

Adaptation and psychometric testing of the Hoarding Rating Scale (HRS): A self-administered screening scale for epidemiological study in Chinese population

Tai Wa Liu

Open University of Hong Kong

Simon Ching LAM (✉ simon.c.lam@polyu.edu.hk)

Hong Kong Polytechnic University <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2982-9192>

Man Hon Chung

Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Ken Hok Man Ho

Tung Wah College

Research article

Keywords: hoarding behavior, obsessive-compulsive disorder, adaptation, validation, factor analysis, psychometric properties

Posted Date: March 3rd, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-15808/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Hoarding disorder is a chronic and debilitating illness associated with restrictions on activities of daily living, compromised social and occupational functioning, and adverse health outcomes. However, researchers lack a brief and self-administered screening measurement to assess compulsive hoarding in the Chinese speaking population. This study aimed to adapt and validate the Hoarding Rating Scale-Interview (HRS-I) to as a tool for screening compulsive hoarding behavior in Chinese population.

Methods: This study comprised two phases. During Phase 1, the English-language HRS-I was translated into Chinese (CHRS) (comprehensible for most Chinese speaking population, e.g., Cantonese & Mandarin) and subjected to an equivalence check. In Phase 2, the CHRS was validated by examining internal consistency, stability, and construct validity. Different samples were used appropriately to verify the items and reflect the psychometric properties.

Results: In Phase 1, the CHRS yielded satisfactory content (CVI/AVE = 0.93) and face validity ratings (comprehensibility = 100%, N = 20 participants of general public with age 18-72) and the English and Chinese versions were found to be equivalent (ICC = 0.887; N = 60 university students and staff). Phase 2 revealed satisfactory levels of internal consistency ($\alpha=0.86$; corrected item-total correlation = 0.60–0.74; N = 820 participants of general public), 2-week test-retest reliability (ICC = 0.78; N = 60 university students), and construct validity (one-factor CFA solution matched with the hypothesized model, $\chi^2/d.f.$ = 2.26, CFI = 0.99, NFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.049, IFI = 0.99; n = 520 participants of general public).

Conclusions: This study provides sufficient evidence of the reliability and validity of the CHRS for compulsive hoarding behavior screening in the Chinese population through self-administered method.

1. Background

Compulsive hoarding is defined as the compulsive acquisition of objects and difficulties with discarding clutter to the extent that personal living space is severely affected (Tolin et al., 2010). Individuals exhibiting compulsive hoarding demonstrated increases risk of falls and fire hazards, head injuries, arthritic conditions, relative to healthy individuals (Ayers et al., 2014). Internationally, 2–5% of general public suffer from compulsive hoarding (Cath et al., 2017; Mueller et al., 2009) and the lifetime prevalence rates is as high as 5% (Samuels et al., 2008). In Chinese population, apart from a small scale study on 139 patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder indicating a prevalence of 8.6% hoarding symptom of

them (Li et al., 2009), there is a limited number of epidemiological research reporting the phenomenon of compulsive hoarding in general public. Given the onset of compulsive hoarding symptoms may occur early (i.e., childhood) (Grisham et al., 2006; Tolin et al., 2010) and progress throughout life (Grisham et al., 2006), having a screening tool for compulsive hoarding is crucial for early detection. Historically, compulsive hoarding was considered as a subtype of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) (Morris et al., 2016) and was assessed in previous studies (Frost et al., 2000; Fontenelle et al., 2004) using the Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS; Goodman et al., 1989). However, the use of an OCD instrument to assess compulsive hoarding is subject to two main methodological limitations. First, assessing hoarding under the context of OCD would mean that essential features of hoarding disorders, such as the severity of cluttering and associated functional impairments, would not be considered (Frost et al., 2009). Second, people with hoarding disorders might not regard their hoarding behavior as “obsessive” or “compulsive” (Frost et al., 2009). Accordingly, the validity of these two Y-BOCS items to assess compulsive hoarding could be jeopardized.

The 5-item Hoarding Rating Scale-Interview (HRS-I) (Tolin et al., 2010) is trustworthy to assess and screen hoarding in accordance with the diagnostic criteria of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association 2013). The HRS-I assesses several domains of compulsive hoarding, including the level of cluttering, excessive acquisition, difficulties of discarding, associated distress and functional impairment (Tolin et al., 2010). The original HRS-I was scored on a nine-point scale (0 = none, 8 = extreme) and demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 to 0.97 for internal consistency and excellent test-retest reliability ($r = 0.96$; intraclass coefficients = 0.81–0.85) in a validation study of 87 (Tolin et al., 2018) to 136 (Tolin et al., 2010) subjects with or without compulsive hoarding or OCD. The HRS-I also yielded good known-group validity in the discrimination of hoarding and non-hoarding participants with or without OCD (Tolin et al., 2010). Furthermore, the HRS-I scores exhibited significant strong correlations with other validated hoarding measures ($r = 0.72–0.89$, $p < 0.001$), including the Savings Inventory Revised, Clutter Image Rating (Frost et al., 2009) and Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory-Revised (Foa et al., 2002), in an analysis of convergent validity.

Given the increasing prevalence of hoarding and the need to early diagnoses hoarding in Chinese population, clinicians and researchers would benefit from having a self-administered Chinese HRS (CHRS) to assess and screen people with compulsive hoarding. Therefore, this study had the following objectives: (1) to translate the HRS-I from English into Chinese; (2) to psychometrically test the Chinese version of the HRS (CHRS), including content validity, internal consistency, test-retest reliability and structural validity in a general population of Hong Kong.

2. Methods

This two-phase methodological study used a cross-sectional design. Phase 1 aimed: (i) to translate the English-language version of the HRS-I into the traditional Chinese language (the most common and comprehensible language used by Chinese speaking people worldwide) (Farndon, 2010), (ii) to examine the relevancy and comprehensibility of this version, and (iii) to evaluate the equivalence of the

translation. Phase 2 examined the psychometric properties of the traditional Chinese-language version (hereinafter referred to as CHRS). Figure 1 illustrates the entire process of adaptation and validation.

2.1. Phase 1: Translation of Hoarding Rating Scale

The translation process was based on the principles of Brislin's model of forward and backward translation (Brislin, 1986). Two independent translators (bilingual, PhD in Nursing and Social Science, experience in mental health) translated the HRS-I (Tolin et al., 2010) from its source language (SL; English) to the target language (TL; Traditional Chinese). The TL version was then reviewed by a Chinese monolingual reviewer to identify ambiguous and unclear wordings, which were modified by the research team. A bilingual linguistic expert (a PhD graduate in linguistics and translation) compared the back-translated version (BT; English), which was translated by a psychiatric nursing professor, with the SL version to examine the linguistic congruence and cultural relevancy. The research team subsequently discussed any incongruence in translation or difficulties encountered by the expert. The abovementioned process was repeated until the SL and BT reached maximum agreement (i.e., no loss of any essential and stem meaning of each statement).

2.1.1. Content and face validation

Six healthcare and social science professionals (including a psychiatrist, psychiatric nurses and academic experts in psychology and sociology) were invited to examine the relevancy of CHRS and establish content validity using a four-point Likert scale (from 1 = not relevant to 4 = highly relevant) (Polit & Beck, 2006). Panel members were identified by their publications and expertise in the university profiles as well as hospital services, hence, they were of competent knowledge experience in the subject matter. Expert panel members who gave ratings of less than 3 were asked to provide feedback. The content validity index (CVI), which indicates the proportion of responses that agree with the relevancy of the scale, was computed based on the percentage ratings from experts who gave scores of 3 or 4. The scale-(CVI/AVE) and item-level CVIs (I-CVI) were considered satisfactory if they received values of 0.80 or above (Polit & Beck, 2006; Portney & Watkins, 2009).

Face validation was performed to assess the comprehensibility of the CHRS items by the general public and ensure the applicability of this scale as a self-administered instrument. A purposive sample of 8 to 20, including an appropriate good mix of demographics (e.g., men and women, highly and less educated, and young and old adults), were recruited for the validation analysis because the literature indicated that this sample size can sufficiently detect ambiguous items (Lam, 2018; Lam et al., 2017; Streiner & Norman, 2008). These participants were invited to review the scale in terms of comprehensibility (this was rated on a yes/no nominal scale) (Portney & Watkins, 2009) and to rephrase each item to improve its interpretability (the researcher rated the respondents' answers on a 4-point Likert scale regarding interpretability, 1 = fully correct to 4 = completely wrong) (Lam, 2018). The former method was conventionally adopted by other studies for face validation (Portney & Watkins, 2009), while the latter method (some school of thoughts regarded it as "cognitive debriefing/interview") was deemed to be

relatively more sensitive and specific for identifying problematic items (Lam, 2018). If necessary, the participants suggested appropriate wordings and sentence styles for the items. Afterwards, a preliminary version of the CHRS was developed.

To establish equivalence between the interview-based (HRS-I) and self-administered (CHRS) methods, a convenience sample of 15 participants recruited at a community interest group was initially invited to respond to the CHRS, followed by a face-to-face interview with a psychiatric nurse 2 weeks later. The equivalence between the two methods was computed using an intraclass correlation coefficient (model 3) ($ICC \geq 0.75$ indicated a satisfactory result) (Portney & Watkins, 2009).

2.1.2. Cross-language testing

Cross-language testing is considered the most stringent method for examining translation equivalence (Jones, 1987). The translation adequacy of the HRS-I and CHRS was tested in a convenience sample of 60 university students and teaching staff recruited from a local university in Hong Kong. These participants were selected for their capability to understand the items of both the HRS-I and CHRS. The participants first responded to the HRS-I, followed by the CHRS 2 weeks later. Each participant was indexed using an anonymized self-generated code for internal matching purposes. The equivalence between the HRS-I and CHRS was computed by comparing the two sets of scores. An ICC exceeding 0.75 indicates satisfactory translation equivalence (Portney & Watkins, 2009).

2.2. Phase 2: Psychometric testing of the Chinese version of the Hoarding Rating Scale

A correlational and cross-sectional design was adopted for the psychometric testing of CHRS, which evaluated the internal consistency, stability, and construct validity. In order to provide independent evaluation of psychometric properties and avoid psychological carry-over effects, samples used in phase 1 were excluded. The participants were newly recruited from among the general public in three districts of Hong Kong—New Territories, Kowloon, and Hong Kong Island—which included a good mix of people with different sociodemographic backgrounds (Lam et al., 2018). A research assistant invited pedestrians to complete self-administrated questionnaires, including demographic questionnaires and the CHRS. The paper-and-pencil method was used to collect data. The sample size was 800; of these, 300 participants were randomly selected for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and the remaining 500 were included in a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The estimated sample size was considered good for CFA (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and appropriate for the psychometric testing described below.

2.2.1. Reliability of the Chinese version of the Hoarding Rating Scale

The internal consistency of the CHRS was examined using Cronbach's α statistics (where $\alpha \geq 0.70$ indicates a satisfactory result) and the corrected item-total correlation coefficient (where $r \geq 0.30$ indicates a homogenous item) (Portney & Watkins, 2009). Stability was tested by examining the test-retest reliability over a 2-week period. Given that samples recruited from the general public did not contain any contact information (because of anonymity) for assessing test-retest reliability, a convenience

sample of 62 university students was selected to answer the first questionnaire (T1), as well as a second questionnaire 2 weeks later (T2). The anonymous T1 and T2 responses collected from each student were matched using self-generated codes (i.e., combinations of student identity numbers and mobile numbers) as described in a previous study (Lam et al., 2017). A published formula (expected ICC = 0.80, 95% confidence interval [CI] for ICC = 0.20 and attrition rate = 20%) was used to suggest a sample size of 62 (Giraudeau & Mary, 2001). The ICC (model 3) (≥ 0.75 indicates a satisfactory result) was used to compare the T1 and T2 scores and measure the stability of the scale (Portney & Watkins, 2009).

2.2.2. Construct validity of the Chinese version of the Hoarding Rating Scale

Construct validity was established by evaluating the factorial structure of the CHRS. As the developers of the HRS-I did not present the factor model, an EFA was initially used to explore the factorial structure of the CHRS. A scree plot was generated using a maximum likelihood analysis (for normally distributed data) or principal axis factoring (for non-normally distributed data) to illustrate the number of factors to be extracted (Costello & Osborne, 2005). We used the Promax rotation method for oblique rotation with Kaiser normalization to produce the best factor solution. Data factorability was evaluated using Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < 0.001$) and the Kaiser–Myer–Olkin (KMO) index (> 0.6) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The factor loading of each item to the respective latent factor should exceed 0.40 (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Data from 300 randomly selected participants in the data pool were used to compute the EFA.

A CFA was then performed to examine the degree of fitness of the data in a hypothesized model (i.e., the model identified by EFA) and determine the internal structure of the CHRS. Goodness-of-fit measures, including the chi-square/degree of freedom ratio ($\chi^2/d.f.$), comparative fit index (CFI), normed fit index (NFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and incremental fit index (IFI), were used to evaluate the model fit. The aforementioned measures yielded a goodness-of-fit indices of $\chi^2/d.f. < 5.00$ (Chen & Wang, 2010; Hair et al., 2010); NFI, CFI, and IFI > 0.90 and RMSEA < 0.08 (Byrne, 2009; Chen & Wang, 2010). Data from the remaining 500 participants were used to generate the CFA model.

2.3 Instrument

The CHRS derived through Phases 1 and 2 of this study was used to measure CHB. The original HRS-I comprised five items: severity of cluttering, difficulty discarding, excessive acquisition, distress and functional impairment associated with hoarding (Tolin et al., 2010). Each item was rated on a 9-point scale (0 = none/no problem, 2 = mild/occasionally, 4 = moderate/regularly, 6 = severe/frequently, 8 = extreme/very often, depending on the question). The total CHRS score was computed by summing all items, with a possible range of 0–40. A higher score indicated more severe CHB. The optimal cut-off score of 14 was determined to have a both a sensitivity and specificity of 0.97 for indicating CHB (Tolin et al., 2010) and the latest analysis indicated a cut-off score of 11 that showed excellent sensitivity (1.00) and specificity (1.00) for distinguishing the hoarding disorder group and healthy control group (Tolin et al., 2018).

2.4. Data analysis

The Statistical Product and Service Solutions software, version 22.0 for Windows (IBM SPSS Inc.), was used for the analysis. Descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations and percentages) and inferential statistics (e.g., Cronbach's α , ICC, t-test, statistics used in the EFA) were used as described above. AMOS version 7.0 (IBM SPSS Inc.) was used for the CFA. A p value of < 0.05 was used to indicate statistical significance.

2.5. Ethics

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethical committee of a local university and the collaborative organization. The research team reproduced and translated the HRS-I with permission from corresponding copyright holders (Tolin et al., 2010). Appropriate methods were used to obtain consent from the participants, including implied consent from participants who were recruited among the general public in railway stations and written consent from university students and staff recruited on campuses.

3. Results

3.1. Phase 1 results

The HRS-I was translated from English to traditional Chinese. The Chinese monolingual reviewer did not report any ambiguity in the preliminary TL version. A linguistic expert confirmed the satisfactory linguistic congruence and relevancy of both the SL and BT. The basic meanings of the items were maintained in the translation.

The HRS-I had adopted an interview method involving probing with follow-up questions, and the raters made an independent rating of severity (Tolin et al., 2010). For content validation, therefore, the experts strongly suggested that the CHRS, as a self-administered scale, should include several items to recap the current condition of stocking (not adding items to this construct, and instead interpreting these items as probing or warm-up questions). The research team accepted this constructive suggestion and added four stocking questions prior to developing the CHRS. These questions asked the respondents to review the numbers of shoes, bags, t-shirts and any other items stored in their houses in large amounts. After this addition, the six healthcare and social science professionals commented that the CHRS was satisfactorily relevant, as reflected by a CVI/AVE of 93.3% and I-CVI of 80.0–100%. For face validation, 20 participants (60% female) aged 18–72 years and with education levels ranging from primary school to a master's degree commented that the items on the CHRS were comprehensible, yielding a comprehensibility and interpretability rating of 100%. In order to test the equivalence between the interview-based (HRS-I) and self-administrated (CHRS) methods, a sample of 15 participants was retested twice during two weeks interval (mean self-administered CHRS score = 14.47, SD = 6.32; mean HRS-I interview score = 13.60, SD = 6.25), the ICC was 0.852 (95% CI: 0.616–0.948, $p < 0.001$). To test the translation adequacy, a total of 60 university students and staff members were invited to respond to both the English and traditional Chinese versions of the HRS-I. Fifty participants (response rate = 83.3%) responded to both versions within a 2-week interval, and the ICC was 0.887 (95% CI: 0.809–0.934, $p < 0.001$).

3.2. Phase 2 results

Recruitment from the general public yielded 921 completed questionnaires. Of these, 101 responses were discarded due to the incompleteness of CHRS items ($n = 24$) and acquiescence response ($n = 77$). Finally, 820 responses were included in the analysis (42.0% male, 59.0% single, 67.2% with tertiary education or higher and 62.5% with a monthly income less than USD 2,564) (refer to Table 1 for details).

The Cronbach's alpha of the CHRS was 0.86, with corrected item-total correlation coefficients of 0.60–0.74. All coefficients indicate that the scale has satisfactory internal consistency. Subsequently, with two attrition cases (3.2%) because of incompleteness of questionnaire twice, the test-retest reliability of CHRS was computed based on the data of 60 university students. The ICC of 0.78 (95% CI: 0.63–0.88) indicated satisfactory stability.

Prior to the factor analyses, the univariate and multivariate normality of item responses from 820 samples were checked. Although univariate normality was supported (i.e., skewness value = -0.017 to 0.481; kurtosis value = -0.798 to -0.478), multivariate normality was slightly violated (multivariate kurtosis value = 6.275, critical ratio = 10.738). To explore the previously unexamined structure of the CHRS, an EFA was conducted using 300 randomly selected datasets from the abovementioned 820 samples. The data factorability was satisfactory according to the KMO (0.809) and significant Bartlett's test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 = 777.25, p < 0.001$). With a non-normally distributed data, a principal axis factoring was used. The EFA indicated that the CHRS had a single factor structure, and 65.84% of the total variance was explained. The item loadings on this construct ranged from 0.69 to 0.85.

The 520 remaining datasets were included in a CFA, which indicated that all paths were significantly loaded to a single factor construct (range of loadings: 0.58–0.90). The preliminary goodness-of-fit indices revealed a marginal fit of the data model ($\chi^2/d.f. = 23.66$, CFI = 0.90, NFI = 0.90, RMSEA = 0.209, IFI = 0.90). A Bollen-Stine bootstrapping (with 2000 bootstraps) was used to provide a better adjustment of the χ^2 and p -value for the non-normality of the estimation (Bollen, & Stine, 1992). The results also rejected the current model fit. With reference to the covariance modification indices, two pairs of error terms with the largest indices (first covaried errors of items: 1 and 2, and second covaried errors of items: 1 and 3) could be covaried to improve the model fit (Gaskin, 2012). The corrected model yielded satisfactory goodness-of-fit indices ($\chi^2/d.f. = 2.26$, CFI = 0.99, NFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.049, IFI = 0.99) in this single factor model (refer to Figure 2 for the CFA model). The results of Bollen-Stine bootstrapping also accepted this model fit (rejected null hypothesis with $p = 0.068$) with adjusted χ^2 of 4.04 (i.e., bootstrap maximum likelihood estimation of $\chi^2/d.f. = 1.35$). Table 2 summarizes the psychometric properties of the CHRS. Appendix A includes the final version of the CHRS.

4. Discussion

This study was the first to translate the HRS-I into the traditional Chinese language using a recommended standard procedure. The traditional Chinese is the most common comprehensible language for Chinese

people in mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and even any countries in the world (Farndon, 2010). The items of HRS-I was developed in accordance with the diagnostic criteria of compulsive hoarding in DSM-5 (Tolin et al., 2010). We believed that the cultural variation for determining the compulsive hoarding is not a concern because, as indicated in the literature, HRS have been translated into different languages and used in different ethnic groups without any major change on items (Faraci et al., 2019; Levy, Stevens & Tolin, 2019; Turna et al., 2018; Tsuchiyagaito et al., 2017). Although the samples used for this study are Hong Kong people, the application of CHRS in broader Chinese population should be still appropriate.

Up to our knowledge, it is the first study to establish the equivalence between English interview version and Chinese self-administered version, which greatly facilitated a large-scale population-based research on this area. Our findings contribute to the development of a CHB instrument by expanding the reliability and validity of the original English-language HRS-I for the assessment of CHB in a general population. Our CFA analysis proposed a five-item, one-factor structure for the CHRS, which is consistent with the DSM-5 and the other hoarding measurement (American Psychiatric Association 2013; Carey, de Bolger & Wootton, 2019).

The goal of an internal consistency assessment is to evaluate the item-level and overall consistency of an instrument intended to measure the same traits of the construct of interest. A satisfactory Cronbach's alpha value of a measurement often represents the homogeneity of items, but up to a point of 0.90 or above, it might suggest redundancy of items (Streiner, 2003). For the high Cronbach's alpha value (0.97) reported in the original English version of the HRS-I (Tolin et al, 2010), one possible explanation is that more than half of the study participants ($n = 73$, 53%) were people being identified with compulsive hoarding preceded to the study. As this cohort of participants already possessed the traits of compulsive hoarding, it is plausible that a high than the desired Cronbach's alpha value was reflected by the HRS-I. This is because the development of HRS-I is consistent with the diagnostic criteria listed in the DSM-5 regarding compulsive hoarding (APA, 2013). Thus, when being applied in general population, our results revealed that the CHRS exhibited satisfactory internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86 (Portney & Watkins, 2009). Indeed, the CHRS also yielded a satisfactory corrected item-total correlations ($r = 0.60-0.74$) when tested among the general population, which might suggest an optimal level of internal consistency with no redundancy ($\alpha > 0.90$) or heterogeneity ($\alpha < 0.70$) (Portney & Watkins, 2009).

The CHRS exhibited acceptable test-retest reliability ($ICC = 0.78$, 95% CI = 0.63–0.88), which was lower than that reported for the original English version ($r = 0.96$) assessed using a sample in which the majority (67%) of clinical cases involved compulsive hoarding or OCD. We could not preclude the possibility that the general population might harbor a greater potential for changes in buying and cluttering behavior during a 2-week interval, given the compulsive traits among people with hoarding behavior and OCD (Rasmussen et al., 2013). Furthermore, our study assessed test-retest reliability using the ICC (model 3) that is a more stringent and recommended method (Streiner & Norman, 2008), while the original development study adopted the Pearson correlations, which might contribute to an overestimation of the correlation coefficients (Yen & Lo, 2002). Hence, the developers have re-examined the test-retest reliability of HRS-I by 11 randomly selected samples with ICC of 0.81-85 (Tolin et al., 2018).

Considering the 2-week test-retest reliability studies of Japanese HRS self-report version (ICC = 0.71; Tsuchiyagaito et al., 2017), the current result was comparable and satisfactory.

According to a unified concept of validity that “integrates consideration of content, criteria, and consequences into a construct framework for empirically testing rational hypothesis about score meaning and theoretically relevant relationships” (Messick, 1995, p. 741), the current results have provided evidence on some aspects of validity of CHRS. The comprehensibility/interpretability and relevance of CHRS was evaluated with satisfactory results, which provided evidence of CHRS items that are relevant to the specification of the boundaries of the construct domain to be assessed (Messick, 1995). Our factor analysis, which was performed using an EFA and subsequent CFA, supported the unidimensional structure of the CHRS. The one-factor structure of the CHRS demonstrated that all items were satisfactorily clustered into the same domain, with item loadings ranging from 0.69 to 0.85. As the CHRS explained a satisfactory level of the total variance (65.84%), comparable to previous studies (Tsuchiyagaito et al., 2017), we inferred that the one-factor structure of this instrument indicated that compulsive hoarding could be measured consistently using the underlying notion of the DSM-5. It was noteworthy that two pairs of items’ error terms were covaried (i.e., item 2 ‘level of cluttering’ and item 3 ‘difficulties of discarding’, item 2 ‘level of cluttering’ and item 4 ‘excessive acquisition’). These items seem the antecedent’s causes of compulsivity, like a positive feedback mechanism of keeping high input but no output. The remaining two items (item 5 and 6) described the primary consequences of hoarding behaviors (i.e., the emotional distress and functional impairment) (Tolin et al., 2018). Error terms (representing measurement error of the items) is a unique variance that do not help in the measurement of the latent factor (compulsive hoarding). Some nonrandom measurement errors can be justified reasons for the above error terms being correlated. First, the assessment method of using self-administrative survey can be one of nonrandom measurement errors (Brown, 2006). The HRS originally requires the use of interview as data collection. In order to facilitate the population-based screening of the prevalence of compulsive hoarding, the data collection method of the HRS is converted to self-administrative and validated in current study. It is plausible that such change contributes to some common response biases related to self-reporting of the cluttering, discarding and acquisition. In addition, the similarity of sociodemographic background of respondents, like sufficient supply of goods in a well-developed society, can also overestimate the hoarding behavior (i.e., nonrandom errors of measurement in cluttering, discarding and acquisition) of a common non-compulsive hoarder who does not appear any emotional distress and functional impairment.

Unlike the published validation studies of HRS in other countries (Faraci et al., 2019; Levy, Stevens & Tolin, 2019; Turna et al., 2018; Tsuchiyagaito et al., 2017), one merit of the present study is the sequential use of an EFA and CFA to establish the factor structure of the CHRS (Lam, 2015; Portney & Watkins, 2009), with a large sample size (820 participants) to fulfil the statistical requirements for these models (EFA, $n = 300$; CFA, $n = 520$) (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). These results provided evidence of structural aspect of validity that appraises the fidelity of the scoring structure of CHRS to the structure of the construct domain of CBH in Chinese population (Messick, 1995; Portney & Watkins, 2009). However, the current study did not reveal the external aspect of construct validity (i.e., convergent

and discriminant evidence, and criterion relevance), and consequential aspect of construct validity (i.e., intended and unintended value implications of test interpretation and use) (Messick, 1995). Although this study added knowledge to the measurement of CHB, future research should warrant a comprehensive evaluation of remaining aspects of construct validity because validity is an evolving property and validation is an ongoing process (Messick, 1995).

Our study also had some limitations of note. First, the generalizability is limited, as there no people with known hoarding disorder were included in this study and we lacked information about this population. Second, although this is important to validate a self-administered scale for the feasibility of future large-scale population study on screening compulsive hoarding, we could not preclude response bias using self-administered survey. Third, due to insufficient funding, there is no psychiatrist recruited to perform the diagnosis of compulsive hoarding (i.e., served as gold standard) for participants (N = 820). Thus, the current research was unable to validate the cut-off value of CHRS through diagnosis accuracy testing (Lam et al., 2017). Future study deserves to supplement this missing piece. Fourth, although this study recruited large-scale participants to conduct the validation of CHRS in order to represent general public in Chinese population, the distribution of age of participants was uneven and only 4.4% of them was older than 60. It is noted that samples of older people were insufficient to represent in this study.

5. Conclusions

The adaptation of a validated instrument can help to establish an international foundation of scientific knowledge regarding CHB. Our results demonstrate that the CHRS is a contextual relevant, reliable, and valid measure for assessing CHB. The CHRS can be used to assess CHB in the Chinese population in both clinical and research settings. This instrument can assist with the early identification of those at risk of hoarding disorder and the development of appropriate interventions.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study procedures were carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The Institutional Review Board of the University Research Centre, The Open University of Hong Kong (HE20Jul2017-S&T2017/01), approved the study. All subjects were informed about the study and all provided with appropriate types of informed consents.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and material

The (anonymized) datasets analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was partially supported by the School of Science and Technology Unit Fund, The Open University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong (grant number: ST-17/18-1), and S. Living Campaign 2017, Wofoo Community Service Network, Wofoo Social Enterprises, Hong Kong.

None of the funding bodies had any part in designing the study, the data collection, the analyses, the interpretation of data, or in writing the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization, S.C.L. and T.W.L.; Methodology, S.C.L., T.W.L. and M.H.C.; Writing-Original Draft Preparation, S.C.L. and T.W.L.; Writing-Review & Editing, S.C.L., T.W.L., M.H.C., K.H.M.H.; Project Administration, S.C.L.; Funding Acquisition, S.C.L.

All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants for their contributions to this study. We thank Zoe Sze-long Chan, Andy Chun-yin Chong and Wendy Wing-chi Wong for their participation in the proposal of project; Eliza Yi-ni Wong, Ching-yuk Hon, Rochelle Tzs-wai Tang, Holly Hoi-tung Lam, Ming Tsang, and Lena Lok-ki Sung for their assistance in the data collection and data input. We are also grateful to Dr. Chloe Chit-ning Li, and Dr. Fiona Wing-ki Tang for their inputs to the phase 1 study.

Abbreviations

CBB: compulsive hoarding behavior; CFA: confirmatory factor analysis; CFI: comparative fit index; CHRS: Chinese Hoarding Rating Scale; CI: Confidence Interval; CVI/AVE: Scale-level Content Validity Index; CVI: Content Validity Index; DSM-5: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition; HRS: Hoarding Rating Scale; HRS-I: Hoarding Rating Scale-Interview;

ICC: Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; I-CVI: Item-level Content Validity Index; IFI: Incremental Fit Index; KMO: Kaiser–Myer–Olkin; NFI: Normed Fit Index; OCD: Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder; RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; Y-BOCS: Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale; $\chi^2/d.f.$: Chi-square/degree of freedom ratio

References

1. Abramowitz, J. S., Wheaton, M. G., & Storch, E. A. (2008). The status of hoarding as a symptom of obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *46*(9), 1026-1033. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2008.05.006
2. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
3. Ayers, C. R., Iqbal, Y., & Strickland, K. (2014). Medical conditions in geriatric hoarding disorder patients. *Aging and Mental Health*, *18*, 148-151. doi: 10.1080/13607863.2013.814105
4. Ayers, C. R., Saxena, S., Golshan, S., & Wetherill, J. L. (2010). Age of onset and clinical features features of late life compulsive hoarding. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *25*, 142-149. doi: 10.1002/gps.2310
5. Bollen, K. A., & Stine, R. A. (1992). Bootstrapping goodness-of-fit measures in structural equation models. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *21*, 205-229.
6. Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instrument. In Lonner, W.J., Berry, J.W. (Eds.), *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research*. (pp. 137-164) Sage, Beverley Hills.
7. Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, Guilford publications.
8. Byrne, B. M. (2009). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS basic concepts, Applications, and Programming*. New York: Routledge.
9. Carey, E. A., de Bolger, A. D. P., & Wootton, B. M. (2019). Psychometric properties of the Hoarding Disorder-Dimensional Scale. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, *21*, 91-96.
10. Cath, D. C., Nizar, K., Boomsma, D., Mathews, C. A. (2017). Age-specific prevalence of hoarding and obsessive compulsive disorder: a population-based study. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *25*(3), 245-255. doi: 10.1016/j.jagp.2016.11.006.
11. Chen, K. Y., & Wang, Z. H. (2010). *Advanced statistical analysis using SPSS and AMOS*. Taiwan: Wunan Book Co.
12. Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *10*(7), 1-9.
13. Faraci, P., Perdighe, C., Del Monte, C., & Saliani, A. M. (2019). Hoarding Rating Scale-Interview: Reliability and Construct Validity in a Nonclinical Sample. *International journal of psychology and psychological therapy*, *19*(3), 345-352.
14. Farndon, J. (2010). *The World's Greatest Idea: The Fifty Greatest Ideas that have changed Humanity*. London, UK: Icon Books Ltd.
15. Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological assessment*, *7*(3), 286. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.286

16. 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*, 485-496.
17. Fontenelle, L. F., Mendlowicz, M. V., Soares, I. D., Versiani, M. (2004). *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 45*(5): 375-383. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.14.4.485
18. Frost, R. O., Steketee, G., Williams, L. F., & Warren, R. (2000). Mood: personality disorder symptoms and disability in obsessive compulsive hoarders: a comparison with clinical and monclinical controls. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 38*(11), 1071-1081. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7967(99)00137-0
19. Frost, R. O., Tolin, D. F., Steketee, G., Fitch, K. E., & Selbo-Bruns, A. (2009). Excessive acquisition in hoarding. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 23*(5), 632-639. doi: 10.1016/j.janxdis.2009.01.013
20. Gaskin, J. (2012). *Confirmatory factor analysis*. http://statwiki.kolobkcreations.com/index.php?title=Confirmatory_Factor_Analysis/ (Accessed 8 Feb 2018).
21. Giraudeau, B., & Mary, J. Y. (2001). Planning a reproducibility study: How many subjects and how many replicates per subject for an expected width of the 95 per cent confidence interval of the intraclass correlation coefficient. *Statistic Medicine 20*(21), 3205–3214. doi:10.1002/sim.935
22. Goodman, W. K., Price, L. H., Rasmussen, S. A., Mazure, C., Fleischmann, R. L., Hill, C. L., Heninger, G. R., Charney, D. S. (1989). The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale: Development, use, and reliability. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 46*, 1006-1011.
23. Grisham, J. R., Frost, R. O., Steketee, G., Kim, H., & Hood, S. (2006). Age of onset of compulsive hoarding. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 20*, 657-686.
24. Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B. Y. A., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
25. Jones, E. (1987). Translation of quantitative measures for use in cross-cultural research. *Nursing Research, 36*(5), 324-327. doi:10.1097/00006199-198709000-00017
26. Lam, C. (2015). Development and validation of a quality of life instrument for older Chinese people in residential care homes (Doctoral dissertation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing 10297281.
27. Lam, S. C. (2018). Sensitivity and specificity of face validation in determining the comprehensibility of older people on quality of life items. *Journal of The American Geriatric Society, 66*(S2), S52-S52.
28. Lam, S. C., Chan, Z. S. L., Chong, A. C. Y., Wong, W. W. C., & Ye, J. (2018). Adaptation and validation of Richmond Compulsive Buying Scale in Chinese population. *Journal of behavioral addictions, 7*(3), 760-769.
29. Lam, S. C., Yeung, C. C. Y., Chan, J. H. M., Lam, D. W. C., Lam, A. H. Y., Annesi-Maesano, I., & Bousquet, J. (2017). Adaptation of the Score for Allergic Rhinitis in the Chinese Population: Psychometric Properties and Diagnostic Accuracy. *International archives of allergy and immunology, 173*(4), 213-224. doi:10.1159/000477727

30. Levy, H. C., Stevens, M. C., & Tolin, D. F. (2019). Validation of a Behavioral Measure of Acquiring and Discarding in Hoarding Disorder. *Journal of psychopathology and behavioral assessment*, 41(1), 135-143.
31. Li, Y., Marques, L., Hinton, D. E., Wang, Y., & Xiao, Z. P. (2009). Symptom dimensions in Chinese patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *CNS neuroscience & therapeutics*, 15(3), 276-282.
32. Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741-749.
33. Morris, S. H., Jaffee, S. R., Goodwin, G. P., Frankln, M. E. (2016). Hoarding in children and adolescents: a review. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 47(5), 740-750. doi: 10.1007/s10578-015-0607-2
34. Mueller, A., Mitchell, J. E., Crosby, R. D., Glaesmer, H., de Zwaan, M. (2009). The prevalence of compulsive hoarding and its association with compulsive buying in a German population-based sample. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 47(8): 705-709. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2009.04.005.
35. Performance Urban Planning (2017). *14th Annual Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey: 2018, Ratings Middle-Income Housing Affordability*. New Zealand: Performance Urban Planning and Demographia.
36. Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006) The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(5), 489-497. doi:10.1002/nur.20147
37. Portney, L. G., Watkins, M. P. (2009). *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice*. Pearson/Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River.
38. Rasmussen, J. L., Brown, T. A., Steketee, G. S., Barlow, D. H. (2013). Impulsivity in hoarding. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, 2(2),183-191. doi: 10.1016/j.jocrd.2013.02.004
39. Samuels, J. F., Bienvenus, O. J., Grados, M. A., Cullen, B., Riddle, M. A., Liang, K. Y., Eaton, W. W., Nestadt, G. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of hoarding behavior in a community-based sample. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 46(7), 836-844. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2008.04.004
40. Schneider, A. F., Storch, E. A., Lack, C. W., Shytle, R. D. (2008). Psychometric properties of the Hoarding Assessment Scale in college students. *Illness, Crisis & Loss*, 16(3): 227-236. doi: 10.2190/IL.16.3.c
41. Steketee, G., Frost, R., Kyrios, M. (2003). Cognitive aspects of compulsive hoarding. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 27(4): 463-479. doi: 10.1023/A:1025428631552
42. Storch, E. A., Bagner, D., Merlo, L., Shapira, N. A., Geffken, G. R., Murphy, T. K., & Goodman, W. K. (2007). Florida obsessive-compulsive inventory: Development, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 63(9), 851-859. doi: 10.1002/jclp.20382
43. Streiner, D. L. (2003). Starting at the beginning: An introduction to coefficient alpha and internal consistency. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 80(1): 99-103. doi:10.1207/S15327752JPA8001_18

44. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007) *Using multivariate statistics*. USA: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.
45. 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
46. Tolin, D. F., Gilliam, C. M., Davis, E., Springer, K., Levy, H. C., Frost, R. O., ... & Stevens, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the hoarding rating scale-interview. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders, 16*, 76-80.
47. Tsuchiyagaito, A., Horiuchi, S., Igarashi, T., Kawanori, Y., Hirano, Y., Yabe, H., & Nakagawa, A. (2017). Factor structure, reliability, and validity of the Japanese version of the hoarding rating scale-self-report (hrs-sr-J). *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment, 13*, 1235.
48. Turna, J., Patterson, B., Simpson, W., Pullia, K., Khalesi, Z., Kaplan, G., & Van Ameringen, M. (2018). Prevalence of hoarding behaviours and excessive acquisition in users of online classified advertisements. *Psychiatry research, 270*, 194-197.
49. Yen, M., & Lo, L. H. (2002). Examining test-retest reliability: an intra-class correlation approach. *Nursing research, 51*(1), 59-62.

Tables

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants (N = 820)

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Age range, years		
18-29	368	44.9
30-39	179	21.8
40-49	113	13.8
50-59	123	15.0
≥60	36	4.4
Missing	1	0.1
Gender		
Male	344	42.0
Female	470	57.3
Missing	6	0.7
Marital status		
Single	484	59.0
Married/co-habit	335	40.9
Missing	1	0.1
Education background		
Primary school or below	56	6.8
Secondary school	212	25.9
Tertiary school or above	551	67.2
Missing	1	0.1
Income range[#], USD (HKD)		
<1,282 (<10,000)	175	21.4
1,283-2,564 (10,001-20,000)	337	41.1
2,565-5,128 (20,001-40,000)	211	25.7
5,129-7,692 (40,001-60,000)	72	8.8
≥7,693 (≥60,001)	24	2.9
Missing	1	0.1

USD to HKD exchange rate is generally based on a ratio of 1 to 7.8.

Table 2. Summary of the psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the Hoarding Rating Scale-Interview (CHRS)

	Methods	Statistic methods	Results
<i>Reliability</i>			
Internal consistency	Cronbach's method Corrected item-total correlation	Cronbach's alpha statistic Pearson moment-product correlation coefficient	Alpha of scale = 0.86 Corrected item-total correlation = 0.60-0.74
Stability	2-week test-retest reliability ¹	Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)	r = 0.78, p < 0.001 95% CI: 0.63-0.88
<i>Validity</i>			
Face validity	Review by target population ²	Frequency & percentage	100% comprehensibility and interpretability
Content validity	Review by expert panel	Content validity index (CVI)	I-CVI = 0.80-1.00, CVI/AVE = 0.93
Construct validity	Factor analysis	Exploratory factor analysis ³	KMO = 0.809 Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: $\chi^2 = 777.25$, p < 0.001 Total variance explained = 65.84% Item loadings = 0.69-0.85
		Confirmatory factor analysis ⁴	$\chi^2/d.f. = 2.26$, CFI = 0.99, NFI = 0.99, IFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.049 (First-order one-factor CFA model)

Remarks:

CI = Confidence interval

I-CVI = Item-level content validity index

CVI/AVE = Scale-level content validity index on average

¹ The result was calculated based on 60 university students.


² The result was calculated based on 20 participants of general public (aged 18-72 years).

³ The result was calculated based on 300 randomly selected samples from among 820 samples.

⁴ The result was calculated based on the remaining 520 samples not used to compute the EFA.

Figures

Phase 1: Translation of Hoarding Rating Scale (HRS)




Phase 2: Testing of psychometric properties

Figure 1. A logistic flow chart of the translation and validation methodology

Figure 1

Translation of Hoarding Rating Scale (HRS)

Figure 2. Confirmatory factor analysis model of the Chinese version of the Hoarding Rating Scale (CHRS)



Remark: Item 1 is for recapping the condition of stocking, which serves as probing question to facilitate the participants' responses on item 2 to 6.

Figure 2

Confirmatory factor analysis model of the Chinese version of the Hoarding Rating Scale (CHRS)

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [AppendixACHRSv2.doc](#)
- [AppendixBHRS.doc](#)