

VU Research Portal

Assessing health-related stigma and social participation

Stevelink, S.A.M.

2011

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Stevelink, S. A. M. (2011). *Assessing health-related stigma and social participation: research methods are coming of age.*

General rights

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

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

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

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

CHAPTER 3

Testing the psychometric properties of the Participation Scale in Eastern Nepal

S.A.M. Stevelink, W. H. van Brakel, N. Banstola, C.B. Terwee

Accepted for publication in adapted form in Quality of Life Research

“Experience without theory is blind, but theory without experience is mere intellectual play”
(Immanuel Kant).

Testing the psychometric properties of the Participation Scale in Eastern Nepal

Purpose To test the psychometric properties of the Participation Scale (P-scale) among people with various disabling conditions in Eastern Nepal.

Methods A sample of 153 individuals with disabling conditions was selected through systematic random sampling. The following psychometric properties were tested; structural validity (explanatory and confirmatory factor analyses), internal consistency, inter-tester reliability, construct validity and floor and ceiling effects.

Results The explanatory factor analysis indicated a two-factor structure ('work-related participation' and 'general participation'). The confirmatory factor analysis suggested good model fit. The whole scale explained 33.8% of the variance, whereas the subscales explained 62.8% and 89.0% of the variance, respectively. The internal consistency measured with Cronbach's alpha was 0.93 for the whole scale and 0.78 and 0.93 for the subscales. The inter-tester reliability coefficient was 0.90. All hypothesised correlations were as expected confirming the construct validity of the scale. No floor or ceiling effects were identified for the whole scale; only the subscale 'work-related participation' showed a ceiling effect.

Conclusion The results of the analyses suggest that the psychometric properties of the P-scale are sufficient in the context of Eastern Nepal. Use of the P-scale will require (re-) confirmation of its validity in each new cultural context.

Introduction

People with disabling conditions are often constrained in their performance of daily activities, and in their social life such as: relationships, education and community involvement (1). These restrictions in (social) participation are defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as 'problems an individual may experience in involvement in life situations' (2). The community can have a particularly negative effect on the participation of the person affected, as seen in stereotyping, isolation, and other forms of discriminatory practices of community members (2). Other causes of participation restriction include the absence of (assistive) equipment, policies or disease-related financial problems (1;3).

Several instruments have been developed to assess participation restrictions in people with a health condition. Examples include the Perceived Handicap Questionnaire (PHQ) (4), the London Handicap scale (LHS) (5;6), the Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique (CHART) (7;8), the Assessment of Life Habits (LIFE-H) (9-11), the Impact on Participation and Autonomy questionnaire (IPA) (12) and the Keele Assessment of Participation (KAP) (13). More recently the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) Measure of Activity and Participation – Screener (IMPACT-S) (14), the Participation Profile (PAR-PRO) (15), the Participation Survey/Mobility (PARTS-M) (16) and the Participation Measure for Post Acute Care (PM-PAC) (17) were developed.

All these instruments were developed in high income countries such as the United States, United Kingdom and the Netherlands. Ten years ago, a large rehabilitation field programme in Nepal identified a need for an instrument specifically suitable for use in low and middle income countries to evaluate the impact of its intervention (18). The Participation Scale (P-scale) was developed to meet this need (18).

The P-scale is based on the nine participation domains of the ICF: learning and applying knowledge, general tasks and demands, communication, mobility, self-care, domestic life, interpersonal interactions and relationships, major life areas and community, social and civic life (18;19). According to Noonan et al. the various instruments based on the ICF, that intend to measure social participation, cover 6 to 8 domains of the ICF (20). The P-scale covers 8 out of 9 domains. No item was included that covered the domain general tasks and demands. The instrument measures perceived participation restriction and intends to be generic in nature (18). Specific attention was paid to the cross-cultural validity of the scale, by developing the scale with an international team of experts, simultaneously in six languages and three countries (18). Another important strength of the

P-scale was the emphasis that the instrument should be suitable for use by staff who are not professional interviewers, because specialized staff is scarce in low-income countries (18).

Since the majority of these instruments were developed, important changes occurred in the field of health measurement. Psychometric methods used in instrument development and validation have evolved steadily, resulting in extensive quality criteria that provide indications for what constitute good measurement properties (21). This framework, proposed by Terwee et al. (2007) identified quality criteria for content, criterion and construct validity, internal consistency, agreement, reliability, responsiveness, floor and ceiling effects and interpretability and can be used to evaluate a validation study based on state of the art statistical methods (21).

We considered it useful to submit the instrument to this, more rigorous testing protocol, to see if it could comply to these new standards. In addition, we aimed to validate the P-scale in a new area that is culturally very different from the hill region in Western Nepal which was part of the original development study. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the P-scale among people with various disabling conditions in the Eastern Region of Nepal.

Materials and methods

The study population consisted of people with a disability (PWD) from 6 Village Development Committees (VDCs) in Morang District, Nepal, who participated previously in a large household survey conducted to assess the prevalence, pattern and severity of disabilities¹. Systematic random sampling was applied to select the PWD from 6 VDCs using lists of PWD per VDC as a sampling frame. PWD were considered for inclusion if they had been identified with a disability, were between 16-65 years of age and willing to provide verbal informed consent. PWD were excluded if they were diagnosed with a different health condition (e.g. tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS) that might influence their social participation. Furthermore, we aimed to concurrently select at least 50 controls, using a convenience sampling method. The purpose of the latter was to identify the cut-off point for 'normal' participation in the local population. Two trained and experienced native language-speaking interpreters conducted the data collection in the 6 VDCs.

The main instrument, the P-scale, is an 18-item scale (v.6.0) that was designed to assess participation restrictions in PWD (18). The scale is interviewer administered and has six potential response

¹ Netherlands Leprosy Relief (2009). Rapid Disability Appraisal Survey in six VDCs of Morang District in Nepal.

options; the same as everyone else (0 points), not relevant (0), no problem (1), small problem (2), medium problem (3) and large problem (5). The total score on the scale is the sum of the scores of the individual items (18). The higher the score, the higher the level of participation restriction (18). The adapted 14-item version of the Explanatory Model Interview Catalogue (EMIC) stigma scale was used to assess perceived stigma (22;23). This scale has a 4-point response format, ranging from yes (3), possible (2) and uncertain (1) to no (0). A sum score will be calculated whereby higher scores reflect greater levels of perceived stigma (22;23). The mean score of the respondent's completed items was assigned to missing items found in the EMIC and P-scale. To identify the self-reported health status of the PWD a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) for self-reported health was administered. Participants were asked to rate where their quality of life at that particular moment in time on a line with a range from 0 (bad) – 10 (good).

The P-scale and the EMIC showed good validity and reliability in previous studies in Nepal and India (18;24;25). Cronbach's alpha's for the P-scale ranged from 0.87–0.93 and for the EMIC from 0.76–0.88. For the P-scale, an Intra-Class Correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.83 was found for intra-tester reliability and 0.80 for inter-tester reliability (18;24;25). The weighted kappa for the EMIC was 0.70 (18;24;25). In addition to these three instruments, several socio-demographic variables were asked for such as age, religion, residency, income, education and a five level question related to self-reported health.

Approval for this study was obtained from the Nepal Health Research Council at Kathmandu.

Participants gave verbal informed consent.

Data management and analyses

The data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (v.16.0; Chicago, IL) and MPlus (v.6.11). The chi-square test was used to check for significant differences in the demographic variables between the controls and the PWD. A possible difference in age was investigated using linear regression analysis. A cut-off point for 'normal' participation was calculated, based on the 95th percentile score of the control population. Furthermore, item-total correlations were investigated and the mean and standard deviation (SD) of the items were calculated.

Psychometric properties were tested by using several statistical methods based on predefined quality criteria (21).

Internal consistency. Internal consistency was investigated by calculating the Cronbach's alpha. A Cronbach's alpha between ≥ 0.70 and ≤ 0.95 was classified as good (21).

The dimensionality of the P-scale was assessed using Confirmatory factor Analysis (CFA). Based on previous studies, we hypothesised that CFA would show one main factor, namely 'participation' (18). Indices of good fit such as the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Fit Index (TLI) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were assessed. Adequate cut-off levels for model fit were set at >0.95 for the TLI and CFI and <0.08 respectively for the RMSEA (26;27). A RMSEA score <0.06 indicates perfect model fit (27). Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to examine the dimensionality of the item set measuring the underlying construct, because the results suggested insufficient model fit (28;29). An oblique geomin rotation method was applied because we expected correlations between factors. Factors were extracted based on the break point of the successive eigenvalues identified in Scree Plot, item factor loadings ($r > 0.30$) and interpretability (28;29). CFA was used to confirm the findings of the EFA.

Construct validity. Construct validity was investigated by correlating the P-score with the perceived stigma score and the VAS self-reported health score, formulating hypotheses in advance. Construct validity was rated sufficient if at least 75% of the *a priori* formulated hypotheses were confirmed (21). In our study, only two hypotheses were formulated, so we took this to mean that both should be confirmed. The first hypothesis relates to research findings suggesting a reciprocal relationship between participation and perceived stigma. Second, we hypothesised an association between health status and participation. The higher the level of participation restrictions, the poorer the self-reported health status of the respondent. This resulted in the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: A moderately high positive correlation of 0.4 - 0.8, between the P-scale score and the EMIC Score (Pearson correlation).

Hypothesis 2: A moderately high negative correlation of -0.4 - -0.8, between the P-scale score and the self-reported health score (Pearson correlation).

Reliability. The test-retest reliability of the P-scale was assessed by calculating the $ICC_{\text{agreement}}$ (two-way random effects model). PWD were visited twice within two weeks by a different interviewer without knowledge about the scores obtained during the previous P-scale interview (21). The minimum acceptable level for test-retest reliability was set at 0.70 (21).

Floor or ceiling effects. The presence of floor and ceiling effects was defined as 15% or more of the respondents with the lowest, respectively, highest possible score on the P-scale (21).

Results

Participant characteristics

A total of 153 PWD and 55 controls were included in the study. Socio-demographic characteristics of the PWD and controls are described in Table 1. Significant differences were identified in educational status and (family) income, where PWD were more often illiterate compared to the control group ($p=0.039$) and earned less (respectively $p=0.001$ and $p<0.001$). Moreover, PWD rated their health status worse than the control group ($p<0.001$). The majority of the PWD were physically disabled (61%), followed by a vision-related (22%), mental (7%), multiple (7%), hearing (3%) and voice/speech-related disability (1%).

The PWDs scores on the P-scale ranged from 0–85. A median of 30, a mean of 36 and a standard deviation (SD) of 23 were found for the P-scale sum score. The 95th percentile of the P-score in our control sample was 12. PWD scoring higher than 12 were categorized as having a ‘participation restriction’.

Table 1: Characteristics of people with a disability (N=153) and the control group (N=55)

Variables	Controls (N=55)(%)	PWD (N=153) (%)	Total (N=208) (%)	Difference between groups (X² Test)
<i>Sex:</i>				NS
Male	33 (60.0)	90 (58.8)	123 (59.1)	
Female	22 (40.0)	63 (41.2)	85 (40.9)	
<i>Age:</i>				NS#
Mean (SD)	38.6(15.4)	38.6 (15.1)	38.6 (15.3)	
<i>Religion:</i>				NS
Hindu	53 (96.4)	144 (94.1)	197 (94.7)	
Muslim	1 (1.8)	6 (3.9)	7 (3.4)	
Other	1 (1.8)	3 (2.0)	4 (1.9)	
<i>Cast:</i>				NS
Brammin/Chettri Terai	5 (9.1)	12 (7.8)	17 (8.2)	
Brammin/Chettri Hill	13 (23.6)	35 (22.9)	48 (23.1)	
Dalit Terai	7 (12.7)	25 (16.3)	32 (15.4)	
Dalit Hill	1 (1.8)	3 (2.0)	4 (1.9)	
Ethnic Terai	26 (47.3)	61 (39.9)	87 (41.8)	
Ethnic Hill	1 (1.8)	9 (5.9)	10 (4.8)	
Other	2 (3.6)	8 (5.2)	10 (4.8)	
<i>Residency:</i>				NS
Urban	3 (5.5)	7 (4.6)	10 (4.8)	
Rural	52 (94.5)	146 (95.4)	198 (95.2)	

<i>Marital Status:</i>				NS
Never married	12 (21.8)	44 (28.8)	56 (26.9)	
Separated	1 (1.8)	5 (3.3)	6 (2.9)	
Married	42 (76.4)	93 (60.8)	135 (64.9)	
Widowed	0	11 (7.2)	11 (5.3)	
<i>Education:</i>				0.039
Literate	40 (72.7)	87 (56.9)	127 (61.1)	
Illiterate	15 (27.3)	66 (43.1)	81 (38.9)	
<i>Income:</i>				0.001
(rupees per month)				
No income	20 (36.4)	93 (60.8)	113 (54.3)	
Less than 3000	16 (29.1)	44 (28.8)	60 (28.8)	
3000-5000	12 (21.8)	12 (7.8)	24 (11.5)	
5001-10000	4 (7.3)	3 (2.0)	7 (3.4)	
10001-15000	1 (1.8)	0 (0)	1 (0.5)	
More than 15000	2 (3.6)	1 (0.7)	3 (1.4)	
<i>Income Family:</i>				< 0.001
(rupees per month)				
No income	1 (1.8)	2 (1.3)	3 (1.4)	
Less than 3000	8 (14.5)	56 (36.6)	64 (30.8)	
3000-5000	19 (34.5)	72 (47.1)	91 (43.8)	
5001-10000	13 (23.6)	16 (10.5)	29 (13.9)	
10001-15000	3 (5.5)	2 (1.3)	5 (2.4)	
More than 15000	3 (5.5)	4 (2.6)	7 (3.4)	
Not applicable	8 (14.5)	1 (0.7)	9 (4.3)	
<i>Health Rate:</i>				<0.001
Excellent	9 (16.4)	0 (0)	9 (4.3)	
Very good	9 (16.4)	2 (1.3)	11 (5.3)	
Good	23 (41.8)	34 (22.2)	57 (27.4)	
Fair	14 (25.5)	92 (60.1)	106 (51.0)	
Poor	0 (0.0)	25 (16.3)	25 (12.0)	

* Not Significant (NS) # independent samples t-test

The mean score of the items was 2.0 and ranged from 0.58 (SD 1.59) to 3.86 (SD 1.71). See Table 2 for a complete overview. The item-total correlations ranged from 0.30 for item 10 ('start or maintain a relationship') to 0.85 for item 6 ('take part in social activities').

Internal consistency

A Cronbach's alpha of 0.93 was found for the whole P-scale. However, CFA was unable to confirm the expected unidimensionality of the P-scale. The variance explained by the unidimensional model was 33.8%. The following fit indices were found: CFI 0.98, TLI 0.0.98 and the RMSEA 0.11. The CFI and TLI indicate adequate fit; however the RMSEA suggests insufficient fit between the unidimensional model and the observed data. Factor loadings for the one-factor CFA model can be found in Table 3.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics items (range 0-5)

Observed Variable	Mean	SD
N1 Work opportunity	3.86	1.71
N2 Work hard	3.85	1.68
N3 Contribute economically	3.61	1.80
N4 Visits outside village	1.88	1.99
N5 Festivals and rituals	1.60	1.96
N6 Recreational activities	1.77	1.98
N7 Socially active	2.11	1.94
N8 Respect	2.20	2.38
N9 Self care	1.18	2.06
N10 Relationship life partner	0.58	1.59
N11 Visits in community	1.66	1.99
N12 Mobility house village	1.44	1.91
N13 Visit public places	1.70	1.97
N14 Household work	1.75	2.08
N15 Opinion in discussion	0.63	1.51
N16 Helping others	1.91	2.01
N17 Meeting new people	2.01	2.08
N18 Confidence learning	2.20	2.14

Based on the results from the CFA we performed EFA without limiting the numbers of factors and an oblique geomin rotation. This revealed four factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1; 10.82, 1.77, 1.35 and 1.01. However, factor 4 explained only 5.5% of the variance and the items that made up factor 3 showed an adequate factor loading of at least $r = 0.32$ on factor 2 (30). Furthermore the Scree Plot supported an one or two factor-solution.

Table 3: 18-item CFA analysis (1 factor) (N=153)

Observed Variable	Factor 1
N1 Work opportunity	0.58
N2 Work hard	0.59
N3 Contribute economically	0.63
N4 Visits outside village	0.94
N5 Festivals and rituals	0.95
N6 Recreational activities	0.94
N7 Socially active	0.88
N8 Respect	0.65
N9 Self care	0.88
N10 Relationship life partner	0.48
N11 Visits in community	0.95
N12 Mobility house village	0.93
N13 Visit public places	0.97
N14 Household work	0.80
N15 Opinion in discussion	0.63
N16 Helping others	0.91
N17 Meeting new people	0.38
N18 Confidence learning	0.58

The two factors identified were named 'work-related participation' (items 1-3) and 'general participation' (items 4-18). We conducted CFA on the two factor model to check for model fit. The CFI and TLI were found both 0.99 and the RMSEA was 0.069. This indicates good model fit. The factors were moderately correlated ($r = 0.57$). The factor 'work-related participation' explained 62.8% of the variance, whereas the factor 'general participation' explained 89% of the variance. The factor loadings for the items were found to be adequate (Table 4). The internal consistency of both subscales was sufficient, $\alpha=0.78$ and $\alpha=0.93$, respectively.

Table 4: 18-item CFA analysis (2 factors) (N=153)

Observed Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2
N1 Work opportunity	0.79	
N2 Work hard	0.82	
N3 Contribute economically	0.91	
N4 Visits outside village		0.94
N5 Festivals and rituals		0.95
N6 Recreational activities		0.94
N7 Socially active		0.89
N8 Respect		0.66
N9 Self care		0.88
N10 Relationship life partner		0.48
N11 Visits in community		0.95
N12 Mobility house village		0.93
N13 Visit public places		0.97
N14 Household work		0.80
N15 Opinion in discussion		0.65
N16 Helping others		0.92
N17 Meeting new people		0.38
N18 Confidence learning		0.59

Construct validity

We found a moderately high positive correlation between the P-scale and the EMIC ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.001$) and a moderately high negative correlation between the P-scale and self-reported health scale ($r = -0.51$, $p < 0.001$). These correlations confirmed the *a priori* expectations.

Reliability

For the whole scale, test-retest reliability was high, with an ICC_{agreement} of 0.90 (CI 0.85 – 0.94).

Floor or ceiling effects

No floor or ceiling effects were identified for the whole scale. Only 2% of the respondents scored the lowest possible score of 0 and none of the PWD scored the highest possible score of 90 points on the P-scale. A summary of the findings for the whole scale and the subscales can be found in Table 5.

Table 5: Summary of the psychometric properties of the P-scale

Characteristic	Result
Number of respondents	153
Number of missing items	0
P-scale median score (range)	
<i>PWD</i>	30 (0-85); 95th percentile 80 (n = 153)
<i>Controls</i>	0 (0-15); 95th percentile 12 (n = 55)
Internal consistency	
<i>Confirmatory factor analysis</i>	Whole scale = 33.8% of variance; Factor 1 = 62.8% of variance; factor 2 = 89.0% of variance
<i>Correlation between factors</i>	$r = 0.57$
<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>	Whole scale $\alpha = 0.93$ Work-related participation $\alpha = 0.78$ General participation $\alpha = 0.93$
Construct validity	
<i>EMIC score</i>	$R = 0.55$ ($p < 0.001$, Pearson)
<i>Self-reported health score</i>	$R = -0.51$ ($p < 0.001$, Pearson)
Reliability	
<i>Test-retest reliability</i>	Whole scale ICC = 0.90 (CI = 0.85 – 0.94) Work-related participation ICC = 0.63 (CI = 0.46 – 0.76) General participation ICC = 0.90 (CI = 0.85 – 0.95) (n = 62; $\mu = 9.7$ days)
Floor and ceiling effects (points)	
<i>Floor effects</i>	Whole scale (0) = 2% Work-related participation (0) = 2.6% General participation (0) = 9.8%
<i>Ceiling effects</i>	Whole scale (90) = 0 Work-related participation (15) = 42.5% General participation (75) = 0

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the P-scale. The results show that the psychometric properties of the P-scale were good in the present context.

The initial development study of the P-scale took place in 6 language areas in three countries; Brazil, Nepal and India (18). The psychometric properties found are comparable to those in the initial development study. As described in the introduction, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 was found during the development study and ICCs of 0.80 and 0.83 for inter- and intra-interviewer reliability, respectively (18). Furthermore, construct validity was confirmed by expected significant correlations with expert opinions, self-assessment and impairment scores of the Eyes Hands Feet system (31). Other studies, such as in Nepal, Brazil and India, showed good results. Cronbach's alphas for the whole scale were excellent ($\alpha = 0.86-0.92$), as was inter-interviewer reliability (weighted kappa=0.80) (24;32;33). In addition, no floor or ceiling effects were reported (24).

In the development study, factor analysis suggested one factor, 'participation', which accounted for 90% of the variance (18). In the present study, we were unable to reconfirm this factor structure of the P-scale by applying CFA.

With EFA two factors were identified, named 'work-related participation' and 'general participation'. The two factor structure showed best model fit. Factor loadings were even higher compared to the one factor model, with Cronbach's alphas of 0.78 and 0.93, respectively. Several explanations are possible for this difference in factor structure. Local cultural differences may be present in the experience of participation restrictions, where work-related restrictions may play a different role in the current study population, than those included in the development study. Additionally, the difference may be due to the use of a different type of factor analysis in the two studies. The development study used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) without rotation, while the current study used EFA with oblique geomin rotation.

The two-factor structure found in this study may have certain implications for the use and statistical analysis of the P-scale. If the two-factor structure were to be confirmed, internal consistency and other psychometric properties, such as the ICCs and possible floor and ceiling effects, would have to be calculated per subscale as well as for the whole scale. This may also have implications for the score calculation of the P-scale. However, before changing the description of the structure of the scale, more research is required to determine the optimal factor structure in other, larger data sets. Currently, the scale is used as a general measure for the assessment of participation. If the work-related participation subscale will be replicated consistently, these three items may be used as a separate indicator of specific work-related problems. However, subscale analysis showed ceiling effects, therefore caution is necessary.

According to current international standards, our findings indicate that the P-scale has good measurement properties in South-East Nepal. However, it is important to note that these findings cannot be generalized to use of the scale in other countries. The P-scale has been used successfully in many other languages and only few problems have been reported (24;25;34-36). However, re-validation is necessary in every new cultural setting where the instrument is to be used.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to all of the participants who took part in the study, to the Netherlands Leprosy Relief Amsterdam, the Netherlands Leprosy Relief Biratnagar and to the research assistants. Without their help this study would not have been possible.

Reference List

- (1) Van Brakel WH. Measuring health-related stigma--a literature review. *Psychology Health and Medicine* 2006 August;11(3):307-34.
- (2) World Health Organization. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)*. Geneva: WHO; 2001.
- (3) Wee J, Lysaght R. Factors affecting measures of activities and participation in persons with mobility impairment. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2009;31(20):1633-42.
- (4) Kuptniratsaikul V, Smerasuta O, Klomjaiyen P. The perceived handicap questionnaire: a self perceived handicap measurement in patients with spinal cord injury. *Journal of the Medical Association Thailand* 2002 August;85(8):935-9.
- (5) Harwood RH, Rogers A, Dickinson E, Ebrahim S. Measuring handicap: the London Handicap scale, a new outcome measure for chronic disease. *Quality of Health Care* 1994 March;3(1):11-6.
- (6) Harwood RH, Ebrahim S. The London handicap scale. *Journal of Neurology Neurosurgery and Psychiatry* 2000 September;69(3):406.
- (7) Walker N, Mellick D, Brooks CA, Whiteneck GG. Measuring participation across impairment groups using the Craig Handicap Assessment Reporting Technique. *American Journal of Physical & Medical Rehabilitation* 2003 December;82(12):936-41.
- (8) Whiteneck GG, Charlifue SW, Gerhart KA, Overholser JD, Richardson GN. Quantifying handicap: a new measure of long-term rehabilitation outcomes. *Archives of Physical and Medical Rehabilitation* 1992 June;73(6):519-26.
- (9) Noreau L, Fougeyrollas P, Vincent C. The LIFE-H: Assessment of the quality of social participation. *Technology and Disability* 2002;14:113-8.
- (10) Noreau L, Desrosiers J, Robichaud L, Fougeyrollas P, Rochette A, Viscogliosi C. Measuring social participation: reliability of the LIFE-H in older adults with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2004 March 18;26(6):346-52.
- (11) Noreau L, Lepage C, Boissiere L, Picard R, Fougeyrollas P, Mathieu J et al. Measuring participation in children with disabilities using the Assessment of Life Habits. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology* 2007 September;49(9):666-71.
- (12) Cardol M, de Haan RJ, van den Bos GAM, de Jong BA, de Groot IJM. The development of a handicap assessment questionnaire: the Impact on Participation and Autonomy (IPA). *Clinical Rehabilitation* 1999 October;13(5):411-9.
- (13) Wilkie R, Peat G, Thomas E, Hooper H, Croft PR. The Keele Assessment of Participation: a new instrument to measure participation restriction in population studies. Combined qualitative

and quantitative examination of its psychometric properties. *Quality of Life Research* 2005 October;14(8):1889-99.

- (14) Post MW, de Witte LP, Reichrath E, Verdonschot MM, Wijnhuizen GJ, Perenboom RJ. Development and validation of IMPACT-S, an ICF-based questionnaire to measure activities and participation. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 2008 August;40(8):620-7.
- (15) Ostir GV, Granger CV, Black T, Roberts P, Burgos L, Martinkewiz P et al. Preliminary results for the PAR-PRO: a measure of home and community participation. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2006 August;87(8):1043-51.
- (16) Gray DB, Hollingsworth HH, Stark SL, Morgan KA. Participation survey/mobility: psychometric properties of a measure of participation for people with mobility impairments and limitations. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2006 February;87(2):189-97.
- (17) Gandek B, Sinclair SJ, Jette AM, Ware JE, Jr. Development and initial psychometric evaluation of the participation measure for post-acute care (PM-PAC). *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation* 2007 January;86(1):57-71.
- (18) Van Brakel WH, Anderson AM, Mutatkar RK, Bakirtzief Z, Nicholls PG, Raju MS et al. The Participation scale: Measuring a key concept in public health. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2006 February;28(4):193-203.
- (19) World Health Organization. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)*. Geneva: WHO; 2001.
- (20) Noonan VK, Kopec JA, Noreau L, Singer J, Chan A, Masse LC et al. Comparing the content of participation instruments using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2009 November 13;7.
- (21) Terwee CB, Bot SDM, De Boer MR, van der Windt DAWM, Knol DL, Dekker J et al. Quality criteria were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2007 January;60(1):34-42.
- (22) Weiss M. Explanatory Model Interview Catalogue (EMIC): Framework for comparative study of illness. *Transcultural Psychiatry* 1997;34(2):235-63.
- (23) Weiss MG, Doongaji DR, Siddhartha S, Wypij D, Pathare S, Bhatawdekar M et al. The Explanatory Model Interview Catalog (Emic) - Contribution to cross-cultural research methods from a study of leprosy and mental-health. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 1992 June;160:819-30.
- (24) Rensen C, Bandyopadhyay S, Gopal PK, Van Brakel WH. Measuring leprosy-related stigma - a pilot study to validate a toolkit of instruments. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 2010 August 7;33(9):711-9.

- (25) Stevelink SAM, Van Brakel WH, Augustine V. Stigma and social participation in Southern India: Differences and commonalities among persons affected by leprosy and persons living with HIV/AIDS. *Psychology Health and Medicine* 2011 February 28;1-13.
- (26) Hu LT, Bentler PM. Cut-off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structure Equation Modeling* 1999;(6):1-55.
- (27) Schreiber JB, Nora A, Stage FK, Barlow EA, King J. Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *Journal of Educational Research* 2006 July;99(6):323-37.
- (28) De Vet HCW, Ader HJ, Terwee CB, Pouwer F. Are factor analytical techniques used appropriately in the validation of health status questionnaires? A systematic review on the quality of factor analysis of the SF-36 - Response. *Quality of Life Research* 2005 June;14(5):1223-4.
- (29) Floyd FJ, Widaman KF. Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment* 1995 September;7(3):286-99.
- (30) Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 4th ed. Needham Heights, MA; 2001.
- (31) Brandsma JW, Van Brakel WH. WHO disability grading: operational definitions. *Leprosy Review* 2003 December;74(4):366-73.
- (32) Cross H, Choudhary R. STEP: an intervention to address the issue of stigma related to leprosy in Southern Nepal. *Leprosy Review* 2005 December;76(4):316-24.
- (33) Nicholls PG, Bakirtzief Z, Van Brakel WH, Das-Pattanaya RK, Raju MS, Norman G et al. Risk factors for participation restriction in leprosy and development of a screening tool to identify individuals at risk. *Leprosy Review* 2005 December;76(4):305-15.
- (34) Brouwers C, Van Brakel WH, Cornielje H, Pokhrel P, Dhakal KP, Banstola N. Quality of life, perceived stigma, activity and participation of people with leprosy-related disabilities in south-east Nepal. *Disability, CBR and inclusive development* 2011;22(1):16-34.
- (35) Ebenso B, Fashona A, Ayuba M, Idah M, Adeyemi G, S-Fada S. Impact of socio-economic rehabilitation on leprosy stigma in Northern Nigeria: findings of a retrospective study. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal* 2007;18(2):98-119.
- (36) Nardi SMT, Paschoal JAA, Zanetta DMT. Social participation of people affected by leprosy after discontinuation of multidrug therapy. *Leprosy Review* 2011;82:55-64.