

Behavior Modification

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy as a Novel Treatment for Eating Disorders: An Initial Test of Efficacy and Mediation

Journal:	<i>Behavior Modification</i>
Manuscript ID:	BMOD-12-0059.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscripts
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Jan-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Juarascio, Adrienne; Drexel University, Psychology Shaw, Jena; Drexel University, Psychology Forman, Evan; Drexel University, Psychology Herbert, James; Drexel University, Psychology Timko, Alix; University of the Sciences, Behavioral and Social Sciences Department Butryn, Meghan; Drexel University, Psychology Bunnell, Douglas; The Renfrew Center, Research Department Matteucci, Alyssa; Drexel University, Psychology Lowe, Michael; Drexel University, Psychology
Keywords:	Eating Disorders, Acceptance and Commitment Therapy, Treatment Outcome

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Running Head: ACCEPTANCE AND COMMITMENT THERAPY FOR EATING DISORDERS

**Acceptance and Commitment Therapy as a Novel Treatment for Eating Disorders: An Initial Test
of Efficacy and Mediation**

Adrienne Juarascio, Ph.D.¹, Jena Shaw, M.S.¹, Evan Forman, Ph.D.¹, C. Alix Timko, Ph.D.², James
Herbert, Ph.D.¹, Meghan Butryn, Ph.D.¹, Douglas Bunnell, Ph.D.³, Alyssa Matteucci¹, Michael Lowe,
Ph.D.¹

¹Department of Psychology, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

²Department of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of the Sciences, PA, USA

³Renfrew Center, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Adrienne Juarascio, Department of
Psychology, Drexel University, 245 N. 15th Street, MS 626, Philadelphia, PA 19102. E-mail address:
asj32@drexel.edu.

Abstract

Eating disorders are among the most challenging disorders to treat, with even state-of-the-art cognitive behavioral treatments achieving only modest success. One possible reason for the high rate of treatment failure for eating disorders is that existing treatments do not attend sufficiently to critical aspects of the disorder such as high experiential avoidance, poor experiential awareness, and lack of motivation. These variables are explicit targets of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT). The current study examined the efficacy of an ACT-based group treatment for eating disorders by examining whether the addition of ACT groups to treatment as usual (TAU) at a residential treatment facility for eating disorders would improve treatment outcomes. TAU patients received an intensive residential treatment, while ACT patients received these services but additionally attended, depending on diagnosis, either ACT for anorexia nervosa groups or ACT for bulimia nervosa groups. Although individuals in both treatment conditions demonstrated large decreases in eating pathology, there were trends toward larger decreases among those receiving ACT. ACT patients also showed lower rates of re-hospitalization during the six months after discharge. Overall, results suggest that ACT is a viable treatment option for individuals with eating pathology and further outcome research is warranted.

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy as a Novel Treatment for Eating Disorders: An Initial Test of Efficacy and Mediation

Eating disorders are exceptionally difficult to treat, particularly among adult patients with a long course of illness. These disorders tend to be ego-syntonic, with many individuals presenting with extreme ambivalence about their need for treatment (Fairburn, 2008). Inpatient or residential treatment is often needed to manage severe adult eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa or treatment refractory bulimia nervosa (Bowers, Andersen, Evans, Osview, & Munich, 2008), and though it can produce short term improvements, the long term efficacy is low and relapse rates are particularly high (Wiseman, Sunday, Klapper, Harris, & Halmi, 2000). Although empirically supported treatments exist for adult patients with bulimia nervosa, those that are considered effective lead to symptom remission for less than 50% of those seeking treatment (NICE, 2004). For adults with anorexia nervosa, there are currently no treatments that have achieved empirical support (Agras, et al., 2004; Kaplan, 2002; Wilson, 2007).

CBT for Eating Disorders

Among adult patients with bulimia nervosa, CBT produces large reductions in binge eating, purging, and other compensatory behaviors (e.g., laxative/diuretic use, fasting; Fairburn, 2008; Treasure, et al., 1994). Not only does CBT produce rapid changes in the eating patterns of bulimic patients, but these changes tend to be well maintained over time (Waller, et al., 1996). Despite evidence that CBT is an effective treatment for bulimia nervosa, a large subset (30-50%) of patients remain symptomatic enough to degrade quality of life (Fairburn, 2008; Wilson, 2005). In the case of adults with anorexia nervosa, brief manualized CBT appears to have little efficacy, although more conclusive studies are needed (McIntosh, et al., 2005; Wilson, Grilo, & Vitousek, 2007). Thus, although CBT has been shown to result in statistically significant reductions in eating pathology, particularly for those with bulimia nervosa, a sizable number of eating disorder patients do not benefit from current treatments.

Reasons for limited effectiveness of current treatment

A number of theoretical explanations exist for CBT’s limited efficacy with eating disorders. One explanation concerns the lack of motivation for treatment. Because eating disorders are highly ego-

1
2
3 syntonic, patients may be reluctant to engage in a treatment with a direct agenda to modify eating
4
5 disordered thoughts and may be unwilling to make the suggested behavior changes (i.e., normalization of
6
7 eating, reducing dietary restraint, etc.) to the degree needed to see significant improvements
8
9 (Vanderlinden, 2008). Instead, it may be beneficial for patients to learn how to change their
10
11 “relationship” to disordered eating thoughts and urges, i.e., learning to accept the presence of distressing
12
13 thoughts and feelings without using these momentary experiences as a guide for behavior.
14
15

16 17 **Acceptance and Commitment Therapy**

18
19 Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) is one of several novel acceptance-based models of
20
21 CBT that emphasize changing behaviors rather than altering internal experiences (i.e. thoughts,
22
23 sensations, feelings; Forman & Herbert, 2009; Hayes, Masuda, Bissett, Luoma, & Guerrero, 2004).
24
25 Experiential avoidance, or efforts to reduce distressing internal experiences even when doing so is
26
27 ineffective or impairs the ability to engage in desired behaviors, is thought to be at the root of much
28
29 psychological suffering (Hayes et al., 2004). Ultimately, prioritizing the avoidance of distressing
30
31 thoughts, feelings, or urges reduces the ability to take behavioral steps that are needed to live a valued
32
33 life. Therefore, ACT teaches patients to obtain psychological distance (i.e. defuse) from distressing
34
35 internal experiences; clarify overarching personal values; create goals that can help patients live a more
36
37 fulfilling, meaningful life; and increase willingness to experience negative internal experiences in the
38
39 service of valued behavior. Currently, there are over 50 published treatment studies demonstrating the
40
41 model’s efficacy for a wide range of health concerns (Gifford, et al., 2004; Gregg, 2004; McCracken &
42
43 Eccleston, 2006) and psychiatric disorders (Bach & Hayes, 2002; Dalrymple & Herbert, 2007; Twohig,
44
45 Hayes, & Masuda, 2006; Woods, Wetterneck, & Flessner, 2006). Recent meta-analyses have found that
46
47 ACT is consistently better than control conditions and at least as effective as established treatments such
48
49 as CBT or BT (Hayes, Luoma, Bond, Masuda, & Lillis, 2006; Powers, Zum Vorde Sive Vording, &
50
51 Emmelkamp, 2009). However, ACT’s effectiveness at treating eating disorders remains understudied.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acceptance-Based Behavioral Therapies for Eating Disorders: Theoretical and Empirical Evidence

A growing body of research suggests that core constructs targeted by ACT such as experiential avoidance, mindful awareness, and values clarification are central to the development and maintenance of eating disorders. Experiential avoidance has been shown to be particularly high in eating disorder populations (Cockell, Geller, & Linden, 2002; Keyser et al., 2009; Mizes & Arbitell, 1991; Orsillo & Batten, 2002), and it appears that eating disorder symptoms often function as a way to help the patient avoid upsetting internal experiences (Hayes & Pankey, 2002; Keyser, et al., 2009; Paxton & Diggins, 1997, Serpell, Treasure, Teasdale, & Sullivan, 1999). Individuals with eating disorders become hyper-focused on their body and food intake as a means of avoiding feelings of rejection, imperfection, failure, vulnerability, and intimacy (Hayes & Pankey, 2002; Keyser et al., 2009; Paxton & Diggins, 1997; Pells, 2006). Patients with eating disorders also tend to be less aware of their emotions than healthy individuals, which may make it more challenging for these patients to defuse from these internal experiences (Merwin et al., in preparation; Merwin, Zucker, Lacy, & Elliot, 2009). Previous research has demonstrated that individuals with eating disorders show deficits in emotion recognition and poor interoceptive awareness (Harrison, Sullivan, Tchanturia, & Treasure, 2009; Zonneville-Bender, van Goozen, Cohen-Kettenis, van Elburg, de Wildt, et al., 2004; Zonneville-Bender, van Goozen, Cohen-Kettenis, van Elburg, & van Engeland, 2004) and have poor emotional awareness (Gilboa-Schechtman, Avnon, Zubery, & Jeczmiern, 2006; Keyser, Pastelak, et al., 2009; Sim & Zeman, 2004). Finally, women with eating disorders, and particularly those with anorexia nervosa, tend to strongly value their disorder and experience it as ego-syntonic (Cockell, et al., 2002; Nordbo, 2006; Schmidt & Treasure, 2006; Serpell et al., 1999). Because weight, shape, and eating behavior are so highly valued, other areas of life become much lower priorities and engagement in related behaviors decreases. Patients with eating disorders also tend to have poor clarity for values unconnected with food and body image (Fairburn, 2008). Values clarity may be particularly difficult to achieve in such a risk-averse population because they may fear caring about things that are less tangible or viewed as more difficult to achieve than a specific body shape or weight (Merwin & Wilson, 2009). Helping patients clarify and take committed action towards valued domains outside of

their weight and shape may foster motivation to engage in treatment and could encourage patients to re-engage with areas of life beyond the drive for thinness.

Few studies have investigated the efficacy of ACT for eating disorders; however, there are suggestions that it may be an effective treatment for this population. Several small pilot studies have demonstrated promise for acceptance-based CBT interventions such as dialectical behavioral therapy (Safer, Telch, & Chen, 2009), mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (Kristeller, Baer, & Quillian-Wolever, 2006), and functional contextual treatment (Anderson & Simmons, 2008) in the treatment of binge eating and bulimia nervosa. Moreover, patients with sub-threshold eating pathology who were randomized to ACT showed greater reductions in eating pathology than those randomized to traditional CBT (Juarascio, Forman, & Herbert, 2010). However, despite these positive results, the only data available for ACT as a treatment for eating disorders are case studies (Berman, Boutelle, Crow, 2009; Heffner et al., 2002) and a modified family-based treatment (Timko, Zucker, & Merwin, 2012).

Current Study

The current study sought to empirically investigate the efficacy of a group-based ACT treatment for a population of adult residential patients with an eating disorder. The study took place at a well-known residential treatment facility for eating disorders in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The treatment package delivered at the residential facility has been shown to produce moderate to large changes in disordered eating at post-treatment (Lowe, Davis, Annunziato, & Lucks, 2003). Although effects are large, most patients are still in the clinical range of symptomatology at discharge, suggesting room for improvement. The primary goal of the study was to assess whether ACT plus treatment-as-usual (TAU) could produce larger reductions in disordered eating than TAU alone. It was hypothesized that individuals receiving the ACT groups would show lower eating pathology (both on self-report measures and in a fear food challenge task) by post-treatment, and would be less likely to require re-hospitalization in the months after discharge. It was also hypothesized that number of sessions attended (i.e., dosage of treatment) would be positively associated with symptom improvement. An exploratory hypothesis was that eating disorder diagnosis (i.e., anorexia nervosa versus bulimia nervosa spectrum diagnosis) would

moderate the effect of treatment such that ACT may be more effective for a specific diagnostic population. Although ACT appears to be particularly well suited to treat anorexia nervosa (Merwin & Wilson, 2009), bulimia nervosa tends to be more responsive to treatment (Fairburn, 2008); thus, no directional hypotheses were predicted for this series of analyses. Lastly, we hypothesized that changes in ACT-related process measures would mediate improvements in eating disorder outcome measures.

Given the pilot nature of this first study and the comparison to a treatment that already produces moderate to large effects, patterns, size of effects, and statistical trends rather than formal statistical significance are emphasized.

METHODS

Participants

The study took place at a residential treatment facility for eating disorders in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States (The Renfrew Center). Adolescents were excluded because they had a different treatment schedule in the evenings such that they could not attend ACT groups on a regular basis. All women had a diagnosis of anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa, or eating disorder not otherwise specified in the anorexia nervosa or bulimia nervosa spectrum, based on the criteria from the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM Disorders (SCID; First, Spitzer, Gibbon, & Williams, 2002). There were no other exclusion criteria, and patients with co-morbid disorders were included in the study. Patients were under no pressure or obligation to participate in this study, and were able to attend the ACT groups even if they did not agree to complete study-related measures.

A total of 159 women who met inclusion criteria were admitted to the Renfrew Center during the time period of data collection. Of the 159 who were approached regarding possible participation, 140 consented to take part in the study. The average age of the sample was 26.74 years (*SD*= 9.19), with a range of 18-55. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (89.3%, *n*=125), with small proportions of other racial groups (African American=3.6%, Asian=2.1%, Hispanic=2.9%, Other=1.4%). The sample had a relatively long eating disorder history (*M*= 10.75 years, *SD*= 9.08) with an average age of onset at

16.43 years ($SD=5.5$). We grouped individuals into AN (i.e., $< 85\%$ of their ideal weight; $n=66$, 47.1%) or BN (i.e., $\geq 85\%$ of ideal weight and exhibited binge eating and/or compensatory behaviors; $n=74$, 52.9%) spectrum diagnoses. If patients had recently (i.e. within the preceding four weeks) gained enough weight at another treatment facility to place their percentage above 85% and did not engage in significant binge eating and/or compensatory behaviors, they were still considered AN spectrum. These categories have been used in previous studies, and appear to accurately distinguish between pathologies (Fairburn & Walsh, 2002; Walsh & Garner, 1997). The majority of individuals met criteria for at least one other psychiatric diagnosis, most commonly a mood disorder (77.8%), generalized anxiety disorder (43.5%), and substance abuse (17%) or dependence (6.4%) disorders, as assessed by a semi-structured clinical interview administered by a master's level intake coordinator at the residential treatment facility before beginning treatment.

Measures

Disordered Eating was measured via self-report, a food challenge task, and clinical interview. The *Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire* (EDE-Q; Fairburn & Beglin, 1994) is a self-report version of the Eating Disorder Examination interview. It covers a 4-week time period, and it assesses the core features of eating disorders. Four subscales may be derived from the instrument, together with a global score: Restraint, Weight Concern, Shape Concern, and Eating Concern. Internal consistency and test-retest reliability are both excellent (Luce & Crowther, 1999). Cronbach's alphas for the current study were: Global=.91, Restraint=.82, Eating Concern=.70, Shape Concern=.90, and Weight Concern=.86. The *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM disorders* (SCID; First et al., 2002) is a diagnostic exam used to determine DSM-IV Axis I disorders. For this study, only the eating disorders section of the SCID was used to assess initial diagnostic status. Reliability for the eating disorder section of the SCID has shown acceptable inter-rater and test-retest reliability (Zanarini, et al., 2000). *Willingness to consume a forbidden food* was measured using a food challenge. The food challenge presented participants with 60g of a forbidden food (chosen from rice cakes, animal crackers, wheat thins, chocolate chip cookies, and potato chips). The food item presented to each participant was based on the participant's self-reported

willingness to try the challenge food; Patients were presented with the item they reported being willing to try but that they ranked as the most challenging to consume. The food item participants selected at baseline was the same food item presented for the food challenge at post-treatment to allow for ease in comparison between the two time points. Patients were asked to “eat as much of it as you can”¹ and were given ten minutes to consume the challenge snack. The food was weighed before and after consumption, and grams, calories and percent consumed were recorded. Percent consumed was used as the primary outcome measure to standardize across test foods, however the pattern of results was similar using other measures. Test foods were selected with equivalent frequency ($\chi^2(4) = 2.12, p = .71$), and percent consumed at baseline was small ($M = 13.0, SD = 22.0$) and did not differ significantly between most of the test foods², indicating that the procedure resulted in a distribution of foods such that most participants found it difficult to complete the food challenge. Preliminary data for the food challenge task indicates acceptable reliability and validity (Shaw, unpublished manuscript). However, analyses of food challenge data revealed unexpectedly high consumption levels at baseline for a subset of participants, thereby creating a ceiling effect for this subgroup (i.e., the measure did not allow significant room for improvement). As a result, food challenge analyses only included participants ($n=69$) whose baseline consumption was less than 21.35% (which was the mean consumption at post-treatment)³.

Defusion was measured via the *Drexel Defusion Scale* (DDS; Forman, et al., in press), a self-report questionnaire assessing the extent to which a person is able to distance him/herself from negative thoughts, feelings, and physiological reactions. The measure begins with a 3-paragraph definition of

¹ A full description of the food challenge procedure is beyond the scope of this manuscript and is available from the authors upon request

² Individuals who were given chocolate chip cookies consumed significantly more than those who were given rice cakes ($p = .01$) or animal crackers ($p = .04$). When individuals who consumed above 21.34% at baseline are removed, the difference between those consuming chocolate chip cookies and animal crackers is no longer statistically significant ($p = .31$). No other test foods differed on amount consumed.”

³ Analyses using a 2 x 2 mixed model ANOVA showed that participants above this cutoff at baseline did not experience significant change across time ($F(1,20) = .01, p = .92$), nor were there any significant group by time interactions ($F(1,20) = 1.36, p = .26$). Part of the limitation in change in these patients is likely related to the increase in calories consumed from required meals and snacks from 1800 per day (for all patients) to an average of 2384 calories per day ($SD = 711.7$).

defusion, and is followed by ten items presenting common scenarios that elicit negative internal experiences. The participant is asked to respond how well they are able to defuse from the negative internal experiences on a likert scale from 0 (not at all) to 5 (very much). Higher scores on this measure reflect a greater ability to defuse from negative internal experiences. It has been demonstrated to have acceptable reliability. Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .83.

Psychological Acceptance was measured with the *Acceptance and Action Questionnaire-II* (AAQ-II; Bond, et al., 2011), seven-item version, which assesses experiential avoidance, or the tendency to avoid unwanted internal experiences and willingness to engage in behaviors despite unpleasant internal experiences. It has demonstrated adequate reliability and validity (Bond, et al., 2011). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .92.

Emotion Regulation was measured with the *Difficulties in Emotion Regulation* (DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2004), a 36-item multidimensional self-report measure assessing individuals' characteristic patterns of emotion regulation. It contains six subscales: Nonacceptance of Emotional Responses, Difficulties Engaging in Goal-Directed Behavior, Impulse Control Difficulties, Lack of Emotional Awareness, Limited Access to Emotion Regulation Strategies, and Lack of Emotional Clarity. Preliminary empirical studies have demonstrated good overall internal consistency and adequate subscale reliability with Cronbach's alpha > .80 for each subscale (Gratz & Roemer, 2004). Cronbach's alpha for the current study ranged from .91 to .95 for the subscales.

General Symptoms were evaluated weekly using the *Brief Symptom Questionnaire* (BSQ), a 7-item self-report measure with ratings provided on a 7-point Likert scale ((Forman, Chapman, Herbert, Goetter, Yuen, & Moitra, in press). Items measure outcome (symptom intensity, progress toward goals) and theorized mechanisms of change (e.g., cognitive acceptance versus change, affective acceptance versus change, dysfunctional thinking, cognitive defusion, and willingness) thought to occur in both ACT and more conventional types of CBT. A number of other items were added to this measure to assess weekly changes in eating disordered behavior, but for the purpose of the present study only the 5-mediator based items were utilized. These questions assessed changes in experiential acceptance (both

cognitive and emotional), dysfunctional thinking, willingness, and defusion, using a single item and the text for the items can be found in Forman and colleagues 2012 manuscript. Prior research has demonstrated that the individual items on the BSQ were correlated with the closest-corresponding established measure, suggesting that these items were generally representative of the constructs they were designed to measure (Forman et al., 2012). As each item on the measure is not necessarily related to other items, no Cronbach’s alpha was calculated.

Rehospitalization was gathered both directly from Renfrew treatment records and from data provided by participants to Renfrew in response to an email sent directly from the treatment center at 6 months following discharge⁴.

Weight and Height were assessed using a medical grade scale and a stadiometer. Assessment was completed by nursing staff at the residential treatment facility.

Treatment Acceptability was assessed using the Treatment Acceptability Questionnaire (TAQ, unpublished). The TAQ was created for the current study to assess treatment acceptability in both the TAU and TAU+ACT conditions. Participants were instructed to answer in response to the entire treatment package they received while at Renfrew. The measure contained 6 items rated on a Likert scale from 1-7, with seven being the highest level of treatment acceptability. Domains included acceptability (question 1), morality (question 2), effectiveness (question 3), negative side effects (question 4), knowledge of staff (question 5), and trustworthiness (question 6). Total scores on the treatment acceptability measure higher than a mean of 30 indicate high levels of treatment acceptability.

Procedure

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Drexel University and by the Core Research Committee at The Renfrew Center. Due to use of a pre-existing residential treatment as a comparison condition, pure random assignment was not feasible. We therefore used a nonequivalent groups design where half of the participants received standard TAU and half received TAU+ biweekly

⁴ The email sent at 6-month follow-up from the Renfrew Center did not assess other outcome or process measures. A separate study specific email was sent to participants, but response rate was poor and produced data that were unusable for follow-up analyses.

1
2
3 ACT groups. Given the threats to internal validity observed in non-equivalent group designs, a switching
4 replication design was utilized to as best as possible ensure that observed differences in groups were due
5 to the interventions (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Reichardt, 2005). Groups were run in three sequential
6 phases and all participants entering the treatment center during a given phase were assigned to the same
7 condition. The order of the sequence, i.e., TAU, ACT, TAU, was chosen through random assignment.
8 Each treatment phase was followed by a three-week washout period which resulted in no patient being in
9 the treatment facility during two different waves.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 **Assessments.** Main assessments occurred at pre- and post-treatment. Patients who were over the
20 age of 18 and admitted to the treatment facility were approached within three days of their admission date
21 by a member of the research team to determine if they would be interested in participating in the study,
22 and if so, to review the consent form. If a patient consented to being part of the treatment study, she
23 underwent a 1-hour pre-treatment assessment that included a brief structured interview, food challenge,
24 and a questionnaire packet including all ACT process variables. Additional eating disorder-specific
25 measures (including the main outcome measure for the study, the EDE-Q) were administered during a
26 subsequent assessment that is part of the standard Renfrew intake and discharge procedure. Both
27 assessments were repeated between five and zero days before discharge. The Brief Symptom
28 Questionnaire (BSQ) was administered weekly.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Treatment as Usual (TAU).** Treatment at the residential facility is based on a comprehensive
43 system designed to normalize eating patterns, stabilize or increase weight, and eliminate compensatory
44 behaviors. The theoretical orientation of the program is eclectic and includes psychodynamic, feminist,
45 interpersonal, and cognitive behavioral components. Although most of the group and individual
46 treatments are eclectic, many of the more behavioral interventions inherent in the residential treatment
47 program (i.e. regular weighing, normalization of eating, fear food exposures) are components of CBT for
48 bulimia nervosa (Fairburn, 2008). Patients are assigned to a treatment team consisting of a clinical
49 psychologist, a psychiatrist, a master's level primary therapist, a registered nurse, a dietician, a family
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

therapist, and art and movement therapists. During the day patients attend structured meals, individual meetings with members of their treatment team, and therapist-run group sessions addressing diverse topics. Patients also attended evening staff-run groups that addressed topics such as leisure planning, coping skills, and female bonding. These groups were 60-75 minutes in duration and occurred seven times per week.

TAU+ACT. Participants in the TAU+ACT (subsequently referred to as ACT) condition received all TAU elements described above and also received twice weekly ACT group treatment in lieu of the regularly programmed staff-run leisure groups described above. The manualized group treatment was heavily based off of exercises and discussions in existing ACT books including “Get out of your mind and into your life” (Hayes & Smith, 2005) and “Acceptance and Commitment Therapy” (Hayes et al., 1999). Some activities were modified to focus on eating disorder specific experiences and others were left to focus on more general distress such as depression and anxiety. Eight unique groups were offered to ensure that patients with a longer-than average length of stay would not have repetitive groups. Although eight groups were offered, the average patient was unable to attend all groups due to the typical length of stay and competing demands of her schedule. A small number (n=6) attended the same group more than one time. Due to the nature of the treatment facility, all participants who wanted to attend the group were given permission to do so, even if they had already attended the same group before. Each group covered a variety of core ACT processes such as acceptance, willingness, defusion, mindfulness, values clarification, committed action, and perspective taking. In addition to these skills, a principal focus of the groups was identifying, practicing, and achieving behavioral goals. Many of these were drawn from the behavioral suggestions recommended by conventional CBT for eating disorders such as normalization of eating, reducing dietary restraint, and eliminating compensatory behaviors. Patients were instructed to utilize ACT strategies while attempting behavioral change. Additionally, each group contained at least one exposure activity, which was either body/eating focused or interpersonally focused.

Group attendance was determined by diagnostic status, with AN patients attending one group and BN patients attending the other group. The manual was designed to target mechanisms hypothesized to underlie both AN and BN as recent research has suggested a transdiagnostic model of eating pathology (Wade, Bergin, Martin, Gillespie, & Fairburn, 2006). Although the content of the groups was parallel, this allowed group therapists to use examples and exercises that were more specific to those experienced by the majority of participants within each group. The groups utilized an open format to account for the presence of new admissions and discharges. Groups were structured as stand-alone ACT interventions to ensure that patients who could only attend a small number of groups would receive the full treatment. Patients missed groups for a variety of reasons including attendance at other therapeutic groups, passes off campus, visiting hours, or discharge from the facility before having the opportunity to attend all groups. However, because all groups covered several core ACT processes, attendance at three groups (or roughly one group a week for the average length of stay for patients with bulimia nervosa) was considered a sufficient dosage of treatment to be considered a treatment-completer. ACT groups were conducted by master's-level therapists with prior experience in treatment for eating disorders and ACT. All primary therapists had received at least three years of training and supervision in ACT and had served as study therapists on previous ACT treatment outcome studies. Primary therapists had also worked at the Renfrew Center as group therapists for at least one year prior to leading the ACT groups. The primary therapists were also the creators of the manualized treatment groups and followed checklists during each group to ensure adherence. Adherence was further maintained through weekly team supervision meetings.

RESULTS

Participant Enrollment

As previously stated, a total of 140 participants consented to take part in the study (TAUa=20, ACT=66, TAUb=54). Twenty women did not return pre-treatment questionnaires (TAUa= 3, ACT= 5, TAUb=12) because they were no longer interested in participating ($n=18$) or because they left the unit due to limited insurance coverage ($n=2$). Four additional participants could not participate in the food

challenge due to dietary restrictions. Retention was high throughout the initial phase of the study, with 111 (92.5%) completing the main Renfrew post-treatment questionnaire packets for eating disorder outcome variables (ACT=58, TAU=53), 90 (75%) completing the additional ACT process measures questionnaire packet (ACT=45, TAU=45), and 98 (84.5%) participating in the food challenge (ACT = 50, TAU = 48). Sixty-five women responded to the emailed assessment at 6-month follow-up (32 ACT and 33 TAU). There were no significant differences in response rates across condition. See Figure 1 for a complete CONSORT flow sheet.

Baseline Characteristics and Equivalence of Groups

To ensure that the two TAU waves were equivalent and could be combined for the purposes of analysis, a series of one way ANCOVAs were conducted comparing the groups on all post-treatment outcome measures when controlling for baseline scores on the measure. Only small and statistically non-significant differences were found on any of the measures, suggesting the groups showed relatively equal improvements during treatment. Thus, these samples were combined into one group (henceforth referred to as TAU).

ACT participants attended 4.75 (*SD*= 2.51, range 0-11) group sessions on average. ACT group completers (defined as attending 3 or more groups; *n*=56 of whom 52 completed post-treatment measures; 93%) were equivalent to ACT non-group completers (*n*=10) on demographic and baseline variables, with only length of stay differing between the two groups (Group completers: 28.83 days, *SD*=10.24, Non-Group completers: 19.00, *SD*=8.36, *t*(64)=2.86, *p*<.01). The results described below used the full completer samples (ACT: 52 patients who completed at least three groups and main outcome post-treatment measures, TAU: all 53 patients who completed main outcome post-treatment measures); all analyses were repeated both with non-completers and using intent-to-treat analyses with last observation carried forward, and results were equivalent.

TAU and ACT completers were generally equivalent on demographic characteristics and baseline symptoms, as well as process and well-being variables (see Table 1). The one exception was that in the ACT group DERS impulsivity was higher. Analyses were performed both with and without these

variables as covariates; because results were virtually identical, only the latter analyses are reported. A similar percentage of AN and BN spectrum patients were in both treatments conditions (ACT: 25 AN patients and 27 BN patients; TAU: 29 AN patients and 24 BN patients; $\chi^2 = 0.46, p = .56$). The average length of stay for completers was 29.09 days ($SD = 14.12$, range = 10 to 90) in the TAU group and 29.10 days ($SD = 10.40$, range = 12 to 62) in the ACT group; $t(103) = -.001; p = .99$.

Treatment Acceptability

Acceptability of TAU and TAU+ ACT was compared by using an independent measures t-test to examine mean differences in acceptability. Across groups, the scores for overall treatment acceptability were high, with all individual items averaging over 5 (out of 7) and the total (35.90, $SD = 4.93$) well over the pre-established cut-off (30) for an acceptable treatment. Individual and total acceptability items were equivalent between TAU and TAU+ACT Groups.

Main Outcome Analyses

Overall changes during treatment across groups were assessed using mixed model ANOVAs. As can be seen in Table 2, large improvements were observed in nearly all outcome and process variables over the course of treatment. No significant differences were observed in the amount of change seen in process variables between conditions, although patients in the ACT condition trended towards greater improvements in AAQ-II scores (Table 1). Another series of mixed model ANOVAs were used to compare outcome variables between groups. Several trends were observed for EDE-Q scores at post-treatment, with those in the ACT condition showing larger decreases in weight concern ($p = .07$), shape concern ($p = .09$), and global eating pathology ($p = .07$; Figure 2) at post-treatment (Table 1). Effect sizes for these analyses ranged from small to moderate. The ACT group also increased their consumption in the food challenge by nearly twice as much (post-treatment consumption: 24.88%) as TAU (post-treatment consumption: 11.90%, $p = .09$; Figure 3). Other EDE-Q variables followed a similar pattern, but did not reach the trend level. Other EDE-Q variables followed a similar pattern, but did not reach the trend level.

Clinical Significance

Clinical significance was assessed by examining the rates of EDE-Q global score within 1 standard deviation of the community mean (EDE-Q global below 1.74; Murphy, Straebler, Cooper, & Fairburn, 2010). Normative comparisons of this type are widely used to identify clinically significant change (Ogles, Lunnen, Bonesteel, 2001; Kazdin, 2003). Twenty of 52 (38%) ACT patients who were in the clinical range at pre-treatment had fallen to the normative range by post-treatment, whereas only 9 of 53 (17%) of TAU patients similarly improved ($\chi^2= 5.56, p=.02$). Additional treatment between discharge and 6 months post-treatment was assessed by dichotomizing into those who did or did not return to inpatient care. Those in the TAU group were more likely to be re-hospitalized (18%) compared to the ACT group (3.5%; $\chi^2=3.19, p=.07$), suggesting poorer maintenance of treatment gains in the TAU group.

Eating Disorder Diagnostic Status

A series of repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted to examine the interaction between treatment, time, and eating disorder diagnosis in predicting key outcomes. To reduce the number of analyses, we only utilized EDE-Q global scores and food challenge scores. There was a general pattern for a stronger advantage of ACT for AN when compared to BN when examining graphical representations of the data, but overall effects were small and insignificant (EDE-Q global $F(108)=2.01, p=.15, \eta_p^2=.02$). An advantage of ACT on challenge food consumption was evident for AN participants (time x condition $F(1,23) = 4.32, p = .05, \eta^2=.16$), but not BN participants (time x condition $F(1,17) = 0.76, p = .40, \eta^2=.04$). However, because no significant differences were observed statistically on the more validated measures of eating pathology, it is important to note this pattern must be interpreted cautiously.

Session Attendance

To test the hypothesis that greater session attendance in the ACT condition would predict greater improvement in eating behaviors, a linear regression with EDE-Q global as the outcome variable was assessed. Session attendance in the ACT condition (which was strongly associated with length of

stay, $r = .64, p < .01$) was positively associated with improvements in EDE-Q Global ($r = .28, B = -.19, t = -2.09, p = .04$) subscale scores from pre-post treatment.

Mediation Analyses

To test the hypothesis that changes in ACT- related process variables would mediate change in outcome variables, a series of mediation analyses were conducted. Mediation analyses were conducted using two types of measures: the standard process measures and the Brief Symptom Measure (BSQ) given one time each week. To reduce the number of analyses, only EDE-Q global subscale scores were used as an outcome measure. The bootstrapping method described by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used as an initial test of mediation, with change from pre- to mid-treatment (for BSQ data) or post-treatment (for other process measures) on the mediator variables predicting changes from pre- to post-treatment on the outcome variables. The bootstrapping method produces confidence intervals to test for significance, with values not crossing zero corresponding to significance at the $p < .05$ level. Most tests, specifically all analyses using change in process measures (DERS, AAQ-II, and DDS) from pre to post-treatment, did not support mediation hypotheses. However, BSQ-General Willingness significantly mediated the effects of treatment condition on EDE-Q global ($CI = -.4623$ to $-.0046, p < .05$). This question asked participants to rate on a scale of 1 (Does not prevent me from doing anything important) to 7 (keeps me from doing many important things), “*In terms of the effect of my emotions on my behavior, my anxiety, depression and other distress...*”, with lower scores indicating greater willingness to experience distressing thoughts and feelings while engaging in valued behaviors.

DISCUSSION

Prior research has indicated that even state-of-the-art treatment by highly trained therapists leaves a large portion of patients with bulimia nervosa either partially or fully symptomatic (Wilson, 2005), and the outcomes for anorexia nervosa are decidedly worse (Wilson et al., 2007). It has been theorized that the lack of efficacy of predominant treatment models stems from their failure to focus on important maintenance factors such as experiential avoidance and distress intolerance. So-called “third generation” CBT treatments such as Acceptance and Commitment Therapy specifically

target these potential maintenance factors (Hayes et al., 2004), but only limited research has been conducted to date on ACT as a potential treatment for eating disorders. The current study sought to examine the incremental efficacy of an ACT treatment group when added to a pre-existing comprehensive intervention program at a residential treatment facility.

Main Outcomes

The main hypotheses for the current study were partially supported. Overall, the data showed a consistent pattern wherein participants in the ACT condition experienced slightly greater improvements in eating pathology when compared to participants in the TAU condition, although the results were typically only significant at the trend level. Individuals in the ACT condition trended towards lower global eating pathology, shape concerns, and weight concerns by post treatment, as well as greater willingness to consume a distressing food. Patients in this condition also trended towards greater increases in psychological flexibility as measured by the AAQ-II. Although relatively small effects, it is notable that the addition of a small number of ACT group sessions showed a consistent pattern of reduced eating pathology by post-treatment over and above the effect of a much broader and more comprehensive treatment program (i.e., TAU). These patterns are especially noteworthy considering that the TAU treatment resulted in considerable improvement on its own. Of note, the ACT condition also trended towards lower rates of re-hospitalization among those who responded to the six-month follow-up. The fact that a relatively low dosage of ACT can create small but consistent improvements in eating pathology above and beyond the effects of a full residential treatment program raises the possibility that a full ACT-based treatment program would be especially efficacious and should be a target of future evaluation. Although the trend level results observed in this pilot study limit the ability to make conclusions about the efficacy of the ACT groups, the consistency in pattern suggests future study in ACT as a treatment for eating pathology is warranted.

Additionally, although the primary test of eating disorder diagnostic status as a moderator did not indicate a statistically significant relationship, for challenge food consumption, a weak pattern suggesting a possible three-way interaction trend was observed, suggesting that AN patients in particular

benefited from ACT. These results may be due to ACT's focus on treating experiential avoidance and values clarity, which tend to be more pervasive among individuals with anorexia nervosa (Hayes & Pankey, 2002; Merwin & Wilson, 2009; Schmidt & Treasure, 2006). If replicated, this would be a noteworthy finding as AN spectrum patients are typically more challenging to treat and have a worse prognosis. However, it is possible that length of stay, which was longer in AN patients, confounds these findings, and additional research where length of stay is less variable would lead to greater confidence in interpretation. The modest effect sizes and lack of statistical significance for main outcome variables constrains the interpretability of these findings which await future replication. At this point, any suggestions that ACT might be particularly useful for AN patients is unreliable and additional research in a well-powered sample is sorely needed.

As was expected, greater session attendance was found to enhance the impact of the ACT condition. However, interpreting this result is complicated by the fact that attendance is confounded with length of stay (and thus with severity and treatment response). A test of a model controlling for length of stay was conducted, but the results were inconclusive because of low power. Additional research both with larger samples and among patient populations where length of stay will not be a confounding variable (i.e. in a trial where everyone receives the same number of ACT sessions) can better clarify the influence of receiving more or less ACT treatment.

Mediation

Tests of statistical mediation suggested that willingness to experience negative thoughts or emotions while still engaging in valued behaviors was a significant mediator of global eating pathology, eating concern, weight concern, and body image dissatisfaction. Willingness, as opposed to other ACT-related variables such as acceptance, mindfulness, values clarity, and defusion, appears to be most strongly associated with the improvements seen in the ACT condition. The fact that process variables improved equally across conditions was not predicted but may reflect that the behavioral interventions inherent in TAU resulted in patients developing better experiential acceptance and a better ability to step back from thoughts and feelings. However, the core skill of engaging in values-consistent behavior

when experiencing distressing internal experiences trended towards greater improvements for those who received ACT, and appears to be an important driver of outcome. Despite the promising findings, it is important to interpret these results with caution as the single item measures of willingness are less well-validated than standard measures and the more conventional ACT measures did not show a similar pattern of responding. Additional mediation research is needed with samples powered for this type of analysis.

Limitations

Despite the positive findings, a number of limitations should be noted. Several methodological limitations were evident in the current study which suggest that any interpretation and extensions of the current results must be done in a cautious manner. First, the study was designed as a pilot study, and the use of a residential treatment program as a comparison group (where it was only possible to add in a small number of ACT groups) was in many ways not an ideal control group, but was chosen because it allowed researchers to target a suitable number of patients. A more stringent efficacy design using true randomization is essential for determining whether ACT is a viable treatment option for this population. This study only serves as an initial step in suggesting that future research in ACT for eating disorders is warranted. Although effort was made to ensure that the ACT and TAU patients received the same amount of treatment, it is possible that observed effects were due to greater contact in the ACT condition with therapists as those in the TAU group participated in staff-run leisure groups during this time. Ideally, ACT should be tested as a stand-alone treatment in a variety of settings and against more stringent control conditions (such as empirically-supported treatments like standard CBT for eating disorders). Additionally, given the large changes observed during the course of TAU, there may have been little room for incremental effects of the ACT program. This fact, combined with the relatively low dose of ACT treatment, may have under-estimated the effects of ACT as a potential treatment. Other limitations include the limited prior research involvement at the residential facility. The setting is almost entirely clinically focused, and limited research support was available. For example, patients were often denied insurance coverage prematurely and discharged before members of the research team

1
2
3 were available to complete a post-treatment assessment. To obtain the highest rate of data compliance
4 possible, the post-treatment assessment window was left relatively large (5 days), which meant some
5 patients were assessed closer to their discharge than others. The limited research support also led to a
6 lower response rate on re-hospitalization data at 6 month follow-up, which reduces confidence in these
7 findings. Although the study attempted to mitigate these limitations by checking for equivalency
8 between completers and drop-outs and the use of intention-to-treat analyses, additional research in a
9 more well controlled setting with higher research support would allow for greater confidence in these
10 results. The study did not utilize formal measures of adherence and fidelity, which future research
11 should employ to assess the degree to which the ACT condition was applied competently in the manner
12 suggested in the treatment manuals. Several measures that were utilized to assess ACT process variables
13 are novel measures for which validity and reliability data are currently in progress. Although initial
14 efforts suggest that these measures are valid, additional research is needed. The large number of
15 analyses conducted without corrections for Type 1 error, although consistent with a pilot study analytic
16 approach, raises concerns about potential false positives. Lastly, whereas the study was sufficiently
17 powered for the main outcome analyses, moderation and mediation analyses were underpowered. Future
18 research using larger samples could allow for more accurate tests of potential mediating and moderating
19 variables.

20
21 The limitations described above are balanced by a number of strengths. First, this study reflects
22 one of the only tests of the efficacy of an ACT-based intervention for an eating disorder population. The
23 use of a residential setting for treatment reflects a novel population and few existing eating disorder
24 treatment outcome studies utilize experimental designs to assess treatment at higher levels of care. The
25 use of a full clinical sample, with severe eating pathology as indicated by length of illness and prior
26 hospitalizations, as opposed to subthreshold eating pathology or a college undergraduate population, is
27 also a strength and suggests that ACT may be effective with patients with severe symptomatology.
28 Although underpowered for several analyses, the study reflects a relatively large sample size for eating
29 disorder research. Additionally, the use of both self-report and behavioral measures and consistency of
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

those outcomes allows greater confidence in the validity of the obtained results. Lastly, the use of a control group represents an important strength.

Conclusions and Future Research

The current study is one of the first empirical tests of an ACT-based treatment for eating disorders. Results of this pilot study suggest that ACT may be a useful treatment for eating disorders among women; however, care must be taken in interpreting the trend-level results. Ideally, additional research would not only replicate, but extend, the current findings by examining other potential uses of ACT-based skills, techniques, and treatment programs for eating disorder populations. Future studies could examine ACT as a stand-alone individual treatment, as an adjunctive group treatment, or as a more comprehensive and extensive program in various higher levels of care. Although the study begins to hint at the mechanisms of actions for an ACT-based treatment, larger studies with more assessment periods might provide stronger and more valid tests of mediation, which could enhance knowledge about which maintenance factors most need to be altered to ensure treatment success.

Overall, this study suggests that ACT may have promise as a treatment for eating disorders. As many theorists and researchers have noted, ACT appears to be a good conceptual fit for the treatment of both bulimia nervosa and anorexia nervosa, but the lack of systematic research has limited its use. The benefits of an ACT-based treatment observed in this study will hopefully spur additional research in this area.

References

- Agras, W., Brandt, H. A., Bulik, C. M., Dolan-Sewell, R., Fairburn, C. G., Halmi, K. A., et al. (2004). Report of the National Institutes of Health workshop on overcoming barriers to treatment research in anorexia nervosa. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 35(4), 509-521.
- Anderson, D., & Simmons, A. (2008). A Pilot Study of a Functional Contextual Treatment for Bulimia. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 15(2), 172-178.
- Anestis, M.D., Selby, E.A., Fink, E. L., & Joiner, T. E. (2007). The multifaceted role of distress tolerance in dysregulated eating behaviors. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 40(8), 718-726. DOI: 10.1002/eat.20471
- Bach, P., & Hayes, S. C. (2002). The use of acceptance and commitment therapy to prevent the rehospitalization of psychotic patients: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70(5), 1129-1139.
- Berman, M., Boutelle, K., & Crow, S. (2009). A case series investigating acceptance and commitment therapy as a treatment for previously treated, unremitted patients with anorexia nervosa. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 17(6), 426-434.
- Bond, F. W., Hayes, S. C., Baer, R. A., Carpenter, K. M., Orcutt, H. K., Waltz, T., et al. (in preparation). Preliminary psychometric properties of the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire – II: A revised measure of psychological flexibility and acceptance.
- Bowers, W.A., Andersen, E.A., Evans, K., Osview, F., & Munich, R.L. (Eds.). (2008). *Principles of inpatient psychiatry: Inpatient treatment of eating disorders*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Cardaciotto, L., Herbert, J. D., Forman, E. M., Moitra, E., & Farrow, V. (2008). The assessment of present-moment awareness and acceptance: The Philadelphia Mindfulness Scale. *Assessment*, 15(2), 204-223.
- Cockell, S. J., Geller, J., & Linden, W. (2002). The development of a decisional balance scale for anorexia nervosa. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 10(5), 359-375.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. . *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979) *Quasi-experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Rand McNally, Chicago
- Corstorphine, E., Mountford, V., Tomlinson, S., Waller, G., & Meyer, C. (2007). Distress tolerance in the eating disorders. *Eating Behaviors*, 8(1), 91-97. doi:10.1016/j.eatbeh.2006.02.003
- Dalrymple, K. L., & Herbert, J. D. (2007). Acceptance and commitment therapy for generalized social anxiety disorder: A pilot study. *Behavior Modification*, 31(5), 543-568.
- Davis, R., & Jamieson, J. (2005). Assessing the functional nature of binge eating in the eating disorders. *Eating Behaviors*, 6(4), 345-354.

Engel, S. G., Wittrock, D. A., Crosby, R. D., Wonderlich, S. A., Mitchell, J. E. & Kolotkin, R. L. (2006), Development and psychometric validation of an eating disorder-specific health-related quality of life instrument. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 39, 62–71. doi: 10.1002/eat.20200

Fairburn, C. G. (2008). Cognitive behavior therapy and eating disorders *Cognitive behavior therapy and eating disorders* (pp. xii, 324). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Fairburn, C. G., & Beglin, S. J. (1994). Assessment of eating disorders: Interview or self-report questionnaire? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 16(4), 363-370.

Fairburn, C. G., Shafran, R., & Cooper, Z. (1999). A cognitive behavioural theory of anorexia nervosa. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 37(1), 1-13.

Fairburn CG, Walsh BT. Atypical eating disorders. In: Fairburn CG, Brownell KD, editors. *Eating disorders and obesity: a comprehensive handbook*. New York: Guilford; 2002. p. 171–7.

First, M., Spitzer, R., Gibbon, M., & Williams, J. (2002). *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV-TR Axis I Disorders, Research Version, Patient Edition (SCID-I/P)*. New York: Biometrics Research, New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Forman, E.M., Herbert, J.D., Juarascio, A.S., Yeomans, P.D., Zebell, J.A., Goetter, E.M., Moitra, E. (in press). The Drexel Defusion Scale: A new measure of experiential distancing. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*.

Forman, E. M., & Herbert, J. D. (2009). New directions in cognitive behavior therapy: Acceptance-based therapies. *O'Donohue, William T*, 77-101.

Forman, E.M., Chapman, J. E., Herbert, J.D., Goetter, E., Yuen, E.K., & Moitra, E. (2012). Using session-by-session measurement to compare mechanisms of action for acceptance and commitment therapy and cognitive therapy. *Behavior Therapy*. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2011.07.004

Forman, E. M., Herbert, J. D., Moitra, E., Yeomans, P. D., & Geller, P. A. (2007). A randomized controlled effectiveness trial of acceptance and commitment therapy and cognitive therapy for anxiety and depression. *Behavior Modification*, 31(6), 772-799.

Garner, D. M. (2004). *The Eating Disorder Inventory-3 Professional Manual*. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources Inc.

Gifford, E. V., Kohlenberg, B. S., Hayes, S. C., Antonuccio, D. O., Piasecki, M. M., Rasmussen-Hall, M. L., et al. (2004). Acceptance-Based Treatment for Smoking Cessation. *Behavior Therapy*, 35(4), 689-705.

Gilboa-Schechtman, E., Avnon, L., Zubery, E., & Jeczmiern, P. (2006). Emotional Processing in eating disorders: Specific impairment or general distress related deficiency? *Depression and Anxiety*, 23(6), 331-339.

Goldberg, D., Bridges, K., Duncan-Jones, P., & Grayson, D. (1988). Detecting anxiety and depression In general medical settings. *British Medical Journal*, 297(6653), 897-899.

- Gratz, K.L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26(1), 41-54. DOI: 10.1023/B:JOBA.0000007455.08539.94
- Gregg, J. A. (2004). *A randomized controlled effectiveness trial comparing patient education with and without acceptance and commitment therapy for type 2 diabetes self-management*. Gregg, Jennifer Ann: U Nevada, Reno, US.
- Guarda, A. S. (2008). Treatment of anorexia nervosa: Insights and obstacles. *Physiology & Behavior*, 94(1), 113-120.
- Harrison, A., Sullivan, S., Tchanturia, K., & Treasure, J. (2009). Emotion recognition and regulation in anorexia nervosa. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 16(4), 348-356.
- Hayes, S. C., Luoma, J. B., Bond, F. W., Masuda, A., & Lillis, J. (2006). Acceptance and commitment therapy: Model, processes and outcomes. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(1), 1-25.
- Hayes, S. C., Masuda, A., Bissett, R., Luoma, J., & Guerrero, L. (2004). DBT, FAR and ACT: How empirically oriented are the new behavior therapy technologies? *Behavior Therapy*, 35(1), 35-54.
- Hayes, S. C., & Pankey, J. (2002). Experiential avoidance, cognitive fusion, and an ACT approach to anorexia nervosa. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 9(3), 243-247.
- Heatherton, T. F., & Baumeister, R. F. (1991). Binge eating as escape from self-awareness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(1), 86-108.
- Heffner, M., & Eifert, G. H. (2004). *The Anorexia Workbook: How to Accept Yourself, Heal Your Suffering, and Reclaim Your Life*: New Harbinger Publications.
- Heffner, M., Sperry, J., Eifert, G. H., & Detweiler, M. (2002). Acceptance and commitment therapy in the treatment of an adolescent female with anorexia nervosa: A case example. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 9(3), 232-236.
- Herbert et al., (2010). Awareness, Acceptance, Defusion, & Psychopathology: Implications of Recent Data on the Deconstruction of Mindfulness. Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, November 2010.
- Herbert, J. D., Forman, E. M., & England, E. L. (2009). Psychological acceptance. *O'Donohue, William T*, 102-114.
- Herbert, J. D., Forman, E. M., & Moitra, E. (2008). *Defusion: Development of a New Measure and Potential Mediating Role*. Paper presented at the 42nd annual convention of the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies.
- Holm, J., Holm, L., Bech, P. (2001). Monitoring improvement using a patient-rated depression scale during treatment with anti-depressants in general practice: A validation study on the goldberg depression scale. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*, 19(4), 263-266. doi:10.1080/02813430152706819

Juarascio, A., Forman, E. M., & Herbert, J. D. (2010). Acceptance and commitment therapy versus cognitive therapy for the treatment of co-morbid eating pathology, *Behavior Modification* 34(2), 175-190.

Kaplan, A. S. (2002). Psychological treatments for anorexia nervosa: A review of published studies and promising new directions. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry / La Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*, 47(3), 235-242.

Kazdin, A.E., (2003). Psychotherapy for children and adolescents. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 253-276. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145105

Kendall, P.C., Marrs-Garcia, A., Nath, S.R., Sheldrick, R.C. (1999). Normative comparisons for the evaluation of clinical significance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(3), 285-299.

Keyser, J., Pastelak, N., Sharma, P., Choi, J., Bender, R., & Alloy, L. (2009). *Specificity of Emotion Awareness to Disordered Eating in Undergraduate Females* Paper presented at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies.

Keyser, J., Sharma, P., Pastelak, N., Wirth-Granlund, L., Testa, C., & Alloy, L. (2009). *Do Emotional Avoidance and Fear of Emotions Relate to Disordered Eating in Undergraduate Female*. Paper presented at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapy.

Kristeller, J. L., Baer, R. A., & Quillian-Wolever, R. (2006). Mindfulness-Based Approaches to Eating Disorders. In R. A. Baer (Ed.), *Mindfulness-based treatment approaches: Clinician's guide to evidence base and applications* (pp. 75-91). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Lappalainen, R., Lehtonen, T., Skarp, E., Taubert, E., Ojanen, M., & Hayes, S. C. (2007). The impact of CBT and ACT models using psychology trainee therapists: A preliminary controlled effectiveness trial. *Behavior Modification*, 31(4), 488-511.

Lowe, M., Davis, W., Annunziato, R., & Lucks, D. (2003). Inpatient treatment for eating disorders: Outcome at discharge and 3-month follow-up. *Eating Behaviors*, 4, 385-297.

Luce, K. H., & Crowther, J. H. (1999). The reliability of the Eating Disorder Examination--Self-Report Questionnaire Version (EDE-Q). *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 25(3), 349-351.

Macht, M. (2008). How emotions affect eating: A five-way model. *Appetite*, 50(1), 1-11.

Masuda, A., Price, M., Anderson, P.L., & Wendell, J.W. (2010). Disordered eating-related cognition and psychological flexibility as predictors of psychological health among college students. *Behavior Modification*, 34(1), 13-15. doi: 10.1177/0145445509351569

McCracken, L. M., & Eccleston, C. (2006). A comparison of the relative utility of coping and acceptance-based measures in a sample of chronic pain sufferers. *European Journal of Pain*, 10(1), 23-29.

McIntosh, V., Jordan, J., Carter, F., Luty, S., McKenzie, J., Bulik, C., et al. (2005). Three psychotherapies for anorexia nervosa: A randomized, controlled trial. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 741-747.

- Merwin, R., Baldwin, M., Dandeneau, S., Moskovich, A., Aronica, J., Bulik, C., et al. (in preparation). Selective Attention to Rejecting Facial Expressions in Anorexia Nervosa.
- Merwin, R., Timko, C. A., Moskovich, A., Konrad Ingle, K., Bulik, C., & Zucker, N. (in preparation). Psychological Inflexibility and Symptom Expression in Anorexia Nervosa.
- Merwin, R., & Wilson, K. (2009). Understanding and treating eating disorders: An ACT perspective. *Blackledge, J T*, 87-117.
- Merwin, R., Zucker, N., Lacy, J., & Elliot, C. (2010). Interoceptive awareness in eating disorders: Distinguishing lack of clarity from non-acceptance of internal experience. *Cognition and Emotion*, 24(5), 892-902.
- Mizes, J., & Arbitell, M. R. (1991). Bulimics' perceptions of emotional responding during binge-purge episodes. *Psychological Reports*, 69(2), 527-532.
- Mond, J., Hay, P., Rodgers, B., Owen, C., & Beumont, P. (2004a). Temporal stability of the Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 36(2), 195-203.
- Mond, J., Hay, P., Rodgers, B., Owen, C., & Beumont, P. (2004b). Validity of the Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire (EDE-Q) in screening for eating disorders in community samples. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 42(5), 551-567.
- Murphy, R., Straebl, S., Cooper, Z., & Fairburn, C.G. (2010). Cognitive behavioral therapy for eating disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 33, 611-627. doi:10.1016/j.psc.2010.04.004
- Orsillo, S. M., & Batten, S. V. (2002). ACT as treatment of a disorder of excessive control: Anorexia. [Comment/Reply]. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 9(3), 253-259.
- Paxton, S. J., & Diggins, J. (1997). Avoidance coping, binge eating, and depression: An examination of the escape theory of binge eating. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 22(1), 83-87.
- Pells, J. J. (2006). *The role of negative affect and emotional avoidance in the maintenance of binge eating disorder*. Pells, Jennifer J : U Maine, US.
- Powers, M. B., Zum Vorde Sive Vording, M. B., & Emmelkamp, P. M. (2009). Acceptance and commitment therapy: A meta-analytic review. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 78(2), 73-80.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879-891.
- Reichardt, C. S. (2005). Nonequivalent Group Design. *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*.
- Safer, D., Telch, C., & Chen, E. (2009). *Dialectical behavior therapy for binge eating and bulimia*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Schmidt, U., & Treasure, J. (2006). Anorexia nervosa: Valued and visible. A cognitive-interpersonal maintenance model and its implications for research and practice. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 45(3), 343-366.

Serpell, L., Treasure, J., Teasdale, J., & Sullivan, V. (1999). Anorexia nervosa: Friend or foe? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 25(2), 177-186.

Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 7(4), 422-445.

Sim, L., & Zeman, J. (2004). Emotion Awareness and Identification Skills in Adolescent Girls with Bulimia Nervosa. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33(4), 760-771.

Sorenson, M., & Mezo, P. G. (2009). *Is Mindfulness Differentially Associated With Disordered Eating Behaviors?* . Paper presented at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies.

Tiggemann, M., & Raven, M. (1998). Dimensions of control in bulimia and anorexia nervosa: Internal control, desire for control, or fear of losing self-control? *Eating Disorders: The Journal of Treatment & Prevention*, 6(1), 65-71.

Timko, C.A., Zucker, N., & Merwin, R. Acceptance-based separated family treatment (ASFT) for adolescents with anorexia nervosa: Preliminary outcomes. Poster session presented at the International Conference on Eating Disorders, Austin, TX.

Treasure, J., Schmidt, U., Troop, N., Tiller, J., Todd, G., Keilen, M., et al. (1994). First step in managing bulimia nervosa: controlled trial of therapeutic manual. *BMJ*, 16(5), 329-333.

Twohig, M. P., Hayes, S. C., & Masuda, A. (2006). Increasing Willingness to Experience Obsessions: Acceptance and Commitment Therapy as a Treatment for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Behavior Therapy*, 37(1), 3-13.

Vanderlinden, J. (2008). Many roads lead to Rome: Why does cognitive behavioural therapy remain unsuccessful for many eating disorder patients? *European Eating Disorders Review*, 16(5), 329-333.

Wade, T.D., Bergin, J.L., Martin, N.G., Gillespie, N.A., Fairburn, C.G. (2006). A transdiagnostic approach to understanding eating disorders. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 194(7):510-517.

Waller, D., Fairburn, C., McPherson, A., Kay, R., Lee, A., & Nowell, T. (1996). Treating bulimia in primary care: a pilot study. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 19(1), 99-103.

Walsh BT, Garner DM. Diagnostic issues; 1997. p. 25–33.

Wilson, G. T. (2005). Psychological Treatment Of Eating Disorders. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 1(1), 439-465.

Wilson, G. T., & Fairburn, C. (1993). Cognitive treatments for eating disorders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(2), 261-269.

Wilson, G. T., Grilo, C., & Vitousek, K. (2007). Psychological treatment of eating disorders. *American Psychologist*, 62(3), 199-216.

- Wilson, K., Sandoz, E., Kitchens, J., & Roberts, M. (in press). The Valued Living Questionnaire: Defining and measuring valued action within a behavioral framework. *The Psychological Record*.
- Wiseman, C.V., Sunday, S.R., Klapper, F., Harris, W.A., & Halmi, K.A. (2000). Changing patterns of hospitalization in eating disorder patients. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 30(1), 71-74. DOI: 10.1002/eat.1055
- Woods, D. W., Wetterneck, C. T., & Flessner, C. A. (2006). A controlled evaluation of acceptance and commitment therapy plus habit reversal for trichotillomania. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(5), 639-656.
- Zanarini, M. C., Skodol, A. E., Bender, D., Dolan, R., Sanislow, C., Schaefer, E., et al. (2000). The Collaborative Longitudinal Personality Disorders Study: Reliability of Axis I and II diagnoses. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 14(4), 291-299.
- Zonneville-Bender, M. J., van Goozen, S. H., Cohen-Kettenis, P. T., van Elburg, A., de Wildt, M., Stevelmans, E., et al. (2004). Emotional Functioning in Anorexia Nervosa Patients: Adolescents Compared to Adults. *Depression and Anxiety*, 19(1), 35-42.
- Zucker, N. L., Losh, M., Bulik, C. M., LaBar, K. S., Piven, J., & Pelphrey, K. A. (2007). Anorexia nervosa and autism spectrum disorders: Guided investigation of social cognitive endophenotypes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(6), 976-1006.

Table 1

Baseline and Post-treatment Characteristics of Sample and Results of Mixed Model ANOVAs across treatment completers.

Variable	Pre TAU		Pre ACT		Group differences		Post TAU		Post ACT		Interaction Effect			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	df	p	η^2_p
Outcome Measures														
EDE-Q Restraint	3.93	1.62	4.14	1.89	-0.59	.55	1.51	1.40	1.21	1.02	1.68	103	.19	.02
EDE-Q Eating Concerns	3.93	1.29	3.83	1.38	0.38	.70	2.20	1.24	1.78	1.21	1.35	103	.25	.01
EDE-Q Shape Concerns	4.94	1.31	4.88	1.30	0.25	.83	3.96	1.49	3.48	1.85	2.36	103	.09	.03
EDE-Q Weight Concerns	4.59	1.49	4.51	1.56	0.28	.77	3.65	1.67	3.10	1.76	2.68	103	.07	.03
EDE-Q Global Scores	4.40	1.20	4.34	1.28	0.25	.79	2.85	1.32	2.39	1.32	2.72	103	.07	.03
Percent of challenge food consumed	1.99	4.39	4.57	6.82	-1.92	.06	11.90	16.82	24.88	28.90	2.89	42	.09	.06
Baseline Characteristics														
BMI AN	17.38	1.93	17.00	1.97	0.72	.47	18.97	2.45	18.36	1.51	0.34	52	.56	<.01
BMI BN	23.17	5.09	27.27	10.01	-1.80	.08	23.34	4.57	27.33	9.43	0.23	49	.63	<.01
Age	25.94	8.25	27.32	10.01	-0.73	.46								
Age of Onset	15.78	4.79	16.95	5.94	-1.37	.29								
Previous Hospitalizations	0.92	2.07	1.53	2.43	-0.67	.17								
Process Variables														
DERS acceptance	18.97	6.72	19.90	6.66	-0.67	.51	15.69	6.62	16.48	6.47	0.68	69	.41	.01
DERS goals	17.39	3.63	18.29	3.47	-1.22	.22	15.86	3.77	15.94	4.64	0.19	69	.65	<.01
DERS impulsivity	17.05	4.43	19.01	5.14	-1.97	.05*	13.92	4.86	15.66	5.21	0.41	69	.52	<.01

ACT for ED 2

1
2

3 DERS	16.65	5.36	16.72	5.25	-0.06	.94	20.08	5.39	19.22	6.52	1.18	69	.28	.02
4 awareness														
5 DERS strategy	25.65	6.70	27.63	6.76	-1.42	.16	22.77	7.29	22.58	7.89	0.26	68	.61	<.01
6 DERS clarity	14.48	2.69	14.48	3.11	-0.01	.99	14.01	2.69	13.47	3.06	0.70	69	.79	<.01
7 DDS total	23.90	9.08	22.08	9.91	0.91	.37	27.13	12.09	27.64	9.24	0.43	69	.51	<.01
8 AAQ-II	32.98	8.76	34.74	9.05	-0.96	.34	28.72	11.06	20.79	7.93	3.15	68	.08	.04

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

For Peer Review

Table 2
Overall changes during treatment amongst treatment completers

	Pre-treatment		Post-treatment		F	df	p	η_p^2
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Outcome Measures								
EDE-Q Restraint	4.03	1.76	1.36	1.23	182.47	103	<.01	.64
EDE-Q Eating Concerns	3.88	1.33	1.99	1.24	178.76	103	<.01	.63
EDE-Q Shape Concerns	4.91	1.30	3.72	1.34	64.62	103	<.01	.39
EDE-Q Weight Concerns	4.55	1.52	3.38	1.73	59.94	103	<.01	.37
EDE-Q Global Scores	4.37	1.24	2.62	1.33	187.54	103	<.01	.65
Percent of challenge food consumed	3.25	5.80	18.26	24.18	28.95	42	<.01	.30
BMI BN	25.34	7.74	25.45	8.26	.78	50	.38	.02
BMI AN	17.20	1.94	18.68	2.07	61.61	53	<.01	.54
Process Variables								
DERS acceptance	19.11	6.42	15.89	6.34	16.10	69	<.01	.19
DERS goals	17.78	3.64	15.84	6.35	13.20	69	<.01	.16
DERS impulsivity	17.50	4.84	14.72	5.02	19.83	69	<.01	.23
DERS awareness	16.39	4.90	1.66	5.92	14.66	69	<.01	.17
DERS strategy	26.56	6.84	22.54	7.51	22.26	68	<.01	.24
DERS clarity	14.68	2.87	13.74	2.88	4.13	69	.02	.05
DDS total	22.50	8.86	27.34	10.75	22.55	69	<.01	.25
AAQ-II	33.84	8.76	29.77	9.59	18.96	68	<.01	.21

Figure 1


CONSORT flow-chart

Figure 2
Graph of EDE-Q Global Scores Across Treatment Conditions





Figure 3

Graph of Challenge Food Consumption Across Treatment Conditions (participants consuming < 21.34 at baseline).



Note. TAU = Treatment as Usual. ACT = Acceptance and Commitment Therapy.