IU has been found to be comparable across large samples of clinically diagnosed anxiety disorders including OCD, Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD, Major Depressive Disorder, Social Anxiety Disorder (SAD) and Panic Disorder (PD) (Carleton et al., 2012). Likewise, comparable levels of DT have been found in OCD, GAD, SAD and PD (Laposa et al, 2015; Michel et al, 2016). AS has also been found to play a key role in the development and maintenance of several anxiety disorders including OCD, GAD, SAD, PD and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Olatunji & Wolitzky-Taylor, 2009). The present findings are in line with this literature regarding the transdiagnostic nature of emotional vulnerability factors within various mental health conditions.

Treatments specifically targeting AS, IU and DT have shown positive results in anxiety disorders, including GAD, PD, and SAD (Boswell et al, 2013; Katz et al, 2017; Smits et al, 2008). This could indicate that the current treatments for HD may be improved by the introduction of CBT methods focussing on changing AS, DT and IU. However, recent trial findings have indicated little evidence for emotional vulnerability factors as a mechanism of change in HD (Worden et al, 2019). However, this could be attributable to the intervention techniques and their application, rather than demonstrating the irrelevance of the constructs. Nevertheless, it may be that, in line with cognitive behavioural theory, the focus of research should instead be on understanding the

specific beliefs and behaviour that influence emotional factors in HD, which is consistent with recent mediational analysis of HD trial data providing evidence for beliefs as a mechanism of change (Levy et al., 2017).

### **Limitations**

The present findings would benefit from replication using a community HD sample, where group membership is based upon the gold standard DSM-5 diagnostic interview (SIHD; Nordsletten et al., 2013). However, it should be noted that the HRS and SI-R used in the present study are highly correlated with the DSM 5 criteria for HD (Mataix-Cols et al, 2012). Further, the HRS and SI-R scores for the HD group were comparable to those found in previous research that also adopted diagnostic interviews (e.g. Grisham et al., 2018). Similarly, the mean OCI-R scores in the HD, OCD and HC OCD groups were comparable to those found in previous studies (see Blom et al., 2011; Michel et al, 2016). It is not possible to understand the results in relation to ethnicity as this information was not collected in the present study.

Online methodology has been criticised in terms of its potential negative impact on data validity (see Gosling et al., 2004). However, there is growing evidence that anonymity can positively impact upon task engagement (see Barr, 2017; Bell, 2001); it is possible that the anonymous nature of online data collection may instead improve engagement with research. In addition, equivalency has been demonstrated when comparing psychological information derived from pencil and pen methods versus online methods (Fouladi et al, 2002). Taken together, this suggests that the data produced from the present research is unlikely to experience validity issues attributable to the method of collection.



**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the findings suggest that IU, AS and DT are present in HD, but there is no evidence to indicate that they are any more important in HD compared to other anxiety disorders such as OCD. Future research is required to extend these findings in comparison to other clinical presentations, as well as to investigate the impact of targeting these factors in HD treatments.

### References

- American Psychiatric Association.** (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: APA
- Barr, M. L.** (2017). Encouraging college student active engagement in learning: Student response methods and anonymity. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 33(6), 621-632. doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12205
- Bell, M.** (2001). Online role-play: Anonymity, engagement and risk. *Educational Media International*, 38(4), 251-260. doi.org/10.1080/09523980110105141
- Blom, R. M., Samuels, J. F., Grados, M. A., Chen, Y., Bienvenu, O. J., Riddle, M. A., Liang, K-Y., Brandt, J., & Nestadt, G.** (2011). Cognitive functioning in compulsive hoarding. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 25(8), 1139-1144. doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2011.08.005
- Boswell, J. F., Thompson-Hollands, J., Farchione, T. J., & Barlow, D. H.** (2013). Intolerance of uncertainty: a common factor in the treatment of emotional disorders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69(6), 630-645. doi.org/10.1002/jclp.21965
- Buhr, K., & Dugas, M. J.** (2002). The Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale: psychometric properties of the English version. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 40(8), 931-945. doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(01)00092-4
- Carleton, R. N., Mulvogue, M. K., Thibodeau, M. A., McCabe, R. E., Antony, M. M., & Asmundson, G. J.** (2012). Increasingly certain about uncertainty: Intolerance of uncertainty across anxiety and depression. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 26(3), 468-479. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2012.01.011

- Castriotta, N., Dozier, M. E., Taylor, C. T., Mayes, T., & Ayers, C. R.** (2019). Intolerance of uncertainty in hoarding disorder. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, *21*, 97-101. doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2018.11.005
- Clark, D. M.** (1986). A cognitive approach to panic. *Behaviour research and therapy*, *24*(4), 461-470. doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(86)90011-2
- Clark, D. M., & Wells, A.** (1995). A cognitive model of social phobia. In G. Heimberg, M. R. M. R. Liebowitz, D. Hope, & F. Scheier (Eds.), *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 69–93). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Dugas, M. J., Schwartz, A., & Francis, K.** (2004). Intolerance of uncertainty, worry, and depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *28*(6), 835-842. doi:10.1007/s10608-004-0669-0
- Ehlers, A., & Clark, D. M.** (2000). A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour research and therapy*, *38*(4), 319-345. doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(99)00123-0
- Foa, E. B., Huppert, J. D., Leiberg, S., Langner, R., Kichic, R., Hajcak, G., & Salkovskis, P. M.** (2002). The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory: Development and validation of a short version. *Psychological Assessment*, *14*(4), 485-496. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.14.4.485
- Fouladi, R. T., Mccarthy, C. J., & Moller, N.** (2002). and-pencil or online? Evaluating mode effects on measures of emotional functioning and attachment. *Assessment*, *9*(2), 204-215. doi.org/10.1177/10791102009002011
- Freeston, M. H., Rhéaume, J., Letarte, H., Dugas, M. J., & Ladouceur, R.** (1994). Why do people worry? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *17*(6), 791-802. dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90048-5

- Frost, R. O., & Hartl, T. L.** (1996). A cognitive-behavioral model of compulsive hoarding. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *34*(4), 341-350. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(95)00071-2
- Frost, R. O., Steketee, G., & Grisham, J.** (2004). Measurement of compulsive hoarding: Saving inventory-revised. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *42*(10), 1163-1182. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2003.07.006
- Grisham, J. R., Roberts, L., Cerea, S., Isemann, S., Svehla, J., & Norberg, M. M.** (2018). The role of distress tolerance, anxiety sensitivity, and intolerance of uncertainty in predicting hoarding symptoms in a clinical sample. *Psychiatry Research*, *267*, 94-101. doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.05.084
- Gosling, S.D., Simine, V., Srivastava, S., & John, O.P.** (2004). Should We Trust Web-Based Studies? A Comparative Analysis of Six Preconceptions About Internet Questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, *59*(2), 93-104. dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.93
- Katz, D., Rector, N. A., & Lapsa, J. M.** (2017). The interaction of distress tolerance and intolerance of uncertainty in the prediction of symptom reduction across CBT for social anxiety disorder. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, *46*(6), 459-477. doi:10.1080/16506073.2017.1334087
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B.** (2001). The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of general internal medicine*, *16*(9), 606-613. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x
- Lapsa, J. M., Collimore, K. C., Hawley, L. L., & Rector, N. A.** (2015). Distress tolerance in OCD and anxiety disorders, and its relationship with anxiety sensitivity and intolerance of uncertainty. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *33*, 8-14. doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2015.04.003

**Levy, H.C., Worden, B.L., Gilliam, C.M., D'Urso, C., Steketee, G., Frost, R.O., & Tolin, D.F.**

(2017). Changes in saving cognitions mediate hoarding symptom change in cognitive-behavioral therapy for hoarding disorder. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, *14*, 112-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2017.06.008>

**Mathes, B. M., Oglesby, M. E., Short, N. A., Portero, A. K., Raines, A. M., & Schmidt, N. B.**

(2017). An examination of the role of intolerance of distress and uncertainty in hoarding symptoms. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *72*, 121-129. [doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2016.10.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2016.10.007)

**Mataix-Cols, D., Fernandez de la Cruz, L. & Nordsletten, A.E.** (2012). The London field trial

for hoarding disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, *43*(4), 1-11. [doi:10.1017/S0033291712001560](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291712001560)

**Medley, A. N., Capron, D. W., Korte, K. J., & Schmidt, N. B.** (2013). Anxiety Sensitivity: A

Potential Vulnerability Factor For Compulsive Hoarding. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, *42*(1), 45-55. [doi:10.1080/16506073.2012.738242](https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2012.738242)

**Michel, N. M., Rowa, K., Young, L., & McCabe, R. E.** (2016). Emotional distress tolerance

across anxiety disorders. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *40*, 94-103. [doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.04.009)

**Norberg, M. M., Keyan, D., & Grisham, J. R.** (2015). Mood influences the relationship between

distress intolerance and discarding. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, *6*, 77-82. [doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2015.06.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2015.06.005)

**Nordsletten, A. E., Fernández de la Cruz, L., Pertusa, A., Reichenberg, A., Hotopf, M.,**

**Mataix-Cols, D.** (2013). The Structured Interview for Hoarding Disorder (SIHD):

- Development, further validation, and pragmatic usage. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, 2(3), 346–350. doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2013.06.003
- Oglesby, M. E., Medley, A. N., Norr, A. M., Capron, D. W., Korte, K. J., & Schmidt, N. B.** (2013). Intolerance of uncertainty as a vulnerability factor for hoarding behaviors. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 145(2), 227-231. doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.08.003
- Olatunji, B. O., & Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B.** (2009). Anxiety sensitivity and the anxiety disorders: a meta-analytic review and synthesis. In *Psychol Bull* (Vol. 135, pp. 974-999). United States.
- Pallant, J.** (2010). *SPSS survival manual : a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*: Fourth edition. Maidenhead : Open University Press/McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Postlethwaite, A., Kellett, S., & Mataix-Cols, D.** (2019). Prevalence of hoarding disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of affective disorders*, 256, 309-316. doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.06.004
- Schmidt, N. B., Richey, J. A., Cromer, K. R., & Buckner, J. D.** (2007). Discomfort Intolerance: Evaluation of a Potential Risk Factor for Anxiety Psychopathology. *Behavior Therapy*, 38(3), 247-255. doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2006.08.004
- Shaw, A. M., & Timpano, K. R.** (2016). An Experimental Investigation of the Effect of Stress on Saving and Acquiring Behavioral Tendencies: The Role of Distress Tolerance and Negative Urgency. *Behavior Therapy*, 47(1), 116-129. doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2015.10.003
- Simons, J. S. & Gaher, R. M.** (2005). The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Motivation and Emotion*, 29(2), 83-102. doi:10.1007/s11031-005-7955-3

- Smits, J. A. J., Berry, A. C., Tart, C. D., & Powers, M. B.** (2008). The efficacy of cognitive-behavioral interventions for reducing anxiety sensitivity: A meta-analytic review. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *46*(9), 1047-1054. doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2008.06.010
- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Löwe, B.** (2006). A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *166*(10), 1092-1097. doi:10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
- Steketee, G., & Frost, R.** (2003). Compulsive hoarding: current status of the research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *23*(7), 905-927. doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2003.08.002
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S.** (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson: Allyn & Bacon.
- Taylor, S., Zvolensky, M. J., Cox, B. J., Deacon, B., Heimberg, R. G., Ledley, D. R., Cardenas, S. J.** (2007). Robust dimensions of anxiety sensitivity: development and initial validation of the Anxiety Sensitivity Index-3. *Psychological assessment*, *19*(2), 176. dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.19.2.176
- Timpano, K. R., Buckner, J. D., Richey, J. A., Murphy, D. L., & Schmidt, N. B.** (2009). Exploration of anxiety sensitivity and distress tolerance as vulnerability factors for hoarding behaviors. *Depression and Anxiety*, *26*(4), 343-353. doi:10.1002/da.20469
- Tolin, D. F., Frost, R. O., & Steketee, G.** (2010). A brief interview for assessing compulsive hoarding: The Hoarding Rating Scale-Interview. *Psychiatry research*, *178*(1), 147-152. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2009.05.001
- Tolin, D. F., Frost, R. O., Steketee, G., & Muroff, J.** (2015). Cognitive behavioral therapy for hoarding disorder: A meta-analysis. *Depression and anxiety*, *32*(3), 158-166. doi.org/10.1002/da.22327

**Wheaton, M. G., Abramowitz, J. S., Jacoby, R. J., Zwerling, J., & Rodriguez, C. I.** (2016).

An investigation of the role of intolerance of uncertainty in hoarding symptoms. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 193, 208-214. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2015.12.047

**Worden, B., Levy, H.C., Das, A., Katz, B., Stevens, M., & Tolin, D.F.** (2019). Perceived

emotion regulation and emotional distress tolerance in patients with hoarding disorder.

*Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, 22, 1-8.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2019.100441>