



This is a repository copy of *Psychometric assessment of the short-form Child Perceptions Questionnaire: an international collaborative study.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/103602/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Thomson, W.M., Foster Page, L.A., Robinson, P.G. et al. (11 more authors) (2016) Psychometric assessment of the short-form Child Perceptions Questionnaire: an international collaborative study. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology*. ISSN 0301-5661

<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdoe.12248>

---

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Thomson WM, Foster Page LA, Robinson PG, Do LG, Traebert J, Mohamed AR, Turton BJ, McGrath C, Bekes K, Hirsch C, del Carmen Aguilar-Diaz F, Marshman Z, Benson PE, Baker SR. Psychometric assessment of the short-form Child Perceptions Questionnaire: an international collaborative study. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2016., which has been published in final form at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cdoe.12248/>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# Psychometric assessment of the short-form Child Perceptions Questionnaire: an international collaborative study

Thomson WM<sup>1</sup>, Foster Page LA<sup>1</sup>, Robinson PG<sup>2</sup>, Do LG<sup>3</sup>, Traebert J<sup>4</sup>, Mohamed AR<sup>5</sup>, Turton BJ<sup>6</sup>, McGrath C<sup>7</sup>, Bekes K<sup>8</sup>, Hirsch C<sup>9</sup>, del Carmen Aguilar-Diaz F<sup>10</sup>, Marshman Z<sup>11</sup>, Benson PE<sup>11</sup>, Baker SR<sup>11</sup>

1. Department of Oral Sciences, Sir John Walsh Research Institute, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Otago, New Zealand.
2. School of Oral and Dental Sciences, The University of Bristol, England, UK.
3. Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health, The University of Adelaide, Australia.
4. Postgraduate Program in Health Sciences, University of Southern Santa Catarina, Brazil.
5. Department of Dental Services, Ministry of Health, Brunei Darussalam.
6. Department of Dentistry, University of Puthisastra, Phnom Penh.
7. Periodontology & Public Health, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
8. Department of Paediatric Dentistry, University Dental Clinic, Medical University of Vienna, Austria.
9. Department of Paediatric Dentistry, University of Leipzig, Germany.
10. Department of Public Health, National Autonomous University of Mexico León Unit, León, Guanajuato, México.
11. School of Clinical Dentistry, University of Sheffield, England, UK.

**KEYWORDS:** Psychosocial aspects of oral health. Oral health related quality of life measures. Psychometric properties. Children. Child Perceptions Questionnaire

## **Abstract**

**Objective:** To examine the factor structure and other psychometric characteristics of the most commonly-used child oral-health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) measure (the 16-item short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>) in a large number of children (N = 5804) from different settings and who had a range of caries experience and associated impacts.

**Methods:** Secondary data analyses used subnational epidemiological samples of 11-to-14-year-olds in Australia (N = 372), New Zealand (three samples; 352, 202, 429), Brunei (423), Cambodia (244), Hong Kong (542), Malaysia (439), Thailand (220, 325), England (88, 374), Germany (1055), Mexico (335) and Brazil (404). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to examine the factor structure of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> across the combined sample and within four regions (Australia/NZ, Asia, UK/Europe, Latin America). Item impact and internal reliability analysis were also conducted.

**Results:** Caries experience varied, with mean DMFT scores ranging from 0.5 in the Malaysian sample to 3.4 in one New Zealand sample. Even more variation was noted in the proportion reporting only fair or poor oral health; this was highest in the Cambodian and Mexican samples, and lowest in the German sample and one New Zealand sample. One in 10 reported that their oral health had a marked impact on their life overall. The CFA across all samples revealed two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The first involved all items in the oral symptoms and functional limitations subscales; the second all emotional well-being and social well-being items. The first was designated the “Symptoms/function” subscale, and the second was designated the “Well-being” subscale. Cronbach’s alpha scores were 0.72 and 0.84 respectively. The Symptoms/function subscale contained more of the items with greater impact, with the item “Food stuck in between your teeth” having greatest impact; in the Well-being subscale, the “Felt shy or embarrassed” item had the greatest impact. Repeating the analyses by world region gave similar findings.

**Conclusion:** The CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> performed well cross-sectionally in the largest analysis of the scale in the literature to date, with robust and mostly consistent psychometric characteristics, albeit with two underlying factors (rather than the originally hypothesised four-factor structure). It appears to be a sound, robust measure which should be useful for research, practice and policy.

## Introduction

Oral-health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) is an increasingly important concept in dental health services research, and the last 25 years have witnessed a burgeoning of theoretical and empirical research on scales for use with adults. Work on child measures has been about a decade behind, but it is rapidly catching up, with the emergence of a number of child OHRQoL measures in recent years. These include the 37-item Child Perceptions Questionnaire (CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>)<sup>1</sup>, the 34-item Child Oral Health Impact Profile (COHIP)<sup>2</sup> and the eight-item Child Oral Impacts on Daily Performance scale (CHILD-OIDP)<sup>3</sup>.

The CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> (along with its short-form versions) remains the most commonly used instrument for measuring self-reported oral health in children<sup>4</sup>; to date, the original 2002 paper<sup>1</sup> has been cited 304 times<sup>1</sup>, with most of those citations being in reports from empirical studies. This measure has used items representing each of the domains of oral symptoms, functional limitations, emotional well-being, and social well-being. Subsequently, the development team published four short-form versions of the instrument, all of which had items covering each of those four domains or subscales<sup>5</sup>. Much of the recent published research has used the 16-item “impact” short-form (ISF) version of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>, developed by Jokovic et al (2006)<sup>4</sup> and first tested and validated epidemiologically in New Zealand<sup>6</sup>.

Factor analysis is an important step in construct validation for self-report scales<sup>7</sup> because it examines and confirms the underlying latent variables which the scale items are purported to represent. Interestingly, there was no mention of any such exploration of the data—or elucidation of the factor structure—in the original description<sup>1</sup> of the development of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>. It appears that the four domains were hypothetical, albeit underpinned by a considerable amount of qualitative preliminary research. Subsequent work with a sample of children in Hong Kong did confirm the underlying four-factor structure<sup>8</sup>, but the generalisability of those findings to other settings or cultures is unclear.

Accordingly, there is a need to examine and confirm (or indeed refute) the factor structure and other psychometric characteristics (validity and internal consistency reliability) of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> in representative samples of children from a number of settings. We aimed to

---

<sup>1</sup> Scopus; data accessed 16/2/16

undertake such analyses using data-sets from Oceania, Asia, Europe and Latin America. We hypothesised that the analyses would confirm the measure's original four-factor structure.

## **Methods**

Secondary data analyses were conducted on data from 5804 children using subnational samples of 11- to 14-year-olds in Australia, New Zealand (three samples), Brunei, Cambodia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand (two samples), England (two samples), Germany, Mexico and Brazil (details in Appendix 1). Data-sets were chosen pragmatically, based on the availability of data. All but the Cambodian and two England samples were representative. All studies had used either the 37-item<sup>1</sup> or the impact short-form 16-item<sup>5</sup> version of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>. Response options and scores for each item were: "Never" (scoring 0); "Once or twice" (1); "Sometimes" (2); "Often" (3); and "Every day or almost every day" (4). Two global questions on OHRQoL were also reported. First, participants were asked to rate the health of their teeth, lips, jaws and mouth; and second, they were asked how much their teeth, lips, jaw or mouth affects their life overall. Dental examinations were conducted and DMFT scores were calculated. Methodological details of each of the individual studies are presented in Appendix 1.

### Data analysis

Analyses were confined to the 16-item ISF version of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> because not all studies had used the full version (thus, scores could range from 0 to 64). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used in SPSS (version 21) to examine the factor structure (by principal components analysis with varimax rotation – chosen over other approaches because of its simplicity, accessibility and history of use in similar investigations) of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> across the combined sample and within four geographic regions. In undertaking the CFA, the proposed model was the accepted and commonly used four-factor one, involving the domains of oral symptoms (OS), functional limitations (FL), emotional well-being (EW) and social well-being (SW), and with four items loading on each<sup>5</sup>.

There were missing responses in the Hong Kong and German data-sets. In the former, there were 3 missing responses for the "bad breath" item, and all other items had complete data. In the German data-set, only three items had complete data; the remainder had between one and 13 missing responses, with 11 items having fewer than seven. We imputed missing values by

assigning the median value across all 16 items, doing this separately for the Hong Kong and German data-sets. Comparison of the CFA outcomes before and after undertaking the imputation revealed that there was no effect on the overall outcome, and that any differences observed were very minor (at the level of two to three decimal places in the factor loadings).

As a concurrent validity check, participants responded to the questions (a) “How much does the condition of your teeth, lips, jaws or mouth affect your life overall?” (scored on a 5-point ordinal scale ranging from ‘Excellent’ to ‘Poor’), and (b) “Would you say the health of your teeth, lips, jaws and mouth is: ‘Excellent’/‘Very good’/‘Good’/‘Fair’ /‘Poor’?”. Validity was deemed to be acceptable if there was an ascending gradient in mean CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> scores across those response categories.

## **Results**

Summary data on the characteristics of the various samples are presented in Table 1. Overall, just over half of the combined sample was female; ages ranged from 11 to 14 years, with an average of around 12. Just over half had had permanent dentition caries experience (1+ DMFT), but this varied considerably across the samples, being the lowest in the Australian sample and highest in the Mexican sample. Similar variation was observed with respect to mean DMFT scores across the samples: those were lowest in the Malaysian sample and highest in one of the New Zealand samples. Even more variation was noted in respect of the proportion reporting only fair or poor oral health; this was highest in the Cambodian and Mexican samples, and lowest in the German sample and the third New Zealand sample. One in 10 reported that their oral health had a marked impact on their life overall (that is, they responded ‘a lot’ or ‘very much’ to the first global item).

The correlation matrix for the 16 CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> items is presented in Table 2. Overall, there were higher correlations among the emotional well-being and social well-being items than among the oral symptoms and functional limitations items.

The outcome of the CFA is presented in Table 3. There were two identified factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The first involved all of the items in the oral symptoms and functional limitations subscales; the second involved all of the items in the emotional well-being and social well-being scales. After confirmation of their internal consistency reliability (reflected in Cronbach’s alpha scores of 0.72 and 0.84 respectively), the first was designated

the “Symptoms/function” subscale, and the second was designated the “Well-being” subscale.

Repeating the CFA separately for boys and girls resulted in very similar outcomes (see Appendix 2, Table A1). Repeating the CFA by region (Appendix 2, Table A2) gave largely consistent outcomes, save for the Mexico/Brazil region, where two of the items loaded more strongly on the other factor. The “Difficulty biting or chewing food...” item loaded more strongly on Factor 1 than on Factor 2, and the “Other children teased you or called you names” loaded more strongly on Factor 2 than on Factor 1.

The outcome of the item impact analysis is summarised in Table 4. The Symptoms/function subscale had more of the items with greater frequency of impact, and this was reflected in the lower mean rank across those items. Within that subscale, the item “Food stuck in between your teeth” had the highest impact score, and the “Difficulty saying any words” item the lowest. In the Well-being subscale, the greatest frequency of impact was seen with the “Felt shy or embarrassed” item, and the lowest was seen with the “Other children asked questions about teeth” item.

The demonstration of concurrent validity (whereby an instrument correlates well with a “gold standard” measure that has already been validated) requires ascending gradients to be observed in mean scale scores and impact prevalence rates (one or more impacts ‘fairly often’ or ‘very often’ were reported by 39.0% of participants overall) across the ordinal categories of the two global items which are usually used with the scale. This was largely the case (Table 5), although there were minor differences. For example, the ‘Very good’ category for the first question was problematic for some of the observed gradients, and the most severe category for the second global question had a lower mean score in the Australia/New Zealand sample.

## **Discussion**

This study set out to examine the factor structure and other psychometric characteristics of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> in a large data-set of over 5000 children comprising information from samples from a number of settings, and with a range of dental caries experience and associated impacts. The CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> was found to perform very well, with robust and mostly consistent

psychometric characteristics, albeit with two underlying factors rather than the originally hypothesised four-factor structure. Its internal consistency reliability and concurrent validity were acceptable.

It is appropriate first to consider the weaknesses and strengths of the study. The nature of the samples is a possible weakness, with all being subnational rather than nationally generalisable. Thus, any cross-national comparisons which might be made should be undertaken with a degree of caution. The small number of missing data items in the German and Hong Kong samples was less than ideal, but the missing data were confirmed not to have affected the overall findings. Another possible weakness is that the relatively low mean scores for those with 'Poor' self-reported oral health (such as the 17.7 in the overall sample) do suggest a floor effect which might compromise the measure's evaluative and discriminative utility in population-based samples but make it more useful perhaps in clinical samples; however, this remains to be explored. Moreover, there is always the possibility of subtle differences in meaning and interpretation having arisen from the translation of items, although it is to be hoped that this might be offset to a degree by the cross-cultural origins of the original item pool. The study's strengths include the large sample size, the concurrent collection of clinical measures, and the geographical and cultural diversity of the overall dataset.

Other than our confirmation of the measure's psychometric soundness, the most important finding was that the underlying structure of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> comprises two factors rather than the original four, with the oral symptoms and functional limitations items loading together on a single factor, and the emotional well-being and social well-being items doing the same. Somewhat to our relief, the items in the original four hypothesised factors corresponded well to the subsequent two factors, and so there is a reassuring degree of theoretical consistency in our findings. As mentioned above, factor analysis was not used in the development of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub><sup>1</sup>, with item impact analysis being preferred on the grounds that factor analysis may inadvertently exclude so-called "orphan" items which may be important to respondents<sup>ii</sup>. Thus, the originally hypothesised four domains were based upon a theoretical conceptual framework to which the constituent items were forced to fit. Later work confirmed the underlying four-factor structure in a Hong Kong sample<sup>8</sup>, but no further exploration of the

---

<sup>ii</sup> A Jokovic, personal communication to WMT, 31 October 2000



measure's factor structure has been reported. Accordingly, the current study's use of a diverse international data-set underlines the appropriateness of redesignating the two observed factors as the symptoms/function and well-being subscales. Of course, their use may require some re-analysis of previous data-sets—or the computation and reporting of two sets of subscale scores with more contemporary data—if historical comparisons are to be made. These are minor concerns, however, given the accessibility of analyses these days. Moreover, using two eight-item subscales rather than four four-item ones might ensure greater statistical power (and a lower likelihood of Type II error, especially where there are constraints on participant numbers), and the greater number of items allows finer discrimination<sup>7</sup>.

The item impact analysis was notable for the predominance of the symptoms/function items. This was somewhat surprising, and it can most likely be attributed to our use of epidemiological samples of children (with generally low disease levels) rather than purposive samples of (say) orthodontic patients or those with orofacial clefts. It might be expected that the well-being aspects would be more dominant in the latter two groups, as previously observed in the original validation study<sup>1</sup>, but this awaits empirical confirmation in larger samples.

The history of OHRQoL scales in dental research involves a well-trodden sequence<sup>9</sup>: initial conceptualisation and scale development; testing and validation in patient samples; epidemiological field-testing and validation in descriptive studies; development and testing of short-form versions; examination of the measure's responsiveness in longitudinal studies; and (it is hoped) the measure's routine use in everyday clinical practice. The concurrent development of competing measures also features strongly. While the exact sequence may vary, the overall progression of ideas and information capture is largely similar. At some point toward the end of this sequence, it is useful to take stock, to obtain an overview of the data and determine whether the measure continues to perform as originally designed. Accordingly, studies such as the current one are important because they can provide useful verification that a measure still meets the needs for which it was first developed. Confirmation of the scale's underlying factor structure and important psychometric properties provides further support for its ongoing utility in dental epidemiological and health services research, although there are insufficient longitudinal data available internationally to permit a similar examination of its responsiveness (and so the current study was a cross-sectional

assessment only). In conclusion, the short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> appears to be a sound, robust measure which should be useful for research, practice and policy.

### **Acknowledgments**

We thank the participants and the various funding bodies for their support for the data collection. Full details of funding are contained in the Appendix.

### **References**

1. Jokovic A, Locker D, Stephens M, Kenny D, Tompson B, Guyatt G. Validity and reliability of a questionnaire for measuring child oral-health-related quality of life. *J Dent Res* 2002;81:459-63.
2. Broder HL, McGrath C, Cisneros GJ. Questionnaire development: face validity and item impact testing of the child oral health impact profile. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2007;35(Suppl 1):8-19.
3. Gherunpong S, Tsakos G, Sheiham A. Developing and evaluating an oral health-related quality of life index for children; the CHILD-OIDP. *Community Dent Health* 2004;21: 161-169.
4. Gilchrist F, Rodd H, Deery C & Marshman Z (2014) Assessment of the quality of measures of child oral health-related quality of life. *BMC Oral Health* 14:40-40.
5. Jokovic A, Locker D, Guyatt G. Short forms of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire for 11–14-year-old children (CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>): Development and initial evaluation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2006;4:4 (doi 10.1186/1477-7525-4-4).
6. Foster Page LA, Thomson WM, Jokovic A, Locker D. Epidemiological evaluation of short-form versions of the Child Perception Questionnaire. *Eur J Oral Sci* 2008;116:538-44.
7. Fayers PM, Machin D. *Quality of life: assessment, analysis and interpretation*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2000 (page 33).
8. Lau AWH, Wong MCM, Lam KF, McGrath C. Confirmatory factor analysis on the health domains of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2009;37:163-170.
9. Guyatt GH, Feeny DH, Patrick DL. Measuring health-related quality of life. *Ann Int Med* 1993;118:622-629.

Table 1: Overview of the sociodemographic characteristics and oral health of the various samples (both individually and in aggregate; brackets contain percentages unless otherwise indicated)

Sample and region	Number	Mean age (sd; range)	Females	Prevalence of 1+ DMFT	Mean DMFT (sd; range)	Fair/poor oral health	Oral health has marked impact on life overall
<b>Oceania</b>	<b>1355</b>	<b>11.7 (0.9; 11 to 14)</b>	<b>655 (48.3)</b>	<b>768 (56.7)</b>	<b>1.7 (2.2; 0-13)</b>	<b>221 (16.3)</b>	<b>112 (8.3)</b>
New Zealand 1	352	11.0 (—; 11 to 11)	171 (48.6)	152 (43.2)	1.0 (1.6; 0-9)	79 (22.4)	33 (9.4)
New Zealand 2	202	11.0 (—; 11 to 11)	101 (50.0)	156 (77.2)	3.4 (3.0; 0-13)	42 (20.8)	19 (9.4)
New Zealand 3	429	12.2 (0.4; 11 to 13)	202 (47.1)	311 (72.5)	2.0 (2.0; 0-9)	49 (11.4)	31 (7.2)
Australia	372	12.3 (1.1; 11 to 14)	181 (48.7)	149 (20.1)	1.0 (1.7; 0-12)	51 (13.7)	29 (7.8)
<b>Asia</b>	<b>2193</b>	<b>11.7 (0.7; 11 to 14)</b>	<b>1104 (50.3)</b>	<b>1136 (51.8)</b>	<b>1.4 (1.9; 0-16)</b>	<b>1031 (47.0)</b>	<b>300 (13.7)</b>
Cambodia	244	12.5 (1.0; 11 to 14)	109 (44.7)	174 (71.3)	2.6 (2.6; 0-14)	213 (87.3)	50 (20.5)
Brunei	423	11.2 (0.4; 11 to 14)	217 (51.3)	265 (62.6)	2.0 (2.4; 0-16)	132 (31.2)	75 (17.7)
Hong Kong	542	12.0 (—; 12 to 12)	225 (41.5)	208 (38.4)	0.8 (1.3; 0-10)	286 (52.8)	132 (24.4)
Malaysia	439	12.0 (0.2; 12 to 13)	256 (58.3)	120 (27.3)	0.5 (1.0; 0-5)	99 (22.6)	28 (6.4)
Thailand 1	220	11.1 (0.2; 11 to 12)	114 (51.8)	127 (57.7)	1.2 (1.3; 0-6)	126 (57.3)	7 (3.2)
Thailand 2	325	11.1 (0.3; 11 to 14)	183 (56.3)	242 (74.5)	2.0 (1.8; 0-8)	175 (53.8)	8 (2.5)
<b>Europe</b>	<b>1517</b>	<b>12.1 (1.0; 11 to 14)</b>	<b>850 (56.0)</b>	<b>526 (34.7)</b>	<b>0.8 (1.5; 0-15)</b>	<b>175 (11.5)</b>	<b>103 (6.8)</b>
England 1	88	12.4 (1.1; 11 to 14)	41 (46.6)	30 (34.1)	1.2 (2.8; 0-15)	17 (19.3)	9 (10.2)
England 2	374	11.6 (0.5; 11 to 12)	252 (67.4)	133 (35.6)	0.7 (1.2; 0-5)	61 (16.3)	32 (8.6)
Germany	1055	12.3 (1.1; 11 to 14)	557 (52.8)	363 (34.4)	0.8 (1.5; 0-13)	97 (9.2)	62 (5.9)
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>12.6 (1.0; 11 to 14)</b>	<b>350 (47.4)</b>	<b>538 (72.8)</b>	<b>2.4 (2.4; 0-12)</b>	<b>445 (60.2)</b>	<b>74 (10.0)</b>
Mexico	335	12.8 (0.7; 12 to 14)	151 (45.1)	279 (83.3)	3.2 (2.5; 0-12)	244 (72.8)	38 (11.3)
Brazil	404	12.4 (1.1; 11 to 14)	199 (49.3)	259 (64.1)	1.8 (2.1; 0-12)	201 (49.8)	36 (8.9)
<b>All combined</b>	<b>5804</b>	<b>11.9 (0.9; 11 to 14)</b>	<b>2959 (51.0)</b>	<b>2968 (51.1)</b>	<b>1.4 (2.0; 0-16)</b>	<b>1872 (32.3)</b>	<b>589 (10.2)<sup>a</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>Data missing for 2 cases

Table 2: Correlation matrix for the 16 items

	Pain	Sores	Bad breath	Food stuck	Taken longer	Diff. chewing	Diff. saying	Hot/cold	Irritable	Shy/emb.	Others think	Upset	Avoid smiling	Argued	Teased	Questioned
Pain	1.00															
Sores	0.37	1.00														
Bad breath	0.24	0.20	1.00													
Food stuck	0.28	0.23	0.30	1.00												
Taken longer	0.27	0.19	0.19	0.20	1.00											
Diff. chewing	0.35	0.25	0.21	0.25	0.35	1.00										
Diff. saying	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.23	0.27	1.00									
Hot/cold	0.30	0.21	0.19	0.20	0.26	0.35	0.24	1.00								
Irritable	0.35	0.27	0.25	0.27	0.31	0.34	0.28	0.31	1.00							
Shy/emb.	0.28	0.18	0.28	0.23	0.31	0.30	0.26	0.30	0.51	1.00						
Others think	0.29	0.19	0.29	0.24	0.28	0.31	0.24	0.27	0.42	0.54	1.00					
Upset	0.31	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.29	0.32	0.27	0.27	0.54	0.58	0.49	1.00				
Avoid smiling	0.22	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.22	0.29	0.25	0.27	0.33	0.42	0.41	0.37	1.00			
Argued	0.22	0.14	0.20	0.18	0.25	0.22	0.18	0.20	0.38	0.37	0.32	0.41	0.26	1.00		
Teased	0.27	0.20	0.18	0.21	0.22	0.25	0.24	0.19	0.39	0.42	0.38	0.44	0.32	0.34	1.00	
Questioned	0.26	0.22	0.19	0.22	0.23	0.27	0.22	0.21	0.30	0.34	0.36	0.32	0.30	0.25	0.34	1.00

Table 3: Outcome of confirmatory factor analysis of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> (all samples combined; rotated solution)

Item	Factor loadings	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Pain in your teeth, lips, jaws or mouth	0.184	0.670
Sores in your mouth	0.032	0.652
Bad breath	0.194	0.460
Food stuck in between your teeth	0.136	0.560
Taken longer than others to eat a meal	0.299	0.450
Difficulty biting or chewing food...	0.262	0.594
Difficulty saying any words	0.259	0.433
Difficult to drink or eat hot or cold foods	0.235	0.516
Felt irritable or frustrated	0.618	0.356
Felt shy or embarrassed	0.765	0.202
Been concerned what other people think	0.685	0.243
Been upset	0.744	0.227
Avoided smiling or laughing	0.591	0.183
Argued with other children or your family	0.599	0.124
Other children teased you or called you names	0.640	0.165
Other children asked questions about teeth	0.463	0.297

<sup>d</sup>Factor 1 eigenvalue = 5.3, with 33.1% of the variance explained; Factor 2 eigenvalue = 1.3, with 7.9% of the variance explained; KMO = 0.93

Table 4: Item impact analysis for the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>, by subscale (all samples combined)

Item	Prevalence <sup>a</sup>	Mean <sup>b</sup>	Impact <sup>c</sup>	Rank overall <sup>d</sup>	Rank in domain	Original domain <sup>e</sup>
<b>Symptoms/function</b>						
Pain in your teeth, lips, jaws or mouth	24.6	2.2	54.1	4	3	Oral symptoms
Sores in your mouth	22.5	2.2	49.5	8	6	Oral symptoms
Bad breath	35.6	2.2	78.3	2	2	Oral symptoms
Food stuck in between your teeth	50.7	2.4	121.7	1	1	Oral symptoms
Taken longer than others to eat a meal	21.6	2.4	51.8	5	4	Functional limitation
Difficulty biting or chewing food...	17.3	2.4	41.5	12	7	Functional limitation
Difficulty saying any words	13.7	2.4	32.9	14	8	Functional limitation
Difficult to drink or eat hot or cold foods	21.0	2.4	50.4	7	5	Functional limitation
<b>Well-being</b>						
Felt irritable or frustrated	22.0	2.3	50.6	6	2	Emotional well-being
Felt shy or embarrassed	24.1	2.3	55.4	3	1	Emotional well-being
Been concerned what other people think	21.5	2.3	49.5	9	3	Emotional well-being
Been upset	20.3	2.3	46.7	10	4	Emotional well-being
Avoided smiling or laughing	13.4	2.4	32.2	15	7	Social well-being
Argued with other children or your family	17.5	2.4	42.0	11	5	Social well-being
Other children teased you or called you names	16.7	2.4	40.1	13	6	Social well-being
Other children asked questions about teeth	11.1	2.2	24.4	16	8	Social well-being

<sup>a</sup>Percentage reporting it 'Sometimes', 'Often', or 'Every day or almost every day'

<sup>b</sup>Mean item score among those reporting it 'Sometimes', 'Often', or 'Every day or almost every day'

<sup>c</sup>The product of the prevalence and the mean score

<sup>d</sup>Mean rank for the first block of items = 6.6 (53/8); for the second, it is 10.4 (83/8)

<sup>e</sup>In the previously-accepted four-factor structure for the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>

Table 5: Concurrent validity of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>, by region

	<b>Would you say the health of your teeth, lips, jaws and mouth is:</b>					Overall
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Combined sample (%)</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	8.1 (6.5)	7.9 (6.6)	10.6 (7.5)	13.2 (8.5)	17.7 (10.3) <sup>a</sup>	10.9 (8.1) <sup>a</sup>
Impact prevalence (%)	113 (28.8)	329 (25.7)	834 (36.9)	783 (49.7)	203 (68.4) <sup>a</sup>	2262 (39.0) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Oceania</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	6.7 (5.4)	7.5 (6.0)	10.6 (7.1)	15.1 (9.0)	18.5 (8.5) <sup>a</sup>	10.1 (7.6) <sup>a</sup>
Impact prevalence (%)	25 (20.8)	109 (26.6)	243 (40.2)	130 (65.0)	18 (85.7) <sup>a</sup>	525 (38.7) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Asia</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	12.9 (7.1)	12.7 (7.7)	13.3 (7.7)	13.8 (8.6)	16.9 (10.4) <sup>a</sup>	13.6 (8.3) <sup>a</sup>
Impact prevalence (%)	43 (40.6)	92 (33.2)	327 (42.0)	435 (50.1)	109 (66.9) <sup>a</sup>	1006 (45.9) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Europe</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	5.7 (5.2)	5.8 (5.3)	7.8 (6.4)	9.5 (8.4)	26.2 (9.2) <sup>a</sup>	7.2 (6.6) <sup>a</sup>
Impact prevalence (%)	33 (24.1)	116 (21.1)	200 (30.6)	73 (44.8)	12 (100.0) <sup>a</sup>	434 (28.6) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Latin America</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	7.0 (5.0)	7.0 (4.7)	9.1 (7.0)	12.2 (7.5)	17.8 (10.1) <sup>a</sup>	11.6 (8.1) <sup>a</sup>
Impact prevalence (%)	12 (41.4)	12 (29.3)	64 (28.6)	145 (42.2)	64 (63.4) <sup>a</sup>	297 (40.2) <sup>a</sup>
<b>How much does the condition of your teeth, lips, jaws and mouth affect your <u>life overall</u>?</b>						
	Not at all	Very little	Some	A lot	Very much	
<b>Combined sample (%)</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	8.5 (6.5)	10.5 (7.5)	12.9 (8.6)	13.1 (10.2)	12.5 (10.7) <sup>a</sup>	
Impact prevalence (%)	452 (29.7)	827 (38.9)	708 (45.2)	218 (46.6)	57 (47.1) <sup>a</sup>	
<b>Oceania</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	7.0 (5.3)	10.0 (6.6)	13.7 (8.3)	16.6 (11.2)	12.5 (10.1) <sup>a</sup>	
Impact prevalence (%)	115 (25.9)	211 (37.9)	133 (54.7)	49 (61.3)	17 (53.1) <sup>a</sup>	
<b>Asia</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	11.4 (7.3)	14.2 (7.8)	15.3 (8.2)	13.2 (10.2)	8.5 (8.8) <sup>a</sup>	
Impact prevalence (%)	202 (38.2)	305 (49.8)	373 (49.7)	112 (45.5)	14 (25.9) <sup>a</sup>	
<b>Europe</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	6.8 (5.6)	6.9 (6.1)	7.5 (7.1)	7.2 (7.8)	16.5 (10.7) <sup>a</sup>	
Impact prevalence (%)	88 (27.8)	180 (26.6)	131 (31.3)	21 (25.0)	14 (73.7) <sup>a</sup>	
<b>Latin America</b>						
Mean CPQ <sub>11-14</sub> (sd)	7.1 (5.6)	12.3 (7.5)	14.4 (8.6)	15.9 (8.6)	21.0 (11.5) <sup>a</sup>	
Impact prevalence (%)	47 (20.3)	131 (47.0)	71 (46.1)	36 (62.1)	12 (75.0) <sup>a</sup>	

<sup>a</sup>P<0.001

## Appendix 1: Details of the individual studies

### Australia

A cross-sectional epidemiological study was conducted involving a sample of 8-to-13-year-old schoolchildren in South Australia in 2002/03. All participants completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>. Information on dental caries experience was obtained from the School Dental Services electronic data management system. Ethical approval was given by The University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee. Further details of the study may be found in Do et al (2008)<sup>1</sup>.

### Brazil

In 2009, a cross-sectional study was conducted of 11-to-14-year-old schoolchildren in public and private schools from 13 municipalities in the Midwest Region of the Brazilian Southern State of Santa Catarina. All participants completed the short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using standard oral epidemiological methods<sup>2</sup> (World Health Organization, 1997). The reproducibility of clinical diagnosis was tested through duplicate examinations on 10% of the sample by each of the examiners; this showed kappa values (both intra- and inter-examiner) greater than 0.8, calculated on a tooth-by-tooth basis. The project obtained approval from the Ethics Committee of the Universidade do Oeste de Santa Catarina. Further details of the study may be found in Traebert et al (2012)<sup>3</sup>.

### Brunei

A cross-sectional epidemiological survey of Year-6 schoolchildren (aged 10 to 14) attending the nine Government primary schools in Brunei Zone II (Brunei-Muara district) was conducted in 2010. A Malay version of the short-form CPQ was derived through a forward–backward translation process, then piloted and adapted. All participants completed the Malay short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using the WHO protocol. For intra-examiner reliability, the intraclass correlation coefficient for DMFS was 0.99; for inter-examiner reliability, it was 0.99. Ethical approval was obtained from the Medical and Health Research and Ethics Committee of the Brunei Ministry of Health. Further details of the study may be found in Mohamad et al (2013)<sup>4</sup>.

### Cambodia

A consecutive clinical convenience sample was obtained of 8-to-14-year-old children who received treatment from One-2-One charitable trust's mobile dental clinics in four provinces (Battambang, Phnom Penh, Takeo, and Kampong Thom). All participants completed the short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using the WHO protocol. For intra-examiner reliability, the intraclass correlation co-efficient for DMFT was



0.98; for inter-examiner reliability, it was 0.98. Ethics approval was granted by the Universiti Malaya ethics committee. Further details of the study may be found in Turton et al (2015)<sup>5</sup>.

#### Germany

During the annual dental public health examinations conducted from September 2007 until April 2008, 1,061 11-14-year-old students were recruited from a midsize town in Germany (Wernigerode in Saxonia-Anhalt). All participants completed the German long-form version of the CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using the WHO protocol. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Leipzig. Further details of the study may be found in Bekes et al (2012)<sup>6</sup>.

#### Hong Kong

The data were collected in an oral health survey conducted by the Department of Health of the Hong Kong SAR Government in 2001 in order to assess the oral health of 12-year-old school children, using a random sample of 542 individuals. A total of 26 schools was systematically selected from all local secondary schools in a database provided by the Education Department, and 18 schools agreed to participate. All children had been born in 1988 and were 12 years old. A maximum of 50 children were selectively sampled from each of the selected schools. All participants completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined by a trained and calibrated examiner using the WHO survey protocol. For dental caries experience, the kappa value was 0.94. Further details of the study may be found in Lau et al (2009)<sup>7</sup>.

#### Malaysia

The data came from a cohort study of 12-13-year-old children examined at secondary schools in Banting district, Selangor. Multistage probability sampling was used to sample the children. All participants completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined by a trained and calibrated examiner using the WHO survey protocol. The project was approved by the University of Sheffield and the Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Office, Government of Malaysia. Further details of the study may be found in Baker et al (2010)<sup>8</sup>.

#### Mexico

A cross-sectional study was conducted of 12-to-14-year-old schoolchildren attending public schools in a peri-urban community in a low-income area. All participants completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>. The examiners used the WHO criteria and obtained a kappa of 0.87 for the presence of dental caries. Ethical approval was given by the Dental School of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Mexico City). Further details of the study may be found in del Carmen Aguilar-Diaz et al (2013)<sup>9</sup>.

### New Zealand 1

A cross-sectional epidemiological survey was conducted of all 12- and 13-year-old children attending intermediate schools in Dunedin in 2010. All participants completed the short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using the WHO protocol. For intra-examiner reliability, the intraclass correlation coefficient for DMFS was 0.96; for inter-examiner reliability, it was 0.97. Ethical approval was obtained from the Lower South Ethics Committee. Further details of the study may be found in Foster Page et al (2013)<sup>10</sup>.

### New Zealand 2

A cross-sectional epidemiological survey was conducted of all 12- and 13-year-old children attending schools in Northland in 2008. All participants completed the short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using the WHO protocol. For intra-examiner reliability, the intraclass correlation coefficient for DMFS was 1.00; for inter-examiner reliability, it was 0.98. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Northern Y Regional Ethics Committee. Further details of the study may be found in Foster Page et al (2008)<sup>11</sup>.

### New Zealand 3

A simple random sample of children in their 8<sup>th</sup> year of schooling (and who were enrolled with the Taranaki school dental service) was selected from the four intermediate schools and invited to participate in 2003. All participants completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined using the WHO protocol. For intra-examiner reliability, the intraclass correlation coefficient for DMFS was 0.94; for inter-examiner reliability, it was 0.93. Ethical approval was obtained from the Taranaki Ethics Committee. Further details of the study may be found in Foster Page et al (2005)<sup>12</sup>.

### Thailand 1

This was a sample of children (10-14 years) attending schools in Sriracha district, Chonburi province. Eight schools were purposively sampled to yield a range of social and economic groups and rural and urban locations. All children within the age range at each school were invited to participate and completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>; they were examined using the WHO protocol. The study was approved by the Ethical Review Committee for Research in Human Subjects: Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Further details of the study may be found in Gururatana et al (2014)<sup>13</sup>.

### Thailand 2

These data were obtained from the baseline sample in a randomised control trial involving children (10-12 years old) examined at randomly selected primary schools in Khonkaen. All children within the age range at each school were invited to participate and completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>; they were examined using the WHO protocol. The project was approved by the University of Sheffield and the Ethical Review Committee

for Research in Human Subjects, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Further details of the study may be found in Nammontri et al (2012)<sup>14</sup>.

#### United Kingdom 1

In Sheffield in 2003, a cross-sectional survey was conducted of children (11 and 14 years) attending for an examination at the orthodontic and paediatric dentistry clinics at a Dental Hospital and one General Dental Practice. A consecutive sample of children completed the long-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub> and were examined by calibrated examiners. Dental caries status was assessed at the D3 threshold using the British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry criteria (Pine et al, 1997). The project was approved by the South Sheffield Research Ethics Committee. Further details of the study may be found in Marshman et al (2005)<sup>15</sup>.

#### United Kingdom 2

Baseline data were obtained from a longitudinal epidemiological survey conducted in 2007-08 with a convenience sample of schoolchildren aged 11-12 years attending seven publicly-funded schools in England. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the School of Health and Related Research Ethics Committee on behalf of the University of Sheffield (February 2006), and permission was also obtained from the Local Education Authority of each area sampled. All participants completed the short-form CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>. Caries experience was assessed by two examiners who were BASCD trained and calibrated (Pine et al, 1997)<sup>16</sup>. Further details of the study may be found in Benson et al (2015)<sup>17</sup>.

### References

1. Do LG, Spencer AJ. Evaluation of oral health related quality of life questionnaires in a general child population. *Community Dent Health* 2008;25:205-10.
2. World Health Organization. *Oral health surveys: Basic Methods*. 4th edn. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1997.
3. Traebert J, Telino de Lacerda J, Foster Page LA, Thomson WM, Bortolluzzi M. Impact of traumatic dental injuries on the quality of life of school children. *J Dent Traumatol* 2011;28:423-8.
4. Mohamed AR, Thomson WM, Foster Page LA. Epidemiological validation of a Malay version of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire (CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>) in Brunei. *Brunei Darussalam J Health* 2013;5:56-69.
5. Turton BJ, Thomson WM, Foster Page LA, Saub R, Razak IA. Validation of an Oral Health-Related Quality of Life Measure for Cambodian Children. *Asia-Pacific J Public Health* 2015; 27:NP2339-NP2349.

6. Bekes K, John MT, Zyriax R, Schaller HG, Hirsch C: The German version of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire (CPQ-G11-14): translation process, reliability, and validity in the general population. *Clin Oral Invest* 2012;16:165–71.
7. Lau AWH, Wong MCM, Lam KF, McGrath C. Confirmatory factor analysis on the health domains of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2009;37:163-70.
8. Baker SR, Mat A, Robinson PG. What psychosocial factors influence adolescents' oral health? *J Dent Res*. 2010;89:1230-5.
9. del Carmen Aguilar-Diaz F, Foster Page LA, Thomson WM, Borges-Yanez SA. Differential item functioning of the Spanish version of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire. *J Invest Clin Dent* 2013;4:34-8.
10. Foster Page LA, Thomson WM, Ukra A, Farella M. Factors influencing adolescents' oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL). *Int J Paed Dent* 2013;23:415-23.
11. Foster Page LA, Thomson WM, Jokovic A, Locker D. Epidemiological evaluation of short-form versions of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire. *Euro J Oral Sci* 2008;116:538-44.
12. Foster Page LA, Thomson WM, Jokovic A, Locker D. Validation of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire (CPQ<sub>11-14</sub>). *J Dent Res* 2005;84:649-52.
13. Gururatana O, Baker SR, Robinson PG. Determinants of children's oral health related quality of life over time. *Community Dentistry Oral Epidemiol* 2014;42:206-15.
14. Nammontri O, Robinson PG, Baker, SR. Enhancing oral health via sense of coherence: a cluster randomized trial. *J Dent Res*. 2013;92:26-31.
15. Marshman Z, Rodd H, Stern M, Mitchell C, Locker D, Jokovic A, Robinson PG. An evaluation of the Child Perceptions Questionnaire in the UK. *Community Dent Health*. 2005;22:151-5.
16. Pine CM, Pitts NB, Nugent ZJ. British Association for the Study of Community Dentistry (BASCD) guidance on the statistical aspects of training and calibration of examiners for surveys of child dental health. A BASCD coordinated dental epidemiology programme quality standard. *Community Dent Health*. 1997;14(Suppl 1):18-29.
17. Benson PE, Da'as T, Johal A, Mandall NA, Williams AC, Baker SR, Marshman Z. Relationships between dental appearance, self-esteem, socio-economic status, and oral health-related quality of life in UK schoolchildren: A 3-year cohort study. *Eur J Orthod* 2015;37:481-90.