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Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) has previously been found to be inversely related to distress tolerance, which is the ability to tolerate negative or aversive emotional states (Simons & Gaher, 2005), in trauma-exposed samples. The vast majority of the studies examining the relationship between these two constructs have used DSM-IV PTSD criteria. Additionally, although previous research has considered their relationship at the symptom cluster level (Fetzner et al., 2014; Vujanovic et al., 2013), this is the first study to examine it at the latent level of analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to determine whether the DSM-5 model of PTSD or the dysphoria model of PTSD provided a better fit for the data. CFA was also used to test the five-factor hierarchical model of the Distress Tolerance Scale (DTS; Simons & Gaher, 2005), and then Wald tests of parameter constraints were utilized to determine if the magnitude of the relationships between individual PTSD factors and the second-order DTS factor differed significantly. Results indicated that the four-factor dysphoria model of PTSD provided a significantly better fit compared to the DSM-5 four-factor model of PTSD. Additionally, all four factors of PTSD (re-experiencing, avoidance, dysphoria, and arousal) were
negatively correlated with the higher-order general distress tolerance factor of the DTS. However, when these factor correlations were compared pairwise using Wald tests of parameter constraints, none of them were differentially related to overall distress tolerance. Clinical and research considerations are addressed for both PTSD and distress tolerance.
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Chapter One

Literature Review

Introduction

Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is a mental disorder that can occur following exposure to a potentially traumatic event, and it affects 3.5% of the United States population each year, with a 7% lifetime prevalence rate (Kessler, Chiu, Demier, & Walters, 2005). As research continues to study the unique developmental, maintenance, and treatment variables related to the disorder, focus increasingly turns to understanding the underlying latent structure of PTSD to inform diagnosis and treatment. Similarly, related external constructs, such as emotion regulation (Boden et al., 2013; Schreiber, Grant, & Odlaug, 2012; Tull, Barrett, McMillan, & Roemer, 2007) and distress tolerance (Anestis, Tull, Bagge, & Gratz, 2012; Marshall-Berenz, Vujanovic, Bonn-Miller, Bernstein, & Zvolensky, 2010; Tull, Gratz, Coffey, Weiss, & McDermott, 2013) are being considered in association with PTSD to better understand its development and maintenance.

PTSD Factor Structure

Several factor structure models for PTSD have been proposed to increase understanding of PTSD’s underlying symptom dimensions using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The three-factor model of PTSD proposed in DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), which was divided into re-experiencing, effortful avoidance/emotional numbing, and hyperarousal, proved to be a poor fit of the PTSD symptom structure (Asmundson et al., 2000; Elhai & Palmieri, 2011; Ullman & Long, 2008; Yufik & Simms, 2010), and consequently, alternative models have been proposed.
In response, two four-factor models have emerged. First, King, Leskin, King, and Weathers (1998) proposed an emotional numbing model of PTSD that consisted of four factors: re-experiencing, avoidance, numbing, and arousal. This model differed from the previous three-factor model because it divided the avoidance/numbing cluster into distinct effortful avoidance and emotional numbing factors, based on research showing that avoidance and numbing are distinct (Asmundson, Stapleton, & Taylor, 2004). This four-factor model has been supported in various trauma-exposed samples, including college students (Elhai, Biehn, Naifeh, & Frueh, 2011; Gauci & MacDonald, 2012; Hoyt & Yeater, 2010), military veterans (Elhai, Palmieri, Biehn, Frueh, & Magruder, 2010; Maestas, Benge, Pastorak, Lemaire, & Darrow, 2011), community adults (Elhai, Grubaugh, Kashdan, & Frueh, 2008), adolescents (Ford, Elhai, Ruggiero, & Frueh, 2009), and civilian war survivors (Morina, Bohme, Morina, & Asmundson, 2011).

Similar to the emotional numbing model, the dysphoria model of PTSD was proposed by Simms, Watson, and Doeberling (2002). This four-factor model consists of re-experiencing, avoidance, dysphoria, and arousal factors. The eight-item dysphoria factor is a combination of the five numbing symptoms and three arousal symptoms, which reflects the general distress and dysphoria of anxiety and mood disorders (Simms et al., 2002). The dysphoria model has revealed support in trauma-exposed samples of college students (Elhai et al., 2011; Elhai et al., 2009), military veterans (Engdahl, Elhai, Richardson, & Frueh, 2011; Naifeh, Richardson, Del Ben, & Elhai, 2010; Pietrzak, Goldstein, Malley, Rivers, & Southwick, 2010), disaster workers (Palmieri, Weathers, Difede, & King, 2007), sexual assault victims (Elklit, Armour, & Shevlin, 2010; Ullman & Long, 2008), bereaved individuals (Boelen, van den Hout, & van den Bout, 2008;
Elklit et al., 2010), interpersonal violence victims (Krause, Kaltman, Goodman, & Dutton, 2007), and community adults (Armour & Shevlin, 2009; Carragher, Mills, Slade, Teesson, & Silove, 2010). A meta-analysis conducted by Yufik and Simms (2010) found that the emotional numbing and dysphoria models of PTSD provided superior fit relative to other models, and the dysphoria model also fit marginally better than the emotional numbing model.

The conceptualization of PTSD has again been altered for the newly published DSM-5 (see Table 1 for comparison). DSM-5 has added three additional PTSD symptoms, persistent distorted blame, persistent negative trauma-related emotions, and reckless behavior, for a total of 20 symptoms. Additionally, PTSD now comprises four symptom clusters: intrusions (or re-experiencing), avoidance, negative alterations in mood and cognition (NAMC), and marked alterations in arousal and reactivity (AAR; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Because of its recent publication, limited research has been completed concerning the validity of this new four-factor model, which is based on the emotional numbing model (King et al., 1998).

| Table 1. DSM-5 Adjusted Dysphoria Model Compared to the DSM-5 Model of PTSD |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| PTSD Symptom                        | Dysphoria | DSM-5       |
| B1: Intrusive thoughts              | R       | R            |
| B2: Nightmares                      | R       | R            |
| B3: Reliving trauma                 | R       | R            |
| B4: Emotional cue reactivity        | R       | R            |
| B5: Physiological cue reactivity    | R       | R            |
| C1: Avoidance of thoughts           | A       | A            |
| C2: Avoidance of external reminders  | A       | A            |
| D1: Trauma-related amnesia          | D       | NAMC         |
| D2: Negative beliefs                | D       | NAMC         |
| D3: Distorted blame                 | D       | NAMC         |
| D4: Persistent negative emotional state | D       | NAMC         |
| D5: Lack of interest                | D       | NAMC         |
| D6: Feeling detached                | D       | NAMC         |
D7: Inability to experience positive emotions  D  NAMC
E1: Irritability/anger              D  AAR
E2: Recklessness                  H  AAR
E3: Hypervigilance                H  AAR
E4: Easily startled               H  AAR
E5: Difficulty concentrating     D  AAR
E6: Difficulty sleeping           D  AAR

Note. R = Re-experiencing; A = Avoidance; D = Dysphoria; H = Hyperarousal; NAMC = Negative alterations in mood and cognition; AAR = Alterations in arousal and reactivity.

**Distress Tolerance Factor Structure**

A key process that is related to PTSD is distress tolerance. Zvolensky, Vujanovic, Bernstein, and Leyro (2010) define distress tolerance as “the perceived capacity to withstand negative emotional and/or other aversive (e.g. physical discomfort) and the behavioral act of withstanding distressing internal states elicited by some type of stressor” (p. 406). Distress tolerance has been linked to various cognitive-affective processes, such as affect intensity (Cougle, Bernstein, Zvolensky, Vujanovic, & Macatee, 2013; Simons & Gaher, 2005; Vujanovic et al., 2013) and experiential avoidance (Leyro, Zvolensky, & Bernstein, 2010; Schmidt, Richey, & Fitzpatrick, 2006). Bernstein, Zvolensky, Vujanovic, and Moos (2009) found that distress tolerance is a unique variable relative to anxiety sensitivity and discomfort intolerance. In addition, other studies have supported the idea that distress tolerance is able to stand on its own relative to other anxiety constructs such as anxiety sensitivity (Bernstein et al., 2009; Keough, Riccardi, Timpano, Mitchell, & Schmidt, 2010) and physical discomfort intolerance (Anestis et al., 2011; Bardeen, Fergus, & Orcutt, 2013).

Distress tolerance has also been linked to psychopathology and is a component of various therapeutic interventions. Distress tolerance has been associated with major depressive disorder (MDD; Ehring, Fischer, Schnulle, Bosterling, & Tuschen-Caffier,
2008; Mennin, Holaway, Fresco, Moore, & Heimberg, 2007; Rottenberg, Gross, & Gotlib, 2005), generalized anxiety disorder (GAD; Mennin, McLaughlin, & Flanagan, 2009), panic disorder (Marshall et al., 2008; Telch, Jacquin, Smits, & Powers, 2003), substance use disorders (Daughters et al., 2005), and borderline personality disorder (Gaher, Hofman, Simons, & Hunsaker, 2013; Iverson, Follette, Pistorello, & Fruzzetti, 2012; Linehan, 1993). Because of its prominent role in the conceptualization of various psychological phenomena, distress tolerance is also directly addressed in therapeutic interventions, including dialectical behavior therapy (DBT; Linehan, 1993), unified protocol for transdiagnostic treatment of emotional disorders (Barlow, Allen, & Choate, 2004), and acceptance-based emotion regulation group therapy (Gratz & Gunderson, 2006).

The latent structure of distress tolerance has not been explored as extensively as that of PTSD. The Distress Tolerance Scale (DTS; Simons & Gaher, 2005) was developed specifically to measure distress tolerance for negative emotional states. Simons and Gaher (2005) found a hierarchical model of distress tolerance using confirmatory factor analysis, with four lower-order factors (tolerance, appraisal, absorption, and regulation) subsumed by a second-order general distress tolerance factor. The four factors of the DTS are highly related, but tap distinct processes of experiencing distress. Tolerance relates to how much the individual perceives distress as unbearable; Absorption is associated with the tendency to have attention absorbed by focusing on the distressing aspects of the situation; Regulation addresses the change in affect regulation strategies to alleviate distress; and Appraisal relates to how an individual’s inability to accept distress exacerbates his or her suffering (Simons & Gaher, 2005). This structure
has been replicated (Leyro, Bernstein, Vujanovic, McLeish, & Zvolensky, 2011), but most research using the DTS has used observed variables instead of latent factors. Therefore, additional research confirming the latent structure of distress tolerance is necessary.

**PTSD and Distress Tolerance**

Traumatic stress and distress tolerance have several commonalities that suggest their relationship requires further investigation, and there are several theoretical ways that they could be related. Vujanovic, Bernstein, and Litz (2010) proposed that low levels of distress tolerance might be related to a predisposition for greater emotion dysregulation, which resulted from an insufficient capacity to experience and tolerate trauma-related distress. Similarly, some researchers have theorized that experiential avoidance and avoidant coping could underlie the relationship between distress tolerance and PTSD (Lynch & Mizon, 2010). Experiential avoidance involves the inability or unwillingness to experience aversive internal experiences such as emotions and memories, which is very similar to the intolerance associated with distress and trauma (Tull & Roemer, 2003).

Lower distress tolerance has been hypothesized to lead to experiential avoidant coping or reflect a predisposition for experiential avoidance (Lynch & Mizon, 2010). In addition to avoidance being a latent factor of PTSD, individuals with PTSD have been found to avoid person and threatening information in order to regulate or avoid potential negative mood states (Dalgleish, Rolfe, Golden, Dunn, & Barnard, 2008). Similarly, experiential avoidance is associated with increased PTSD symptom severity (Foa & Kozak, 1986).

Besides experiential avoidance, distress has been linked to PTSD as an underlying factor associated with internalizing disorders. Internalizing disorders, such as anxiety
disorders, PTSD, and unipolar depression, have a common core of negative emotionality (reviewed in Stander, Thomsen, & Highfill-McRoy, 2014). Watson proposed that there are three major categories of disorders: bipolar, distress, and fear disorders (Watson, 2005, 2009). PTSD could fit into the distress disorder category, along with dysthymia, MDD, and GAD (Watson, 2005). Arguably, PTSD could also be placed in the fear disorder category because of the fear conditioning associated with trauma exposure, but the present study is concerned with negative emotionality associated with distress rather than fear (Lockwood & Forbes, 2014). Distress disorders, also called anxious-misery disorders, are characterized by a large component of non-specific negative affectivity (Watson, O’Hara, & Stuart, 2008). The ability to tolerate negative emotional states, as measured by distress tolerance, should theoretically be negatively associated with PTSD, but previous research has not considered how these latent factors could be differentially related to the different factors of PTSD.

Previous studies have considered the relationship between distress tolerance and overall PTSD severity or PTSD symptom cluster summed scores, but not the latent factors underlying PTSD. The relationship between PTSD and distress tolerance reveals an inverse relationship in which PTSD symptom severity increases when distress tolerance is lower (Fetzner, Peluso, & Asmundson, 2014; Marshall-Berenz et al., 2010; Vujanovic, Bonn-Miller, Potter, Marshall, & Zvolensky, 2011; Vujanovic et al., 2013). For example, greater ability to tolerate distress (indicated by higher scores on the DTS) is associated with less severe PTSD symptoms (indicated by lower scores on measures of PTSD). Vujanovic et al. (2013) investigated relations between distress tolerance and PTSD severity as a function of negative affect intensity, and the authors reported that
distress tolerance had the strongest relationship with PTSD symptom severity when negative affect intensity was high. Related to PTSD symptom clusters, it has been found that individuals reporting lower levels of distress tolerance report higher levels of re-experiencing, avoidance, and arousal symptoms, compared to individuals reporting higher levels of distress tolerance, and the largest effect size of these symptom clusters was found for the arousal subscale (Vujanovic et al., 2011). Distress tolerance has also been found to have a significant inverse relationship to the re-experiencing and emotional numbing symptom clusters, in that higher levels of distress tolerance are associated with lower symptom severity on the re-experiencing and emotional numbing subscales (Vujanovic et al., 2013). Finally, a relationship was found between distress tolerance and alcohol use behavior indirectly through PTSD’s arousal symptom cluster (Duranceau, Fetzner, & Carleton, 2014).

**Present Study Aims and Hypotheses**

The present study aimed to add to the current understanding of PTSD and distress tolerance, as well as the relationship between the two constructs at the latent level of analysis. The two broad aims of the proposed study were to relate model fit comparison, for both PTSD and distress tolerance, and to compare the relationships between PTSD latent factors and distress tolerance.

The first aim for model fit comparison used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to compare the model fit of two PTSD factor structure models. The present study adds to the current literature by testing the fit of the new DSM-5 latent structure model of PTSD and the DSM-5 adapted dysphoria model of PTSD. It was hypothesized that the dysphoria model would provide a better fit of the data, consistent with the findings of Yufik and
Simms (2010). Similarly, a CFA was conducted to determine the fit of the hierarchical latent structure of distress tolerance using the hierarchical model proposed by Simons and Gaher (2005).

The second aim of the study related to the differential relationship between the different PTSD factors with the second-order general distress tolerance factor. In general, it was predicted that all four factors of PTDS, regardless of which measure was used in the secondary analyses, would be significantly negatively correlated with the DTS higher order factor (Anestis et al., 2012; Fetzner et al., 2014; Vujanovic et al., 2013). The better fitting PTSD model was tested in conjunction with distress tolerance, and each PTSD factor was examined using correlations and Wald chi-square constraint tests to determine if the correlations between factors of PTSD and distress tolerance differed significantly. If the dysphoria model was determined to be the best fit, and therefore used in the subsequent analyses, it was hypothesized that the re-experiencing, avoidance, and arousal factors would have a stronger relationship with distress tolerance, and the dysphoria factor would be the least correlated with distress tolerance. If the DSM-5 factor structure was determined to be the best fit and used in subsequent analyses, it was hypothesized that the re-experiencing, avoidance, and alterations in arousal and reactivity factors would be more related to distress tolerance than the negative alterations in mood and cognition factor is related to distress tolerance (Anestis et al., 2012; Fetzner et al., 2014; Vujanovic et al., 2011).
Chapter Two

Method

Participants

Subjects were undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Toledo in an Introductory Psychology course. Only individuals 18 years or older who endorsed trauma exposure were eligible for participation. Recruitment continued until at least 225 individuals with trauma-exposure meeting DSM-5 criteria completed the study materials. Previous research has shown that 132 participants represent an adequate number of subjects considering the typical fit statistics associated with PTSD factor structure (Elhai & Palmieri, 2011).

Procedure

Subject Recruitment. Participants were recruited from the undergraduate population. They each had an account on the University’s SONA Systems platform, which is a program for managing psychological research participation. A brief abstract was provided, which stated, “This study is a 30 minute web survey inquiring about stressful life events and emotional functioning.” Each individual who completed the study materials received 0.5 research credits toward their class requirement.

Participant Screening. Prior to completing any research studies for the semester, students completed a pre-screen questionnaire to determine their eligibility for the different studies being offered. Only two of these screening questions were used to determine eligibility in the present study. First, students had to endorse that they were at least 18 years of age. Second, the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV PTSD Trauma Screen (discussed below) was used to determine if the student potentially had
trauma exposure. This single-question screener required a forced “yes” or “no” response, and only individuals who responded “yes” were eligible to participate in the study.

**Data Collection.** The present study was conducted as a web-based survey. Subjects were able to sign up for the study on the university’s SONA Systems website, and they were routed to complete the materials on PsychData. PsychData is a web survey creation and delivery platform, writing data to a research database system that securely stores all study information. The computer servers are password protected, encrypted, and secured to ensure participants’ privacy. Participation was anonymous and conducted in a private location of their own choosing at their leisure. The study should not have exceeded 30 minutes per person to complete. All downloaded data are de-identified and were stored securely.

**Measures**

**Demographics Survey.** Information regarding participants’ gender, age, race, ethnicity, education, employment status, relationship status, and household income were collected.

**Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID) PTSD Trauma Screen.** The SCID (First, Spitzer, Gibbon, & Williams, 2002) is a structured diagnostic interview for Axis I diagnoses. Only the PTSD module’s screen for trauma exposure was presented, and it is a single-sentence probe concerning exposure to a traumatic event, providing specific examples of potentially traumatic events. Only subjects who endorsed a trauma on this prescreen question were able to participate in the study. The SCID PTSD trauma screen has demonstrated 65.5% sensitivity, 87.2% specificity, and 72.3% diagnostic power in an undergraduate sample (Elhai, Franklin, & Gray, 2008).
Stressful Life Events Screening Questionnaire (SLESQ). The SLESQ (Goodman, Corcoran, Turner, Yuan, & Green, 1998) is a self-report measure assessing lifetime trauma exposure. It includes 12 categories of potentially traumatic events that meet *DSM-IV* PTSD’s Criterion A, as well as an “other” category. Elhai et al. (2012) modified the SLESQ, adapting the trauma queries to be consistent with *DSM-5* criteria for a traumatic event, to be used in the present study. Similarly, the modified SLESQ included a prompt to nominate a most distressing traumatic event, and the individual was instructed to keep that event in mind when rating his or her symptoms of PTSD. The SLESQ has demonstrated good test-retest reliability across the event categories, with a mean kappa value of .73 (Goodman et al., 1998). In addition, it has been found to have good convergent and concurrent validity ($r = .77$) when compared to an extensive interview concerning trauma exposure (Goodman et al., 1998).

PTSD Checklist for *DSM-5* (PCL-5). The PCL (Weathers, Litz, Herman, Huska, & Keane, 1993) is a self-report measure examining PTSD symptom severity. With the new publication of *DSM-5*, the PCL has been adapted for the new symptom criteria for PTSD (Weathers et al., 2013). Each question asked the subject to indicate the amount of their distress, over the last month, on a five-point Likert-type scale (0 = “Not at all” to 4 = “Extremely”). Preliminary results for the PCL-5 suggest excellent internal consistency with alpha = .94 and convergent validity compared to the Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale (PDS) and the original PCL, $r = .90$ and .87, respectively (Blevins, Weathers, Witte, & Davis, 2012). The original PCL based on *DSM-IV* has shown good internal consistency in an undergraduate sample with Cronbach’s alpha of .94 for total PCL score, as well as .85 for re-experiencing, .85 for avoidance, and .87 for the hyperarousal
subscale (Ruggiero, Del Ben, Scotti, & Rabalais, 2003). Convergent validity was found in an undergraduate sample with high correlations (all rs > .75) between the PCL, the Impact of Events Scale (IES), and the Mississippi Scale for PTSD-Civilian Version (MS-C; Ruggiero et al., 2003). It similarly has a moderate correlation with interview-based PTSD measures (r = .65; Adkins, Weathers, McDevitt-Murphy, & Daniels, 2008).

**Distress Tolerance Scale (DTS).** The DTS (Simons & Gaher, 2005) is a 15-item self-report measure examining an individual’s ability to tolerate emotional and psychological distress. Each item is rated on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = “Strongly Agree” to 5 = “Strongly Disagree”), with lower scores indicative of less distress tolerance. The scale is further broken down into four subscales: perceived ability to tolerate emotional distress (Tolerance), attention being absorbed by negative emotions (Absorption), subjective appraisal of distress (Appraisal), and regulation of efforts to alleviate distress (Regulation). Good internal consistency has been found in undergraduate samples, with Cronbach’s alpha of .89 (Cougle et al., 2013; Simons & Gaher, 2005). Cougle et al. (2013) also found adequate to good internal consistency for the subscales with alpha values of .80 (Appraisal), .78 (Absorption), .70 (Regulation), and .64 (Tolerance). The DTS total score shows a good intra-class correlation (r = .61) for test-retest over a six-month interval (Simons & Gaher, 2005). The DTS has been found to have good divergent validity from measures of affective distress (r = -.59) and emotional lability (r = -.51), and in regard to convergent validity, it is positively related to negative mood regulation (r = .54) (Simons & Gaher, 2005).

**Data Analysis**
Data were downloaded from the secure PsychData application and screened for
missing data. Individuals who did not qualify as trauma-exposed according to DSM-5
criteria were excluded, as well as individuals who did not endorse a most distressing
trauma. Data for participants were excluded if more than 50% of item responses were
missing from either the PCL-5 or DTS, and a pairwise present approach was used to
estimate any additional missing value items in Mplus.

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted using Mplus 7.1 software.
Because both the PCL-5 and DTS items have five response options, they were treated as
ordinal, and therefore a polychoric covariance matrix and probit regression coefficients
were generated in the CFA (Wirth & Edwards, 2007). Because the data were treated as
ordinal, robust weighted least squares estimation with a mean- and variance-adjusted chi-
square (WLSMV) for the CFA was implemented. Residual error variances were fixed to
zero, and in order to scale the factors, all factor variances were fixed to one. Standardized
parameter estimates were interpreted.

For goodness of fit, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and
root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) estimated are reported. Excellent
model fit is characterized by CFI and TLI ≥ .95 and RMSEA ≤ .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999).
A total of four CFAs were conducted. First, the four-factor dysphoria model of PTSD
was examined, adapted for DSM-5 PTSD criteria. Second, the four-factor DSM-5 model
of PTSD was examined. The four-factor model providing the best fit of the data was used
in subsequent analyses. Next, the latent structure of the DTS was examined with CFA to
verify the fit of the accepted hierarchical factor structure. Finally, the combined
PTSD/DTS five-factor model was tested for model fit.
The better fitting PTSD model was determined by comparing the fit indices of the DSM-5 four-factor model with the dysphoria DSM-5 adjusted four-factor model. These two models are non-nested, and therefore they could not be compared using chi-square difference testing. Instead, Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) values were obtained by re-running both models using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation. A lower BIC value is indicative of better fit, and a difference of ten points is strong support for a distinguishable difference between the compared models (Kass & Raftery, 1995).

Six Wald tests of parameter constraints were then conducted and used to test for significant differences in the correlations between the best-fitting PTSD model’s four factors and the single DTS second-order factor. These Wald chi-square constraint tests examined all possible correlation pairs to determine if the correlations between distress tolerance and PTSD were significantly different (e.g. the difference between the correlation of a) the DTS higher order factor and PTSD’s re-experiencing factor and b) the DTS higher order factor and PTSD’s avoidance factor). Correlations between PTSD factors and the DTS are presented.
Chapter Three

Results

Sample Characteristics

The full sample was collected over three academic semesters (from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015) and consisted of 509 undergraduate psychology students. Of those, 18 opted out of the study and provided no data. Additionally, 243 participants were eliminated for not endorsing a most distressing trauma on the SLESQ. Of the remaining subjects, six were excluded for not endorsing a DSM-5 Criterion A qualifying trauma: one individual reported witnessing a traumatic event, but only through electronic media; five individuals reported repeated exposure to traumatic content through media only, but not as part of their occupation. The final sample therefore consisted of 242 trauma-exposed individuals, which is 47.5% of the total sample endorsing trauma exposure. The death of a close family member or friend (n = 100, 41.3%) was the most frequently endorsed index trauma, which PTSD symptoms were rated against. See Table 2 for frequencies of each type of reported traumatic event within this sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traumatic Event</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life-threatening illness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-threatening accident</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical force in robbery or mugging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of an immediate family member or close friend due to accident, homicide, or suicide</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically forced used to have intercourse against wishes in childhood or adulthood</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical force or threat used to attempt to have intercourse or inappropriate sexual contact against wishes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically harmed or beaten by parent or caregiver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically harmed or beaten by romantic partner, date, stranger, or someone else</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened with a deadly weapon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Frequencies of Reported Index Traumas Within Sample
There were some differences between the individuals with trauma exposure compared to individuals that were excluded for not endorsing a traumatic experience based on DSM-5 criteria. Males and females did not differ in their likelihood of being trauma exposed, $\chi^2(1) = .054, p = .816, \phi = .011$. Individuals with trauma exposure were significantly older than the group of individuals excluded for no trauma exposure ($M = 19.59, SD = 3.334$), $F(1, 484) = 6.408, p = .012, \eta^2_p = .007$. Finally, the trauma-exposed group had a significantly lower overall DTS score ($M = 46.06, SD = 13.10$) when compared to the mean of the non-trauma exposed group ($M = 49.22, SD = 11.53$), $F(1, 485) = 8.083, p = .005, \eta^2_p = .008$.

The effective sample was mostly white ($n = 202, 83.5\%$) and female ($n = 168, 69.4\%$). The mean age was 20.67 years old ($SD = 5.816$), and most of the participants were college freshman (years of education after first grade; $M = 13.06, SD = 1.54$). Most participants were employed part time ($n = 118, 48.8\%$) or identified as unemployed students ($n = 93, 38.4\%$), and approximately half self-reported being single ($n = 124, 51.2\%$). Comprehensive demographic information is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$, %</th>
<th>$M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74, 30.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168, 69.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.67 (5.82)</td>
<td>18-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>202, 83.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>42, 17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16, 6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.06 (1.54)</td>
<td>11-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed part time</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed student</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship, not living together</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship, living together</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, separated, or widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $44,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $89,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 or higher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Some percentages do not add up to 100% because of missing values. Race and ethnicity categories are not mutually exclusive, as participants could choose as many as applied. Education rated as years of education since the first grade.

**Preliminary Data Analyses**

The mean PCL score was 24.43 ($SD = 18.20$), skew = 0.649 ($SE = 0.16$), kurtosis = -0.382 ($SE = 0.31$). The PCL for the present sample also had good internal consistency, Cronbach’s alpha = .952. About a third ($n = 85$, 35.1%) met probable PTSD diagnosis based on the *DSM-5* diagnostic algorithm (Cook, Thompson, Coyne, & Sheikh, 2003), and the mean number of years since the target trauma was 3.47 ($SD = 4.35$). For the PCL, 86.0% ($n = 208$) had no item-level missing data, 11.2% ($n = 27$) were missing a single item on the PCL, and no one was missing more than five of the 20 items.
The mean DTS score was 46.04 (SD = 13.10), skew = 0.045 (SE = 0.16), kurtosis = -0.204 (SE = 0.31). The DTS had good internal consistency, Cronbach’s alpha = .917. For the DTS, 87.2% (n = 211) had no item-level missing data, 11.2% (n = 27) were missing a single item, and no individual was missing more than three of the 15 items.

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

Two CFAs were conducted for the competing PTSD factor models. The first CFA, for the four-factor DSM-5 PTSD model, indicated good fit, robust $\chi^2$ (164, $N = 242$) = 236.065, $p < .001$, CFI = .978, TLI = .974, RMSEA = .060 (90% CI = .042 -.077). Next, the CFA for the four-factor dysphoria model was found to have good fit, robust $\chi^2$ (164, $N = 242$) = 233.940, $p < .001$, CFI = .978, TLI = .975, RMSEA = .059 (90% CI = .041 -.076). The two CFAs were then reanalyzed using ML estimation instead of WLSMV in order to obtain BIC values to compare model fit. The difference in BIC values between the DSM-5 model (5653.467) and dysphoria model (5641.672) was greater than ten (11.795), indicating that the dysphoria model had significantly better fit than the DSM-5 PTSD model and was therefore used in subsequent analyses.

Next, the model fit for the DTS was tested using a hierarchical model, with four-factor factors subsumed by a higher order general distress tolerance factor. Results indicated adequate fit, robust $\chi^2$ (86, $N = 242$) = 353.441, $p < .001$, CFI = .960, TLI = .952, RMSEA = .113 (90% CI = .101 -.126). Finally, the full model was tested, which combined the four-factor dysphoria model of PTSD with the higher order DTS model. This five-factor model met criteria for excellent fit, robust $\chi^2$ (546, $N = 242$) = 834.927, $p < .001$, CFI = .970, TLI = .967, RMSEA = .047 (90% CI = .040 -.053). Factor loadings
for the PCL and DTS are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively, and factor
correlations are presented in Table 6.

Table 4. *PCL Item Mappings for Tested Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTSD Symptom</th>
<th>Dysphoria</th>
<th>DSM-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1: Intrusive thoughts</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: Nightmares</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3: Reliving trauma</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4: Emotional cue reactivity</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5: Physiological cue reactivity</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1: Avoidance of thoughts</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: Avoidance of external reminders</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: Trauma-related amnesia</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: Negative beliefs</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3: Distorted blame</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4: Persistent negative emotional state</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5: Lack of interest</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6: Feeling detached</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7: Inability to experience positive emotions</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1: Irritability/anger</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2: Recklessness</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3: Hypervigilance</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4: Easily startled</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5: Difficulty concentrating</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6: Difficulty sleeping</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. *DTS Factor Loadings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feeling distressed is unbearable to me</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can’t handle feeling distressed</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There’s nothing worse than feeling distressed</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I feel distressed, all I can think about is how bad I feel</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My feelings of distress are so intense that they completely take over</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When I feel distressed, I can’t help but concentrate on how bad the distress actually feels</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can tolerate being distressed as well as most people*</td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My feelings of distress are not acceptable</td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other people seem to be able to tolerate feeling distressed better than I can</td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Being distressed is always a major ordeal for me</td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am ashamed of myself when I feel distressed</td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My feelings of distress scare me</td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I’ll do anything to avoid feeling distressed</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. I’ll do anything to stop feeling distressed
14. When I feel distressed, I must do something about it immediately

Tolerance 
Absorption 
Appraisal 
Regulation

DT 0.989 
DT 0.978 
DT 0.920 
DT 0.737

Note. *Item 6 is reverse scored; DTS = Distress Tolerance Scale; TOL = Tolerance; ABS = Absorption; APP = Appraisal; REG = Regulation; DT = Second-order factor of distress tolerance.

Table 6. Correlations Between PCL and DTS Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REEX</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>DYS</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>APP</th>
<th>REG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REEX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYS</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>-0.411</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
<td>-0.448</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>-0.426</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
<td>-0.340</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
<td>-0.448</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.384</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations are significant at p < .01 level; PCL = PTSD Checklist; DTS = Distress Tolerance Scale; REEX = Re-experiencing; AV = Avoidance; DYS = Dysphoria; AR = Arousal; TOL = Tolerance; ABS = Absorption; APP = Appraisal; REG = Regulation; DT = Second-order factor of distress tolerance.

Wald Tests

Wald tests of parameter constraints were then conducted with the four factors of PTSD, which compared the magnitude of relationships between the DTS higher-order factor and PTSD factors (see Table 7). Distress tolerance was not significantly more related to re-experiencing ($r = -.443$) than avoidance ($r = -.465$), Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 0.129$, $p = .719$. Similarly, distress tolerance was not significantly more related to re-experiencing than dysphoria ($r = -.496$), Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 1.403$, $p = .236$, or arousal ($r = -.412$), Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 0.357$, $p = .550$. Distress tolerance was not more related to avoidance than
dysphoria, Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 0.256, p = .613$, or arousal, Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 0.582, p = .446$.

Finally, distress tolerance was not more related to dysphoria compared to arousal, Wald $\chi^2 (1) = 2.369, p = .1238$.

Table 7. Results of the Wald Tests of Parameter Constraints Using DSM-5 Adapted Dysphoria Model of PTSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation 1</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Correlation 2</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Wald $\chi^2 (p$ value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; Re-exp</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>DT &amp; Avoid</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td>0.129 (.719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; Re-exp</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>DT &amp; Dysphoria</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>1.403 (.236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; Re-exp</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>DT &amp; Arousal</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td>0.357 (.550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; Avoid</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td>DT &amp; Dysphoria</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>0.256 (.613)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; Avoid</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td>DT &amp; Arousal</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td>0.582 (.446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; Dysphoria</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>DT &amp; Arousal</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td>2.369 (.124)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. DT = Second-order factor of distress tolerance; Re-exp = Re-experiencing; Avoid = Avoidance.*
Chapter Four

Discussion

Summary of Results and Hypotheses

The aims of the present study were twofold: to compare the model fit of two competing latent factor models of PTSD using DSM-5 criteria and to examine the relationships between the latent factors of PTSD and distress tolerance. Both the DSM-5 model of PTSD and the DSM-5 adjusted dysphoria model of PTSD provided good fit for the latent structure of PTSD in the present sample, but as hypothesized, the dysphoria model fit significantly better. The hierarchical model of the DTS, characterized by four factors subsumed by a general distress tolerance second-order factor, provided good fit to the data, as expected from previous research. Also congruent with the hypotheses, all four PTSD factors of the dysphoria model were significantly and negatively associated with the DTS higher-order factor.

However, when the PTSD correlations with the DTS were examined, none of the paired comparisons showed significant differences. It was hypothesized that the re-experiencing and avoidance factors of PTSD would be more highly correlated to distress tolerance, and the dysphoria factor of PTSD would be the least strongly correlated with distress tolerance. All four PTSD factors should negatively correlate with distress tolerance, but no single factor was significantly more or less related than any other.

Implications for PTSD and Distress Tolerance Research

The present findings do not support previous research indicating that the dysphoria factor of PTSD is more related to generalized distress or other types of psychopathology, such as depression (Contractor et al., 2014; Elklit et al., 2010; Simms...
et al., 2002). The dysphoria factor contains symptoms that are not specific to PTSD, such as difficulty concentrating, irritability, loss of interest, and feelings of detachment, which are also seen in depression and anxiety disorders. Of the three new symptoms added to the PTSD diagnostic criteria for *DSM-5*, two of them (persistent or distorted blame and persistent negative emotional state) load onto the dysphoria factor. Therefore, the degree of specificity of the dysphoria factor, when compared to other external constructs, remains relevant to investigation. The present study found that none of the four factors of PTSD, including dysphoria, were differentially related to the external construct of distress tolerance, which is in line with some findings using *DSM-IV* PTSD criteria where dysphoria was just as related to distress as the other three factors (Marshall, Schell, & Miles, 2010; Miller et al., 2010). Additionally, because previous studies used symptom clusters, no previous investigation of distress tolerance and PTSD’s dysphoria factor has been conducted. Therefore, more research concerning distress tolerance and dysphoria is needed.

PTSD and distress tolerance are highly related, with high PTSD symptom severity related to less tolerance for negative emotional states (i.e. lower distress tolerance). The pattern of relationships between PTSD and distress tolerance suggest more support for the generalized distress as the shared variance underlying internalizing disorders than for the theory of experiential avoidance. PTSD’s avoidance factor was not more related to distress tolerance than the other factors of PTSD. Previous studies have conceptualized experiential avoidance and avoidant coping to underlie the PTSD-distress tolerance relationship (Lynch & Mizon, 2010; Tull & Roemer, 2003). However, if experiential avoidance acted as an underlying mechanism, it would be expected that the avoidance
and arousal (because of the hypervigilance to environmental cues) to trauma factors of PTSD would show stronger relationships with distress tolerance than the dysphoria factor, characterized by feelings of detachment, general negative affect, and trouble sleeping and concentrating, which was not supported in the present study. In line with the present findings, Vujanovic et al. (2013) found that avoidance and distress tolerance were significantly related at the correlational level, but this significance was lost after controlling for anxiety sensitivity. Therefore, the findings from the present study suggest that factors such as negative affect or generalized distress could influence the underlying relationship between distress tolerance and PTSD.

In contrast, it appears that the inability to tolerate distress and negative emotional states is related to PTSD symptomatology overall. The present findings support the generalized distress or negative emotionally proposed to underlie internalizing disorders (Clark & Watson, 2006; Watson et al., 2008). Future research should be sure to account for distress or negative emotionality in the study of the PTSD and its latent relationships with other constructs.

Because the present study was the first to compare the latent relationships of the PCL-5 and DTS, it is not entirely surprising that the same results found in previous studies using observed variables were not supported (Duranceau et al., 2014; Fetzner et al., 2014; Vujanovic et al., 2011; Vujanovic et al., 2013). Although previous research has found that the avoidance and hyperarousal symptom clusters of PTSD are more related to distress tolerance than other PTSD symptom clusters, using latent modeling (which allows for non-observable constructs to be examined, shared variance to be accounted for, and correcting for effects of measurement error) these relationships are not
supported. Instead, it appears that distress, and one’s ability to tolerate it, is related to PTSD at its core and not its subcomponents.

**Clinical Implications**

The present findings have several implications for clinical practice. Distress tolerance is consistently and negatively associated with all four factors of PTSD, which indicates that it is an important construct related to this disorder. As a distress disorder (Watson, 2005), PTSD is highly comorbid with major depressive disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, and other disorders characterized by high levels of generalized distress. In fact, about three out of four individuals with a principal diagnosis of PTSD have comorbid depression, anxiety, or both (Ginzburg, Ein-Dor, & Solomon, 2010). These disorders have also been found to have significant relations with distress tolerance, which could help explain their co-occurrence and the general shared variance consistently found across internalizing disorders.

Clinically speaking, because individuals presenting with PTSD are highly likely to also exhibit depression and anxiety symptoms, it could be beneficial for clinicians to address the underlying mechanism of distress. Distress tolerance skills have been incorporated into several manualized treatments, particularly DBT (Linehan, 1993). Distress tolerance is one of the core skills addressed in DBT because individuals with borderline personality disorder tend to lack skills in this domain. Preliminary information is available on the utility of DBT in trauma-exposed samples, usually for comorbid PTSD and BPD, but the effectiveness of this line of treatment requires further investigation (Wagner & Linehan, 2006). Additionally, no current studies have examined changes in distress tolerance, using the DTS, over the course of DBT or any other empirically
supported treatment with a distress tolerance component. Therefore, a components analysis of distress tolerance skill change pre- and post-treatment is an avenue for future research.

Additionally, distress tolerance, as measured by the DTS, is generally considered a relatively stable trait-like quality (Simons & Gaher, 2005) compared to psychopathology, such as PTSD. The ability to withstand negative emotional states should precede the symptoms of PTSD following trauma. Therefore, it could be clinically relevant to screen for distress tolerance in individuals following a trauma exposure in order to make sure that the most vulnerable individuals (i.e. those scoring low in distress tolerance) have access to services and skills related to distress prior to full-criteria PTSD developing. Future research should consider if there are different latent profiles of distress tolerance and how these could potentially influence the development and maintenance of PTSD and other psychological symptoms following trauma exposure.

**Limitations**

The present study had some limitations that should be addressed and could limit the generalizability of the findings. First, the sample consisted of undergraduate students from the United States, which resulted in a more homogeneous sample than if the sample was pulled from the general population. These individuals all endorsed a DSM-5 qualifying trauma, but in general, the sample was not severely traumatized. Similarly, although the sample should have been adequately powered, it was still relatively small for a latent model. The correlations compared using the Wald tests could have shown more differentiation if there was additional power to estimate the parameters. Finally, this study examined one’s perceived tolerance of distress via self-report; however,
incorporating behavioral measures of distress and discomfort intolerance would add to the validity of the findings (Cougle et al., 2013). Behavioral indices of distress tolerance include bio-behavioral measures (such as thermal stress tolerance) and cognitive-based tolerance tasks, like the mirror tracing task (Leyro et al., 2010).

Despite these limitations, the present study adds to the current literature in three important ways. First, the present study used DSM-5 data for the new PTSD criteria and examined the model fit for the newly published criteria. Both the DSM-5 and dysphoria models of PTSD provided good fit, but in this sample the dysphoria model fit the data significantly better. Next, the hierarchical model of the Distress Tolerance Scale was supported, which increases its psychometric support and utility in research. Finally, the current study was the first study to examine the latent relationships between PTSD and distress tolerance instead of using symptom clusters or total scores. The use of latent variables instead of observed variables allowed for more accurate estimation of the relationships between the constructs.

**Future Directions**

Based on the present findings, there are several avenues for future research to pursue. Primarily, additional research is required between PTSD and distress tolerance at the latent level, in order to determine if PTSD’s factors are differentially related to distress tolerance in other samples. Additionally, instead of only using the higher-order factor of distress tolerance, the other four factors - tolerance, absorption, appraisal, and regulation - could be examined to determine if one of the individual distress tolerance factors is more or less related to posttraumatic stress. Other factors related to generalized distress, such as negative affect, emotion dysregulation, and anxiety sensitivity, should
also be examined in order to determine the most accurate representation of the relationships between PTSD, distress, and distress tolerance. Future research should also consider the pre-trauma variables, such as childhood victimization, rumination, or social support, which could possibly predispose individuals to be more distress intolerant. Of clinical and empirical importance would be examining how emotion regulation strategies and affective vulnerabilities contribute to the development and maintenance of PTSD symptomatology over time, as well as mechanisms and treatments to address the emotional distress-related symptoms of PTSD.
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