



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Research in Developmental Disabilities



# Psychometric properties of the *DCDDaily-Q*: A new parental questionnaire on children's performance in activities of daily living

Berdien W. van der Linde<sup>a,\*</sup>, Jaap J. van Netten<sup>b</sup>, Bert (E) Otten<sup>a</sup>,  
Klaas Postema<sup>c</sup>, Reint H. Geuze<sup>d</sup>, Marina M. Schoemaker<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Center for Human Movement Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> Department of Surgery, Hospital Group Twente, Almelo, The Netherlands

<sup>c</sup> Department for Rehabilitation Medicine, Center for Rehabilitation, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

<sup>d</sup> Department of Clinical and Developmental Neuropsychology, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 6 December 2013

Received in revised form 26 February 2014

Accepted 6 March 2014

Available online xxx

#### Keywords:

Developmental coordination disorder

Activities of daily living

Children

Parental questionnaire

Reliability

Validity

### ABSTRACT

Difficulties in the performance of activities of daily living (ADL) are a key feature of developmental coordination disorder (DCD). The *DCDDaily-Q* was developed to address children's motor performance in a comprehensive range ADL. The aim of this study was to investigate the psychometric properties of this parental questionnaire. Parents of 218 five to eight year-old children (DCD group:  $N=25$ ; reference group:  $N=193$ ) completed the research version of the new *DCDDaily-Q* and the *Movement Assessment Battery for Children-2 (MABC2) Checklist* and *Developmental Coordination Disorder Questionnaire (DCDQ)*. Children were assessed with the *MABC2* and *DCDDaily*. Item reduction analyses were performed and reliability (internal consistency and factor structure) and concurrent, discriminant, and incremental validity of the *DCDDaily-Q* were investigated. The final version of the *DCDDaily-Q* comprises 23 items that cover three underlying factors and shows good internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha > .80$ ). Moderate correlations were found between the *DCDDaily-Q* and the other instruments used ( $p < .001$  for the reference group;  $p > .05$  for the DCD group). Discriminant validity of the *DCDDaily-Q* was good for *DCDDaily-Q* total scores ( $p < .001$ ) and all 23 item scores ( $p < .01$ ), indicating poorer performance in the DCD group. Sensitivity (88%) and specificity (92%) were good. The *DCDDaily-Q* better predicted DCD than currently used questionnaires ( $R^2 = .88$ ). In conclusion, the *DCDDaily-Q* is a valid and reliable questionnaire to address children's ADL performance.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Children with developmental coordination disorder (DCD) experience motor difficulties in a broad range of activities of daily living (ADL), such as mobility, personal hygiene, feeding, and dressing; handwriting and doing craftwork; ball skills and

\* Corresponding author at: Center for Human Movement Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, PO Box 196, 9700 AD Groningen, The Netherlands. Tel.: +31 6 48274325; fax: +31 50 363 3150.

E-mail addresses: [B.W.van.der.Linde@umcg.nl](mailto:B.W.van.der.Linde@umcg.nl), [berdienwillemijn@hotmail.com](mailto:berdienwillemijn@hotmail.com) (B.W. van der Linde), [Jv.Netten@zgt.nl](mailto:Jv.Netten@zgt.nl) (J.J. van Netten), [Egbert.Otten@umcg.nl](mailto:Egbert.Otten@umcg.nl) (B.E. Otten), [K.Postema@umcg.nl](mailto:K.Postema@umcg.nl) (K. Postema), [R.H.Geuze@rug.nl](mailto:R.H.Geuze@rug.nl) (R.H. Geuze), [M.M.Schoemaker@umcg.nl](mailto:M.M.Schoemaker@umcg.nl) (M.M. Schoemaker).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.03.008>

0891-4222/© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

riding a bike (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Blank, Smits-Engelsman, Polatajko, & Wilson, 2012; Geuze, 2005; May-Benson, Ingolia, & Koomar, 2002). Moreover, due to their motor difficulties in ADL, children's participation may be restricted, and psycho-social consequences may arise, such as low self-esteem and social exclusion (Geuze, 2007; May-Benson et al., 2002). The great impact of DCD on children's daily lives necessitates proper assessment of ADL, to support diagnosis and intervention, in order to limit the consequences of the disorder (Larkin & Rose, 2005; Sugden, 2006).

For optimal insight into children's daily functioning, ADL assessment should address both children's capacity and performance in ADL (Holsbeeke, Ketelaar, Schoemaker, & Gorter, 2009; World Health Organization, 2007). Capacity in ADL, as assessed with a standardized clinical test, reflects what a child is capable of in a standardized environment, i.e. what a child can do (Holsbeeke et al., 2009; World Health Organization, 2007). Performance, assessed with a parental or teacher questionnaire, addresses the child's daily life performance, i.e. what a child actually does during everyday life (Green et al., 2005; Holsbeeke et al., 2009; World Health Organization, 2007). Both are of interest, as what children are able to do in a standardized test does not always reflect what they do in daily life according to parents or teachers (Holsbeeke et al., 2009; World Health Organization, 2007). For example, in clinical assessment, children might perform worse than during daily life due to the pressure they feel, or better, due to their focussed attention and the guidance of the assessor. Questionnaires on the other hand, may be subjective, although parents and teachers provide a valuable source of information (Glascoc, 2001; Green et al., 2005). A combination of assessment tools is preferred to provide a more complete representation of children's difficulties (Larkin & Rose, 2005; Wilson, 2005). The combination of a standardized clinical test and a questionnaire holds another advantage, as ADL may be addressed with questionnaires that are difficult to include in clinical assessments, such as swimming or riding a bike. The assessment of a comprehensive range of ADL is particularly important in children with DCD, as it is a heterogeneous disorder that is represented by a wide range of variation in everyday functioning (Cermak, Gubbay, & Larkin, 2002).

As comprehensive assessment of ADL was lacking for children with (or suspected to have) DCD, the *DCDDaily* and *DCDDaily-Q* were developed (Blank et al., 2012; Van der Linde et al., 2013; Van der Linde et al., in press). With the *DCDDaily*, professionals are enabled to assess children's capacity in ADL in an objective and standardized way (Van der Linde et al., 2013). The *DCDDaily-Q* is a parental questionnaire to address children's performance in ADL. Together, the instruments may provide complete assessment of ADL as recommended in the International Practice Guideline for DCD (Blank et al., 2012). The current study presents the *DCDDaily-Q*. The *DCDDaily-Q* is the first questionnaire (I) to address the broad range of ADL that children with DCD face trouble with according to the literature, (II) covering the three domains of ADL relevant for children: "self-care and self-maintenance", "productivity and schoolwork", and "leisure and play" (American Occupational Therapy Association, 1994; Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists, 1991; Cermak et al., 2002; Geuze, 2005; May-Benson et al., 2002; Reed & Sanderson, 1999; Sugden, 2006). The aim of this study is to investigate the psychometric properties of the *DCDDaily-Q*.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Participants

Two groups of five to eight year old children were included in this study, a DCD group ( $n = 25$ ; 21 boys; mean age in years [SD] = 6.8 [1]) and a normative reference group ( $n = 193$ ; 90 boys; mean age [SD] = 6.5 [1]; see Table 1 for a complete description of the sample).

All children in the DCD group were referred to a rehabilitation centre or physical therapy centre in the Netherlands and diagnosed by a medical doctor, according to the diagnostic criteria for DCD operationalized in the International Clinical Practice Guideline for DCD (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Blank et al., 2012). The reference group comprised a sample of the Dutch population of five to eight year old children, selected from ten mainstream primary schools throughout the Netherlands. Schools were selected from various geographic locations, accounting for possible differences between larger cities and smaller villages. From the participating schools, all children aged five to eight years were included, with no exclusion criteria applied.

As a control group for validity analysis, a third group was composed from children in the reference group to enable comparison of children with DCD and typically developing children, i.e. without any known clinical condition. First, children in the reference group were preliminary selected for the control group when they had no known clinical condition such as uncorrected visual problems, and were not at risk for DCD (a score equal to or lower than the 16th percentile on the *Movement Assessment Battery for Children-2 [MABC2] Test*; Henderson, Sugden, & Barnett, 2007). Second, from this preliminary selection, children were randomly selected, blinded for outcomes, to match for age (within one year) and gender with the DCD group ( $n = 25$ ).

### 2.2. Instruments

#### 2.2.1. *DCDDaily* and *DCDDaily-Q*

The design of the *DCDDaily* and *DCDDaily-Q* comprised four phases (extensively described in the article on the design of the *DCDDaily* [Van der Linde et al., 2013]): (I) description of a theoretical model; (II) setting specifications for the instruments to fulfil, of which the following specifications were applicable to the questionnaire: "encompassing the domains of ADL relevant for children" and "actual daily activities for children five to eight years of age"; (III) literature study and expert interviews in order to select possible items for inclusion; (IV) expert meeting to discuss the list of relevant items. A limited

**Table 1**

Age, gender, mean MABC2 test percentile scores, mean *DCDDaily* total scores, mean *DCDDaily-Q* total scores, mean MABC2 checklist total scores, and mean DCDQ total scores, for all groups.

	N	Male: female	MABC2 test % mean (SD; range)	<i>DCDDaily</i> mean (SD; range)	<i>DCDDaily-Q</i> mean (SD; range)	MABC2 checklist mean <sup>a</sup> (SD; range)	DCDQ mean <sup>a</sup> (SD; range)
Reference group	193	90:103	47 (28; .5–99)	23 (4; 18–39)	31 (6; 23–48)	4 (5; 0–20), q = 186	63 (10; 21–75), q = 192
Age 5	41	23:18	40 (26; .5–98)	27 (4; 21–35)	35 (5; 26–46)	6 (5; 0–17)	59 (11; 21–74)
Age 6	63	26:37	46 (29; 1–99)	24 (4; 18–39)	31 (6; 23–48)	4 (5; 0–20)	63 (9; 30–75)
Age 7	51	22:29	50 (28; .5–98)	21 (2; 18–28)	29 (4; 23–37)	3 (4; 0–15)	66 (8; 45–75)
Age 8	38	19:19	53 (30; 5–95)	21 (3; 18–29)	28 (5; 23–44)	3 (5; 0–20)	64 (11; 37–75)
DCD group	25	21:4	6 (6; .1–16)	30 (6; 22–43)	46 (7; 28–60)	22 (13; 0–51), q = 23	41 (16; 19–71), q = 21
Age 5	4	4:0	5 (3; 1–9)	38 (6; 30–43)	44 (5; 40–51)	14 (7; 7–23)	59 (7; 52–66)
Age 6	5	5:0	6 (6; .5–16)	33 (4; 30–40)	46 (7; 35–55)	22 (11; 6–36)	39 (14; 22–59)
Age 7	9	7:2	9 (6; 2–16)	28 (4; 24–37)	48 (7; 38–60)	24 (15; 0–44)	37 (17; 19–71)
Age 8	7	5:2	1 (2; .1–5)	27 (4; 22–32)	44 (8; 28–51)	25 (16; 12–51)	38 (16; 19–61)
Control group	25	21:4	55 (27; 25–99)	24 (4; 19–34)	30 (5; 23–40)	3 (5; 0–20), q = 25	63 (10; 43–75), q = 25
Age 5	4	4:0	38 (18; 25–63)	30 (5; 23–34)	34 (3; 31–38)	5 (6; 0–13)	63 (12; 46–71)
Age 6	5	5:0	43 (19; 25–63)	26 (2; 25–30)	34 (7; 25–40)	8 (9; 0–20)	59 (10; 46–70)
Age 7	9	7:2	68 (28; 25–99)	22 (3; 19–27)	28 (3; 23–33)	2 (3; 0–8)	66 (7; 57–75)
Age 8	7	5:2	57 (28; 25–91)	21 (1; 20–22)	27 (5; 24–36)	1 (2; 0–4)	63 (12; 43–75)

Note: MABC2 test % = movement assessment battery for children-2 percentile score; *DCDDaily* = *DCDDaily* total score; *DCDDaily-Q* = *DCDDaily-Q* total score – final version; MABC2 checklist = movement assessment battery for children-2 checklist total score; DCDQ = developmental coordination disorder questionnaire total score.

<sup>a</sup> q = the number of questionnaires completed per group.

but broad range of ADL was included in the *DCDDaily*; a more complete range of ADL was included in the *research version* of the *DCDDaily-Q* (see Table 2 and Appendix 1). Subsequently, as described in the current study, the number of items of the *research version* of the *DCDDaily-Q* was reduced, and the psychometric properties of the *final version* were investigated.

The *DCDDaily-Q* is a parental questionnaire to address children’s performance in a broad range of ADL, designed to be completed by parents of five to eight year old children. An overview of the items of the *DCDDaily-Q* is provided in Table 2 and Appendix 1. Parents rate their child’s performance on a three-point scale for each item (1 = good, 2 = medium, 3 = poor). The *DCDDaily-Q* total score is the sum of the 23 item scores, ranging from 23 (good) to 69 (poor). The questionnaire was designed such that each item can be marked “good” when the child usually performs the activity without trouble, and “poor” when the

**Table 2**

Summary of the principal component analysis of the *DCDDaily-Q*.

	Rotated factor loadings		
	Fine motor activities	Self-care and self-maintenance	Gross motor playing activities
1. Buttering bread	.37	<b>.47</b>	.21
2. Cutting bread with a knife	.21	<b>.46</b>	.39
3. Pouring a drink	.07	<b>.60</b>	.22
4. Unwrapping package	.21	<b>.45</b>	.42
5. Spoon use	.26	<b>.59</b>	.12
6. Washing hands	.19	<b>.62</b>	.07
7. Drying after a shower	.11	<b>.62</b>	.08
8. Brushing teeth	.05	<b>.69</b>	.25
9. Using keys	.19	<b>.51</b>	.29
10. Putting on socks	.43	<b>.44</b>	.06
11. Writing	<b>.66</b>	.07	.28
12. Glueing paper	<b>.70</b>	.24	.15
13. Folding a Jacobs ladder <sup>a</sup>	<b>.80</b>	.25	.15
14. Colouring	<b>.78</b>	.03	.22
15. Cutting with scissors	<b>.71</b>	.27	.21
16. Constructional play	<b>.42</b>	.24	.11
17. Using pawns	<b>.46</b>	.17	.44
18. Hopping in squares	.28	.38	<b>.51</b>
19. Jumping a rope	.29	.25	<b>.50</b>
20. Throwing a ball	.13	.19	<b>.79</b>
21. Catching a ball	.25	.07	<b>.75</b>
22. Kicking a ball	.07	.23	<b>.73</b>
23. Playing marbles	.35	.16	<b>.46</b>
Eigenvalues	8.02	1.68	1.41
% Variance	34.87	7.32	6.15
Cronbachs $\alpha$ , reference group	.77	.70	.74
Cronbachs $\alpha$ , DCD group	.81	.75	.72

<sup>a</sup> A Jacobs ladder is a specific Dutch craftwork project, folding two long pieces of paper over each other to create a funny ladder.

activity can usually not be performed without dropping things, knocking things over, or falling, or when the child is not able to complete the activity (see Appendix 2 for an illustration and general instructions). The questionnaire takes 15 min to complete.

### 2.2.2. MABC2 test

The *MABC2 Test* is recommended for the operationalization of the first diagnostic criterion for DCD (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Blank et al., 2012; Henderson et al., 2007). It is designed to classify 3–16 year-old children according to degree of motor impairment (scores range from .1 to 99, a higher score indicates better performance; a score <5th percentile is classified as motor impairment, a score between the 5th and 16th percentile is classified as at risk; Henderson et al., 2007). Validity and reliability of the instrument are good (Wuang, Su, & Su, 2012).

### 2.2.3. MABC2 checklist and DCDQ

The *MABC2 Checklist* and *DCDQ* are currently used for the operationalization of the second diagnostic criterion for DCD (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Blank et al., 2012; Henderson et al., 2007; Wilson, Kaplan, Crawford, Campbell, & Dewey, 2000). The *MABC2 Checklist* is designed for teachers to identify 5–12 year-old children with motor difficulties (total scores range from 0 to 120; a higher score indicates poorer performance; Henderson et al., 2007). Validity and reliability of the instrument are good (Schoemaker, Niemeijer, Flapper, Smits-Engelsman, 2012). In the Dutch manual of the *MABC2 Checklist*, reliability and validity data, as well as norm scores, are provided separately for completion by teachers and parents (Smits-Engelsman, 2010). The parental norm scores were used in this study. The *DCDQ* was designed to identify motor problems in 5–15 year-old children (total scores range from 0 to 75; a higher score indicates better performance; Wilson et al., 2000).

## 2.3. Procedure

The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the University Medical Center Groningen in the Netherlands. After informed consent was obtained from their parents, children were subsequently assessed with the *DCDDaily* and *MABC2 Test*, in a separate room in their school or rehabilitation centre, between September 2008 and March 2012 (Henderson et al., 2007; Van der Linde et al., 2013). Assessors were advanced students with a background in human movement sciences or physical therapy, who were trained in the assessment of the tests, but who had not been involved in the design of the instruments. The *DCDDaily-Q*, *MABC2 Checklist* and *Developmental Coordination Disorder Questionnaire (DCDQ)* were sent to the parents, who returned these to the researchers after completion within three weeks after assessment (Henderson et al., 2007; Wilson et al., 2000).

## 2.4. Statistical analysis

Standards of the American Educational Research Association were used for statistical testing (American Educational Research Association, 1999). Analyses were performed using SPSS (IBM SPSS, version 20.0, Chicago, IL, USA). Missing values were replaced with the mean item score of the child's group (reference or DCD). A maximum of four questions was found unanswered per questionnaire; in total, less than 1% of all answers was found missing. As the distribution of the data was not normal, non-parametric tests were used.

In order to provide a reliable and valid questionnaire, item reduction and the factor structure of the *DCDDaily-Q* were explored stepwise. First, redundant items were excluded when item-total correlation was <.30; when <10% of the combined sample showed poor performance; or when items did not discriminate. Second, an exploratory factor analysis was performed and further items were removed when communality was <.20; when the highest factor loading was <.40; or when an item had similar loadings on different factors. Thirdly, the number of factors was determined using exploratory factor analyses following five criteria: (a) all potential model factors have eigenvalues greater than 1.0; (b) a scree plot shows a change in slope; (c) the model explains a reasonable amount of variance in the data; (d) the model contains the smallest number of factors possible while grouping items together logically by content; (e) no factor contains fewer than 4 items. Finally, a Principal Component Analysis was performed with Varimax rotation of the forced number of factors, to result in the final version of the *DCDDaily-Q*. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was used to analyze the sampling adequacy; the Bartlett's test of sphericity was used to analyze whether the correlations between items was large enough for Principal Component Analysis.

The internal consistency of the final version of the *DCDDaily-Q* was calculated for the test as a whole and for the factors found, with .70 taken as an acceptable level. Discriminant validity of the *DCDDaily-Q* was determined by calculating differences between the DCD group and the control group for mean item scores and mean total scores, using Mann-Whitney U tests. A receiver-operator characteristics curve was composed in order to investigate to what extent the *DCDDaily-Q* discriminates between children with and without DCD, using data of the DCD group and the control group. An appropriate cut-off point was determined for the *DCDDaily-Q* total score to indicate DCD, accounting for optimal sensitivity and specificity, e.g. at or above .80 and .90 respectively. The area under curve statistic was calculated to reflect the probability that a child diagnosed with DCD had a worse *DCDDaily-Q* total score than a typically developing child, with a value above .80 considered high. Concurrent validity was determined by calculating Spearman's  $\rho$  between mean *DCDDaily-Q* total scores and mean *MABC2 Checklist* total scores and mean *DCDQ* total scores, as well as mean *MABC2* percentile scores and mean *DCDDaily* total scores, for the reference group and DCD group separately (Henderson et al., 2007; Van der Linde et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2000). Finally, in order to determine the incremental validity of the *DCDDaily-Q*, a binary logistic regression analysis was performed to predict the presence or absence of

DCD with the questionnaires used as predictors. In Step 1, mean *DCDDaily-Q* total scores were entered. In Step 2, mean *MABC2 Checklist* total scores were entered. In Step 3, mean *DCDQ* total scores were entered.

### 3. Results

Descriptive statistics on age, gender, and *MABC2 Test* percentile scores and *DCDDaily* total scores are shown in Table 1. This table demonstrates the reference group to comprise a balanced number of children across age and gender. Furthermore, the *MABC2 Test* percentile scores in the reference group (.5–99) covered the full range of possible scores almost completely, with a mean score near the 50th percentile (Henderson et al., 2007).

Table 1 also shows mean total scores on the final version of the *DCDDaily-Q*, and the *MABC2 Checklist* and *DCDQ*. In the reference group, mean scores on the final version of the *DCDDaily-Q* revealed better performance for older children than younger children ( $F[3,189] = 15.04, p < .001$ ). The Bonferroni post hoc test for age revealed a significant difference between the group of five-year-old children and the groups of six ( $p = .001$ ), seven and eight-year-old children ( $p < .001$ ).

From the 38-item research version of the *DCDDaily-Q*, first, eleven items were removed due to: an item-total correlation  $< .30$  (putting on a jacket); because  $< 10\%$  of the combined sample showed poor performance (opening and closing lunchbox, putting on trousers, sweater and jacket, walking the stairs, climbing, and computer use); or because items did not discriminate between the DCD group and the control group (walking the stairs, laying the table, tying shoe laces, cycling, and skating, see Appendix 1). Second, four items were removed because: the highest factor loading was  $< .40$  (putting on a backpack and walking with a chair); or because items had similar loadings on different factors (running and swimming). Third, the number of factors was determined, with seven factors showing Eigenvalues  $> 1$ , and the scree plot showing a change at three or four factors. The model with three factors showed the items to group logically. These three factors explained 48% of the total variance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure demonstrated the sampling adequacy to be good, with  $KMO = .897$ . The Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated the correlations between items to be sufficiently large for Principal Component Analysis ( $\chi^2[253] = 1939.75, p < .001$ ).

The final version of the *DCDDaily-Q* comprised 23 items covering three underlying factors (see Table 2). Factor 1 was found to reflect fine motor activities; Factor 2 was found to reflect activities of self-care and self-maintenance; and Factor 3 was found to reflect gross motor playing activities. Further reliability analyses showed the internal consistency of the 23 items of the *DCDDaily-Q* to be good: Cronbach's  $\alpha = .85$  for the reference group and  $.84$  for the DCD group. For the age groups separately, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  ranged from  $\alpha = .73$  to  $\alpha = .87$  in the reference group and from  $\alpha = .70$  to  $\alpha = .88$  in the DCD group. Further, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was found  $> .70$  for each of the factors, as specified in Table 2.

The final version of the *DCDDaily-Q* showed excellent discriminant validity. Parents rated the ADL performance of children in the DCD group to be significantly poorer than the performance of children in the matched control group, both for the *DCDDaily-Q* total score ( $p < .001$ ) and all 23 item scores: Fig. 1 provides an overview of the differences in item scores between the groups (for each item, mean scores for the DCD group and control group and the Mann-Whitney *U* test values for the differences between the groups are provided in Appendix 1).

The receiver-operator characteristics curve for the DCD group and control group also demonstrated the ability of the *DCDDaily-Q* to differentiate between children officially diagnosed with and those without DCD (see Appendix 3). With a cut-off score of 39, sensitivity and specificity were found to be 88 and 92%. The area under curve characteristic was found to be .961.

For the reference group, moderate but significant correlations were found between *DCDDaily-Q* total scores and the questionnaires (*MABC2 Checklist*: Spearman's  $\rho = .489, p < .001$ ; *DCDQ*:  $\rho = -.638, p < .001$ ) and tests (*MABC2*: Spearman's  $\rho = -.360, p < .001$ ; *DCDDaily*:  $\rho = .454, p < .001$ ). For the DCD group, moderate to low correlations were found (*MABC2 Checklist*: Spearman's  $\rho = .350, p = .102$ ; *DCDQ*:  $\rho = -.562, p = .008$ ; *MABC2*:  $\rho = -.374, p = .066$ ; *DCDDaily*  $\rho = .037, p = .862$ ).

Considering incremental validity, the *DCDDaily-Q* total scores predicted the presence or absence of DCD significantly better than the *MABC2 Checklist* and *DCDQ* (see Table 3). The *DCDDaily-Q* identified 93.8% of the children correctly, the *MABC2 Checklist* 81.3%, and the *DCDQ* 78.3%.




Fig. 1. Mean *DCDDaily-Q* item scores for the DCD group and matched control group. Items are sequenced for the difficulty of items according to the mean scores in the control group. DCD = developmental coordination disorder. Explanation of the item numbers: 1, buttering bread; 2, cutting bread with a knife; 3, pouring a drink; 4, unwrapping package; 5, spoon use; 6, washing hands; 7, drying after a shower; 8, brushing teeth; 9, using keys; 10, putting on socks; 11, writing; 12, glueing paper; 13, folding a Jacobs ladder; 14, colouring; 15, cutting with scissors; 16, constructional play; 17, using pawns; 18, hopping in squares; 19, jumping a rope; 20, throwing a ball; 21, catching a ball; 22, kicking a ball; 23, playing marbles. \* = Significant difference between mean scores in the DCD group and matched control group,  $p < .05$ .

**Table 3**

Results of logistic regression analysis with the *DCDDaily-Q* total scores, *MABC2*-checklist total scores, and *DCDQ* total scores as predictor variables, and an official diagnosis of DCD as criterion variable, for the control group and DCD group.

	B (SE)	p-value	Odds ratio (95% CI)
<i>Step 1</i>			
<i>DCDDaily-Q</i>	0.60 (.23)	.01	1.82 (1.16–1.88)
<i>Step 2</i>			
<i>DCDDaily-Q</i>	0.56 (.25)	.02	1.75 (1.08–2.84)
<i>MABC2 checklist</i>	0.06 (.08)	.51	1.06 (0.90–1.25)
<i>Step 3<sup>a</sup></i>			
<i>DCDDaily-Q</i>	0.56 (.26)	.03	1.75 (1.05–2.93)
<i>MABC2 checklist</i>	0.05 (.08)	.52	1.05 (0.90–1.23)
<i>DCDQ</i>	–0.03 (.06)	.66	0.97 (0.87–1.10)

Note:  $R^2 = .65$  (Cox and Snell), .87 (Nagelkerke) for Step 1;  $R^2 = .66$  (Cox and Snell), .88 (Nagelkerke) for Step 2;  $R^2 = .66$  (Cox and Snell), .88 (Nagelkerke) for Step 3.

<sup>a</sup> All steps were repeated with age included as a confounder, measured for boys only (a limited number of girls diagnosed with DCD was included in the study), showing the same results (e.g., for the *DCDDaily-Q* in Step 3,  $B[SE] = .66 [ .32]$ ,  $p = .04$ , Odds ratio [95% CI] = 1.93 [1.02–3.62],  $R^2 = .87$  [Nagelkerke]).

#### 4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the *DCDDaily-Q*, a new parental questionnaire on ADL performance in five to eight year old children, comprising a comprehensive range of ADL. The final version of the *DCDDaily-Q* included 23 crucial items, covering three factors. The *DCDDaily-Q* showed good reliability, good discriminant validity, good sensitivity and specificity, and it showed better ability to predict the presence or absence of DCD than currently used questionnaires.

The internal consistency of the *DCDDaily-Q* was found to be good, both for the 23 items together and for each of the three factors, demonstrating the reliability of the questionnaire. The three factors “self-care and self-maintenance”, “fine motor activities”, and “gross motor playing activities” seem to correspond with the three domains of ADL found in the literature, e.g. “self-care and self-maintenance”, “productivity and schoolwork”, and “leisure and play” (American Occupational Therapy Association, 1994; Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists, 1991; May-Benson et al., 2002; Reed & Sanderson, 1999; Sugden, 2006). This finding demonstrates the ability of the *DCDDaily-Q* to reflect the broad range of relevant ADL.

The *DCDDaily-Q* further demonstrated the ability to discriminate between typically developing children and children with DCD: parents rated the ADL performance of children in the DCD group to be significantly poorer, for the *DCDDaily-Q* total scores and all 23 individual items. Both the sensitivity (88%) and specificity (92%) of the *DCDDaily-Q* met the required standard, indicating that the *DCDDaily-Q* correctly identified difficulties in ADL performance in children diagnosed with DCD, and the absence of difficulties in ADL performance in children in the control group (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). A combination of satisfactory sensitivity and specificity (at or above 80% and 90% respectively) has not been found for currently used questionnaires (sensitivity and specificity were found 62% and 66% for the *MABC2 Checklist*, and 82% and 84% for the *DCDQ*; Schoemaker et al., 2006, 2012).

In addition, the logistic regression analysis showed the *DCDDaily-Q* better able to predict the presence or absence of DCD than the *MABC2 Checklist* and *DCDQ*. This may be explained by the comprehensive range of ADL included in the *DCDDaily-Q*, addressing those items that children with DCD face trouble with according to the literature. The fact that the *DCDDaily-Q* addresses more aspects of ADL performance than currently used questionnaires may also explain its medium concurrent validity (moderate correlations were found between the *DCDDaily-Q* and the instruments used in this study). This reasoning also holds for other instruments available such as the *Activity Scale for Kids*, *Life-Habits*, and *Vineland Adaptive Behavioural Scale-2*, among others (Noreau, Fougeryrollas, & Vincent, 2002; Sparrow, Cicchetti, & Balla, 2005; Young, Williams, Yoshida, & Wright, 2000). These instruments address several constructs such as activities and participation in daily living skills as well as communication and socialization (Darsaklis, Snider, Majnemer, & Mazer, 2013). The *DCDDaily-Q* and *DCDDaily* concisely address capacity and performance in specifically those ADL that children with DCD face trouble with (Van der Linde et al., 2013).

Several explanations can be given for the low correlation found between the *DCDDaily-Q* and *DCDDaily* (test) in the DCD group. First, a small number of children diagnosed with DCD was included in this study. Second, parental reports may differ from objective information obtained through assessment by a clinician (Holsbeeke et al., 2009; World Health Organization, 2007). Finally, DCD is a heterogeneous disorder, which requires comprehensive assessment of ADL. With only partially overlapping items, differences between *DCDDaily-Q* and *DCDDaily* total scores were expected. Together, the *DCDDaily* and *DCDDaily-Q* complementary address a comprehensive range of ADL, at both capacity and performance level.

In future studies, we recommend further investigation of the relation between the *DCDDaily-Q* and the *DCDDaily*, specifically for the twelve overlapping items. Future studies may also address additional aspects of reliability, such as test-retest reliability, which was not addressed in the current study. Furthermore, more girls and young children diagnosed with

DCD may be included, in order to analyze the validity and reliability of the *DCDDaily-Q* per group of age and gender. The DCD group included in the current study is in agreement with the DCD population: DCD is diagnosed more often in boys than in girls, and children five or six years of age are often not yet diagnosed, as the clinical process is initiated around school age (Geuze, Jongmans, Schoemaker, & Smits-Engelsman, 2001; Kadesjo & Gillberg, 1999). Finally, the *DCDDaily-Q* as currently presented is applicable to Dutch children only. Future use in other countries may require cultural adaptation and validation of the list of items, i.e. activities that are performed daily by most children in a particular country.

In conclusion, the current study showed the *DCDDaily-Q* to be a valid and reliable questionnaire on children’s ADL performance. It is the first questionnaire to provide insight into the broad range of ADL children with DCD experience difficulties with every day, and it is better able to predict the presence or absence of DCD than currently used questionnaires. The *DCDDaily-Q* may inform researchers, adding to their understanding of the difficulties of children with DCD, and it may support clinicians in guiding the planning of intervention for the individual child.

### Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the valuable contribution of children and parents who participated in the study; teachers, clinicians, and students involved in the data collection; and Fonds NutsOhra for financial support of the project.

### Appendix A

Items of the *final version* of the *DCDDaily-Q* and the 15 redundant items of the *research version*, in the three domains of ADL

“Self-care and self-maintenance”	“Productivity and school”	“Leisure and play”
1. Buttering bread 1.48 (0.65); 2.16 (0.55); $U = 143.00, p < .001^*$	11. Writing 1.48 (0.65); 2.16 (0.75); $U = 162.50, p = .002^*$	16. Constructional play 1.00 (0.00); 1.64 (0.70); $U = 150.00, p < .001^*$
2. Cutting bread with a knife 1.64 (0.70); 2.16 (0.55); $U = 183.00, p = .005^*$	12. Glueing paper 1.28 (0.46); 1.88 (0.44); $U = 134.00, p < .001^*$	17. Using pawns 1.16 (0.37); 1.76 (0.72); $U = 167.00, p = .001^*$
3. Pouring a drink 1.32 (0.48); 1.80 (0.41); $U = 162.50, p = .001^*$	13. Folding a Jacobs ladder <sup>a</sup> 1.44 (0.51); 2.08 (0.70); $U = 161.50, p = .001^*$	18. Hopping in squares 1.28 (0.46); 2.08 (0.64); $U = 116.50, p < .001^*$
4. Unwrapping package 1.28 (0.46); 2.08 (0.64); $U = 116.50, p < .001^*$	14. Colouring 1.28 (0.46); 1.88 (0.73); $U = 170.00, p = .002^*$	19. Jumping a rope 1.96 (0.73); 2.72 (0.54); $U = 138.50, p < .001^*$
5. Spoon use 1.08 (0.28); 1.76 (0.60); $U = 123.00, p < .001^*$	15. Cutting with scissors 1.32 (0.48); 2.12 (0.53); $U = 105.00, p < .001^*$	20. Throwing a ball 1.32 (0.56); 2.00 (0.76); $U = 159.50, p = .001^*$
6. Washing hands 1.04 (0.20); 1.56 (0.71); $U = 186.00, p = .001^*$		21. Catching a ball 1.44 (0.58); 2.04 (0.54); $U = 153.50, p = .001^*$
7. Drying after a shower 1.20 (0.40); 2.04 (0.79); $U = 130.00, p < .001^*$		22. Kicking a ball 1.20 (0.41); 2.04 (0.74); $U = 120.00, p < .001^*$
8. Brushing teeth 1.28 (0.46); 2.12 (0.60); $U = 104.00, p < .001^*$		23. Playing marbles 1.36 (0.57); 2.08 (0.57); $U = 128.50, p < .001^*$
9. Using keys 1.08 (0.28); 2.00 (0.65); $U = 82.50, p < .001^*$		
10. Putting on socks 1.08 (0.28); 1.72 (0.61); $U = 135.50, p < .001^*$		Climbing 1.00 (0.00); 1.36 (0.57); $U = 212.50, p = .002^*$
		Running 1.04 (0.20); 1.52 (0.71); $U = 198.50, p = .002^*$
Opening and closing lunchbox 1.00 (0.00); 1.28 (0.46); $U = 225.00, p = .005^*$		Cycling 1.12 (0.33); 1.36 (0.57); $U = 248.50, p = .084$
Opening and closing backpack 1.00 (0.00); 1.4 (0.58); $U = 200.00, p = .001^*$		Swimming 1.16 (0.27); 1.80 (0.76); $U = 162.50, p = .001^*$
Walking with a chair 1.08 (0.28); 1.56 (0.65); $U = 185.50, p = .002^*$		Skating 2.00 (0.65); 2.08 (0.57); $U = 292.50, p = .649$
Laying the table 1.16 (0.37); 1.36 (0.49); $U = 250.00, p = .111$		Using a computer 1.04 (0.20); 1.36 (0.57); $U = 224.50, p = .010^*$
Tying laces 1.88 (0.78); 2.20 (0.58); $U = 238.00, p = .113$		
Putting on trousers 1.04 (0.20); 1.44 (0.58); $U = 199.50, p = .002^*$		
Putting on a sweater 1.00 (0.00); 1.40 (0.58); $U = 200.00, p = .001^*$		
Putting on a jacket 1.04 (0.20); 1.28 (0.46); $U = 237.50, p = .022^*$		
Walking the stairs 1.04 (0.20); 1.20 (0.50); $U = 274.50, p = .156$		

Note: The following data is shown for the 23 remaining items (final version) and the 15 redundant items of the research version of the *DCDDaily-Q*: item score mean(SD) in the control group; item score mean(SD) in the DCD group, Mann–Whitney *U* Test value for the difference between the groups.

<sup>a</sup> A Jacobs ladder is a specific Dutch craftwork project, folding two long pieces of paper over each other to create a funny ladder.

\* Significant difference between mean scores in the control group and DCD group,  $p < .05$ .

**Appendix B**

Illustration and general explanation for the questions in the *DCDDaily-Q*  
 Illustrative item *DCDDaily-Q*

<p>1. a. Activity Buttering a sandwich</p> <p>c. Quality My child can do this...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1. well</li> <li>• 2. sometimes well and at other times less well</li> <li>• 3. not very well (or badly) most of the time</li> </ul>	<p>b. Correct performance (example) The right amount of butter is neatly and evenly spread, at a normal pace, without making a mess and without dangerous situations involving the knife</p>
--	--

Note: the complete *DCDDaily-Q* (in Dutch or English) is available on request from the authors.

General explanation

In column **c. Quality** you are asked to choose the option that best describes the way your child performs the activity described. You tick

- 1 *well* when your child generally performs the activity *as described* in **b**;
- 2 *sometimes well and at other times less well* when your child does not always perform the activity as described in **b**. Your child occasionally gets butter on his/her fingers or on the table, for instance;
- 3 *not very well (or badly) most of the time* when your child as a rule does not perform the activity as described in **b**. Your child tends to be messy or has more difficulty buttering his/her sandwich or takes longer than other children of his/her age.

**Appendix C**

Fig. C.1




Fig. C.1. Receiver–operator characteristics curve for *DCDDailyQ* total scores of the DCD group and control group. For a cut-off at 39, sensitivity was found 88% and specificity was found 92%; the area under curve characteristic was found to be 0.961.



## References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational, & Psychological Testing (US), (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- American Occupational Therapy Association. (1994). Uniform terminology for occupational therapy – third edition. American occupational therapy association. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy: Official Publication of the American Occupational Therapy Association*, 48(11), 1047–1054.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). In American Psychiatric Association (Ed.), *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5* (5th ed.). Washington, DC, USA: American Psychiatric Publishing Incorporated.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-IV-TR*. Washington, DC, USA: American Psychiatric Publishing Inc.
- Blank, R., Smits-Engelsman, B., Polatajko, H., & Wilson, P. (2012). European academy for childhood disability (EACD): Recommendations on the definition, diagnosis and intervention of developmental coordination disorder (long version)\*. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 54(1), 54–93.
- Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists. (1991). *Occupational therapy guidelines for client-centered practice*. Toronto, ON: CAOT/L'ACE.
- Cermak, S. A., Gubbay, S. S., & Larkin, D. (2002). What is developmental coordination disorder? In S. A. Cermak & D. Larkin (Eds.), *Developmental coordination disorder* (pp. 2–22). Albany, NY: Delmar.
- Darsaklis, V., Snider, L. M., Majnemer, A., & Mazer, B. (2013). Assessments used to diagnose developmental coordination disorder: Do their underlying constructs match the diagnostic criteria? *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*, 33(2), 186–198.
- Geuze, R. H., Jongmans, M. J., Schoemaker, M. M., & Smits-Engelsman, B. (2001). Clinical and research diagnostic criteria for developmental coordination disorder: A review and discussion. *Human Movement Science*, 20(1), 7–47.
- Geuze, R. H. (2005). Motor impairment in developmental coordination disorder and activities of daily living. In D. A. Sugden & M. E. Chambers (Eds.), *Children with developmental coordination disorder* (pp. 41–). London and Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers.
- Geuze, R. H. (2007). Characteristics of DCD: On problems and prognosis. In R. H. Geuze (Ed.), *Developmental coordination disorder: A review of current approaches* (pp. 9–25). Marseille: Solal.
- Glascow, F. (2001). Evidence-based approach to developmental and behavioural surveillance using parents' concerns. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 26(2), 137–149.
- Green, D., Bishop, T., Wilson, B. N., Crawford, S., Hooper, R., Kaplan, B., et al. (2005). Is questionnaire-based screening part of the solution to waiting lists for children with developmental coordination disorder? *The British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 68(1), 2–10.
- Henderson, S. E., Sugden, D. A., & Barnett, A. L. (2007). *Movement assessment battery for children-2, examiner's manual*. London: Pearson Assessment.
- Holsbeeke, L., Ketelaar, M., Schoemaker, M. M., & Gorter, J. W. (2009). Capacity, capability, and performance: Different constructs or three of a kind? *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 90(5), 849–855.
- Kadesjo, B., & Gillberg, C. (1999). Developmental coordination disorder in Swedish 7-year-old children. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38(7), 820–828.
- Larkin, D., & Rose, E. (2005). Assessment of developmental coordination disorder. In D. A. Sugden & M. E. Chambers (Eds.), *Children with developmental coordination disorder* (pp. 135–154). London: Whurr Publishers.
- May-Benson, T., Ingolia, P., & Koomar, J. (2002). Daily living skills and developmental coordination disorder. In S. A. Cermak & D. Larkin (Eds.), *Developmental coordination disorder* (pp. 140–156). Albany, NY: Delmar.
- Noreau, L., Fougereyrollas, P., & Vincent, C. (2002). The LIFE-H: Assessment of the quality of social participation. *Technology and Disability*, 14(3), 113–118.
- Reed, K. L., & Sanderson, S. N. (1999). *Concepts of occupational therapy*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Schoemaker, M. M., Flapper, B., Verheij, N. P., Wilson, B. N., Reinders-Messelink, H. A., & Kloet, A. (2006). Evaluation of the developmental coordination disorder questionnaire as a screening instrument. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 48(8), 668–673.
- Schoemaker, M. M., Niemeijer, A. S., Flapper, B. C. T., & Smits-Engelsman, B. (2012). Validity and reliability of the Movement Assessment Battery for Children-2 Checklist for children with and without motor impairments. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 54(4), 368–375.
- Smits-Engelsman, B. C. M. (2010). In S. E. Henderson, D. A. Sugden, & A. L. Barnett (Eds.), *Movement Assessment Battery for Children-2* (Dutch Standardization ed.). Amsterdam: Pearson Education.
- Sparrow, S., Cicchetti, D. B., & Balla, D. A. (2005). *Vineland adaptive behavior scales* (second edition). Circle Pines, MN: AGS Publishing.
- Sugden, D. A. (2006). *Developmental coordination disorder as specific learning difficulty*. Retrieved from: [www.dcd-uk.org](http://www.dcd-uk.org) Accessed 03.12.13.
- Van der Linde, B., Van Netten, J., Otten, E., Postema, K., Geuze, R., & Schoemaker, M. (2013). Development and psychometric properties of the DCDDaily: A new test for clinical assessment of capacity in activities of daily living in children with developmental coordination disorder. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 27(9), 834–844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0269215513481227>
- Van der Linde, B., Van Netten, J., Otten, E., Postema, K., Geuze, R., & Schoemaker, M. (in press). A systematic review of instruments for assessment of capacity in activities of daily living in children with developmental coordination disorder. *Child: Care, Health and Development* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cch12124>. (in press)
- Wilson, B. N., Kaplan, B. J., Crawford, S. G., Campbell, A., & Dewey, D. (2000). Reliability and validity of a parent questionnaire on childhood motor skills. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy: Official Publication of the American Occupational Therapy Association*, 54(5), 484–493.
- Wilson, P. (2005). Practitioner review: Approaches to assessment and treatment of children with DCD: An evaluative review. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(8), 806–823.
- World Health Organization. (2007). *International classification of functioning, disability and health: Children & youth version*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Wuang, Y. P., Su, J. H., & Su, C. Y. (2012). Reliability and responsiveness of the movement assessment battery for children-second edition test in children with developmental coordination disorder. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 54(4), 160–165.
- Young, N. L., Williams, J. I., Yoshida, K. K., & Wright, J. G. (2000). Measurement properties of the activities scale for kids. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 53(2), 125–137.