Participation questionnaire for preschoolers with autism spectrum disorder: content validation and item development

Takuto Nakamura[a]*, Sakumi Koyama[b], Hirofumi Nagayama[a], and Satoshi Sasada[c]

[a]*Faculty of Health and Social Services, School of Rehabilitation, Kanagawa University of Human Services, Yokosuka, Japan;* [b]*Child Development Support Office, Smile-Kids, Nerima, Japan;* [c]*Graduate School of Health and Social Services, Kanagawa University of Human Services, Yokosuka, Japan*

*Corresponding author:

Takuto Nakamura

Kanagawa University of Human Services,

1-10-1 Heiseicho, Yokosuka, Kanagawa, Japan 238-8522

E-mail: nakamura-y49@kuhs.ac.jp

Participation questionnaire for preschoolers with autism spectrum disorder: content validation and item development

Occupational therapists need to comprehensively assess the participation of children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. The Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers measures disability-specific participation in children with ASD. This tool targets a narrow age range of 48–72 months and needs to be adequately assessed for content validity. Therefore, this study aims to expand the target age range of the Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers to 36–83 months, validate its content, and develop its items. A qualitative research-based item development study was conducted. Using the prototype items, interviews were conducted with 8 experts in ASD child support and participation research and 11 caregivers of children with ASD. Interviews were transcribed and subjected to content analysis. The number of questions was reduced (51 vs. 36). Two of the eight sub-domains were removed to clarify the conceptual difference between activity and participation. Moreover, the items' order was changed to explain the subject and improve comprehensibility. The developed Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers comprised disability-specific items. The application of a reflective model may be useful for intervention research. In the future, there will be a need for scale development and assessment of measurement properties such as structural validity.

Introduction

Participation is a concept defined as "involvement in life situations" in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) (World Health Organization [WHO], 2001). This concept encompasses two dimensions: "capacity," the potential

ability to function in individual activities (such as self-care, learning, leisure, etc.) under ideal circumstances, and “performance,” the state of functioning under current circumstances, considering the context of the everyday life environment. Additionally, participation is characterized by the frequency of opportunities for an individual to be involved in activities in life, the degree of involvement, and subjective experiences (Imms et al., 2017). Despite theoretical differences, improving a client’s participation is widely recognized as one of the goals of occupational therapy (Boop et al., 2020).

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by impaired social interaction, restricted interests, and repetitive behaviors (Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5-TR, 2022). Children with ASD regularly confront limitations in participation across various aspects of daily life (Askari et al., 2015). For instance, children with ASD demonstrate more restricted participation than their typically developing peers across multiple areas, including self-care, play, education, and social participation (LaVesser & Berg, 2011). Furthermore, they have been reported to display distinctive participation characteristics compared to that of children with other disorders, such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and cerebral palsy (Schiariti et al., 2018). Therefore, keeping these particularities in mind, occupational therapists must comprehensively evaluate participation, understand the requirements for support, and assess the effectiveness of interventions to meet the

unique participation needs of children with ASD (Anaby et al., 2022).

Currently, two major categories of tools are used to measure participation in children with disabilities. One is a generic measurement tool, represented by examples such as the “Young Children’s Participation and Environment Measure” (Khetani et al., 2015) and the “Children Participation Questionnaire” (Rosenberg et al., 2010). These generic measurement tools were mainly developed for typically developing children and can be used regardless of the presence or type of disability. Consequently, while these tools excel in epidemiological research, they tend to overlook disability-specific information and are considered to have limitations in evaluating the benefits of interventions (Fitzpatrick et al., 1998).

The second category is a disability-specific measurement tool, tailored to focus on a particular disability. While these tools cannot be used to compare different conditions, they are suitable for practical application and effectiveness assessment (Fitzpatrick et al., 1998). Among the existing disability-specific participation measurement tools for children with ASD is the “ICF-CY-based questionnaire for children with autism” developed by Gan et al. (2013). While this tool includes items related to participation, it does not primarily focus on it. It aims to comprehensively measure all elements of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health for Children and Youth (ICF-CY). This tool faces challenges regarding reliability

and validity, mainly due to the lack of item development from the perspectives of children with ASD and their caregivers.

Among the disability-specific measurement tools that have been recently developed, there is the “Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers” (PQP) (Nakamura et al., 2022). The PQP is a caregiver-report questionnaire designed to assess the participation of children with ASD based on the ICF. The PQP is still in the prototype stage. Additionally, it has a limited target age range of 48–72 months. Considering that ASD is often identifiable around the age of 3 in developed countries (Lord et al., 2022), a tool targeting a wider age range would be more practical. The current narrow age range of the PQP might limit its utility. Developing a new tool that allows the evaluation of participation for children across a broader age range would enable occupational therapists to formulate individualized intervention plans based on more clear and specific information about each child’s needs and assess the effectiveness of those interventions. Furthermore, this tool would provide researchers with a means to determine participation patterns and changes in children with ASD and demonstrate the effectiveness of interventions. Therefore, this study aims to expand the target age of the PQP and develop new items suitable for a wider age range of children.

Materials and methods

Method: validation by experts

We employed a research design involving qualitative studies for item development and validation of content (Terwee et al., 2018). The study was conducted with approval from the Research Ethics Committee of Kanagawa University of Human Services.

Questionnaire design

The PQP is based on the ICF, a comprehensive framework developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) to assess health and disability (Nakamura et al., 2022). The PQP evaluates the “participation” of children with ASD in their life situations. A reflective model is adopted in the PQP, and a diverse range of indicators is established to capture the overall picture of “participation.” Initially, the PQP’s preliminary items included eight provisional subdomains based on the codes of activities and participation from the ICF-CY. These subdomains were communication, mobility, self-care, domestic life, interpersonal relationships, play, education, and community life (WHO, 2007).To evaluate participation in these eight domains, the PQP included both the dimensions of performance and capacity, as defined by the ICF. Furthermore, to facilitate a more comprehensive discussion of participation dimensions during interviews, the initial items incorporated elements such as a child’s enjoyment, frequency of engagement, degree of involvement, and parental aspirations, based on findings from literature

reviews (Bedell et al., 2011; Coster & Khetani, 2008; Imms et al., 2016). This approach was intended to ensure that each item reflects various aspects of “participation,” ultimately contributing to a comprehensive representation of “participation” as a whole.

The initial PQP items were ultimately validated for content validity through interviews to obtain the opinions of four occupational therapists, three occupational therapy theory researchers, and one “participation” researcher, physician, speech-language-hearing therapist, clinical psychologist, certified social worker, childcare worker, and physical therapist each; 51 item suggestions were developed (Table 1). Response options were set on a 5-point scale of “agree (5 points),” “somewhat agree (4 points),” “undecided (3 points),” “somewhat disagree (2 points),” and “disagree (1 point),” and the total score was calculated by summing the scores for each item. The target population for the PQP is preschool-aged ASD children with an IQ of 50 or higher who have no comorbidities other than neurodevelopmental disorders (American Psychiatric Association & Association, 2013). The target age range is 48–72 months; however, in this study, the target age range was expanded to 36–83 months, and content validation was conducted.

Participants

Eight participants participated in the study's first phase: three "participation" researchers and one occupational therapist, speech-language-hearing therapist, clinical psychologist, certified social worker, and childcare worker each. The inclusion criteria for selecting the participating researchers were that they had published peer-reviewed articles that included the word "participation" in the ICF; regarding the other professionals, selection was based on them having had at least five years of experience working with children with ASD in their practice. Using a convenience sampling method, participants were approached by e-mail or telephone and informed in advance of the study's content, purpose, and significance. No participant refused to participate in the study. Details of the participants are shown in Table 2.

Data collection

Semi-structured interviews were conducted once with each participant between January 2021 and October 2021 using an online conferencing tool. An interview guide was used for the interviews, asking (1) what were the signs that ASD children's participation was facilitated or limited and (2) whether any items were inappropriate or missing from the draft items developed. The first author, a male occupational therapist in a university rehabilitation department with experience in multiple qualitative studies, conducted

interviews. The second author, a female occupational therapist, sometimes attended the interviews as an interview assistant. The interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Data analysis

Qualitative content analysis was used, and the unit of analysis was “a reference to the question item” (Krippendorff, 2018). The first and second authors independently extracted coding from the transcripts to determine whether each code referenced Relevance, Comprehensiveness, or Comprehensibility. Relevance was defined as (1) the relevance of the item to the construct being measured, (2) the relevance of the item to the target population, (3) the relevance of the item to the context of the use of interest, (4) the appropriateness of the response options, and (5) the appropriateness of the recall period being defined as appropriate. Comprehensiveness was defined as the coverage of important factors for measuring the construct. Comprehensibility was defined as (1) respondents understanding the instructions as intended, (2) respondents understanding the items and response options as intended, (3) items being appropriately worded, and (4) response options being consistent with the question (Terwee et al., 2018).

The two authors then provided the results of their analysis, and after discussion, a final code assignment was determined. In addition, it was determined whether items would be modified, deleted, or added to respond to the coded mentions. If new items

were modified or added, they were identified as falling under one of the activity/participation codes with reference to the ICF-CY and placed in the existing subdomain. Data analysis was conducted after each interview, and a new interview was conducted using the proposed modified items. In doing so, items from existing scales were sometimes referenced (Matsuishi et al., 2008; Sparrow et al., 2005). After all interviews were completed, each code was calculated to determine (1) which participant's reference it was and (2) to which domain it was a reference to an item. Codes categorized as Relevance and Comprehensibility were further categorized inductively, focusing on the reasons why they were deemed in need of revision.

Methods: content validation by caregivers

We employed a research design involving qualitative studies for item development and validation of content (Terwee et al., 2018). The study was conducted with approval from the Research Ethics Committee of Kanagawa University of Human Services.

Questionnaire design

The draft PQP items as modified in the first phase were used.

Participants

The study was conducted with participants who were caregivers of children with ASD. Inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) The participants were caregivers of preschool children between 36 and 83 months of age with a diagnosis of ASD, (2) the children had no comorbid diagnoses other than neurodevelopmental disorders in the DSM-5, and (3) the children had an intelligence quotient (IQ) of 50 or higher. In recruiting, the authors requested referrals from Child Development Support Centers or medical facilities and approached participants by e-mail or telephone. No one refused to participate. Purposive sampling was employed for sampling, and participants were selected to cover a range of participants in terms of child sex, age in months, comorbid diagnoses, IQ, region of residence, family structure and caregiver sex, and employment status. The final total number of participants was 11. Details of the participants are shown in Table 3.

Data collection

Cognitive and semi-structured interviews were conducted using an online conferencing tool. The interviews were conducted by the first author, who had received two months of training in cognitive interviewing. In the cognitive interviews, participants were asked to use the “think-aloud method” in combination with the “verbal probing method” (Beatty & Willis, 2007). Specifically, the think-aloud method was used for each item in each section of the PQP: “First, please describe your child’s condition,” “Next, please

describe your feelings," and "Finally, please describe your child's feelings." If the first author felt that there was a need for further questions, additional open-ended questions were asked (e.g., "You mentioned that it was difficult to make a judgment, but what specifically was difficult for you?"). In addition, a semi-structured interview was conducted after the cognitive interview. To ensure that the items for understanding participation were covered and that no inappropriate items were included, participants were asked (1) whether the items covered aspects important to the lives of the participants' children and their families and (2) whether the drafted items were irrelevant, inappropriate, or offensive to their daily lives. The second author was also present during the interviews as an interview assistant. The interviews were recorded and transcribed, and either the first or second author took notes for reference in the analysis. Participants who needed to modify any items in the analysis were interviewed a second time to determine if the modification resolved the problem; after three consecutive interviews with 11 participants without new modifications being suggested, it was judged that the data were saturated, and data collection was terminated.

Data analysis

The same analysis was performed as in Phase 1.

Results

Content validation by experts

A total of 120 changes were made to the proposed PQP questions, reducing the final number of questions from 51 to 35. The changes comprised 80 modified questions, 28 deleted questions, and 12 added questions. The subdomain most frequently reported was "Education," which was reported 35 times (29.2%), followed by "Self-care" 23 times (19.2%), "Interpersonal interaction and relationships" 15 times (12.5%), "Community, social and civic life" 14 times (11.7%), "Engagement in play" 13 times (10.8%), "Domestic life" 8 times (6.7%), "Communication" 7 times (5.8%), and "Mobility" 4 times (3.3%). One modification (0.8%) was also made to the overall design of the questionnaire. Table 2 shows the number of occurrences of Relevance, Comprehensiveness, and Comprehensibility codes in each interview.

Relevance

There were 30 Relevance codes, accounting for 25% of all codes. When the Relevance codes were inductively categorized according to their reasons, the most frequently mentioned code was "clarifying the difference between activity and participation" (n=17, 56.7%). Approximately 82.4% of these codes were attributed to Participant 1 (the "participation" researcher). It was ascertained that all questions within the

communication and mobility domains pertained more to activity than participation, leading to the deletion of these two domains. Additionally, Participant 1 referenced "clarifying the difference between environment and participation" (n=5) 16.7% of times.

> I think the sub-domain of communication often asks about skills, so, well, if you ask if it's about participation, I will say it's not really. (Participant 1)

In addition, "the meaning of the question changes depending on the context" (n=7) was mentioned by Participants 2 ("participation" researcher) and 3 (Speech-Language-Hearing Therapist), accounting for 23.3% of the total. Another code, which indicated items that highlighted caregivers' concern, was identified: "raises concerns among caregivers." Codes for appropriateness appeared in 93.3% of the total responses from Participant 3, after which only two codes appeared in Participant 7.

Comprehensiveness

There were 14 codes for Comprehensiveness, accounting for 11.7% of all codes. Half of the codes for Comprehensiveness (n=7) were located in the education domain.

> I think it's important for children of the same age to have opportunities, for example, to get together in a group like during a music festival or a play or a Christmas party and enjoy the atmosphere. Whether it's possible to share time and place... I feel like this is something important for participation. (Participant 5)

In response, a new item was added in the education domain: "Has opportunities to enjoy reading with children of the same age" (later revised to "Enjoys class activities in cooperation with children of the same age").

Comprehensibility

There were 76 Comprehensibility codes, accounting for 63.3% of all codes. Comprehensibility codes were inductively classified as "question structure is difficult to understand" (n=41) for 46.1%, "topic is unclear" (n=39) for 43.8%, "answer is difficult to determine" (n=8) for 9.0%, and "instructions are difficult to understand" (n=1) for 1.1% (13 codes were overlapped into two classifications). In particular, in the interview with Participant 2, it was suggested that the items, which had been categorized into eight domains according to the ICF activity and participation codes, be presented in the following three question formats: "answer the following questions about your child," "describe how you feel" and "answer the question about your child's feelings."

> The subjects have been repeatedly “this child is” and “you are.” This item consists of two types of questions: “A question to answer about the child as understood from the mother’s perspective” and “A question for the mother to speculate from the child’s perspective.” We must consider that changing the subject requires effort for people with tendencies of neurodevelopmental disorders, and it could be burdensome for them to answer. (Participant 2)

With this change, the items that had been arranged as eight domains were rearranged into the three question formats described above.

Content validation by caregivers

A total of 49 changes were made to the PQP items, resulting in the final number of questions changing from 35 to 36. There were 48 modifications, 0 deletions, and 1 addition. Interpersonal interaction and relationships were modified 20 times (40.8%); education, 13 times (26.5%); engagement in play, 8 times (16.3%); community, social, and civic life, 4 times (8.2%); self-care, 2 times (4.1%); and modifications regarding response options, 2 times (4.1%). No modifications were made to “domestic life.” The number of occurrences of the “Relevance,” “Comprehensiveness,” and

“Comprehensibility” codes in each interview is shown in Table 3, and the revised items, after the interviews were completed, are shown in Table 4.

Relevance

No issues of Relevance were reported in the interviews. All participants stated that the items were relevant to the child, and the questions were not deemed sensitive for the respondents to answer.

Comprehensiveness

Only one code for Comprehensiveness was reported, accounting for 2.1% of the total; Participant 3, a parent of a child with an IQ within the average range, noted that there were few questions about relationships with friends, commenting:

> At the age of about five years, I have no problem changing clothes and daily habits, and I am worried about what is going on with my friends, so I thought it would be okay if I had some more questions like that. (Participant 3)

A new item “Has close friends (Talk a lot, play together a lot, etc.)” was added in response.

Comprehensibility

With regard to Comprehensibility, there were 48 references to question ambiguity and misleading item order, accounting for 98.0% of the total. The codes were inductively categorized as follows: “topic is unclear” (41.7%, n=20), “question is difficult to recall” (18.8%, n=9), “answer is difficult to determine” (16.7%, n=8), “question structure is difficult to understand” (8.3%, n=4), and “others” (14.9%, n=7). The “others” included the content of the instructions, the order in which the items were presented, and the placement of the response options (applicable options on the left and non-applicable options on the right). For example, although Participant 6 talked about her child’s challenging behavior at mealtime in the semi-structured interview, she answered “agree” to the item “family time seems to be fun.” However, when she was asked by the interviewer’s probing whether she rarely had fun during family time, she replied as follows.

> When he doesn’t get his way, there are quite a few times when he gets angry... But the joyful look on my child’s face is quite impressionable to me, so I ended up choosing “agree” for this question. (Participant 6)

This item was judged to be a “question difficult to recall” and was revised to “Always seems to enjoy his time with his family.”

Discussion

The PQP item development and its characteristics

The purpose of this study was to expand the target age range of the PQP and develop new items adapted for a broader age range of children; the development of the PQP is also a new attempt to more specifically measure and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. It addresses a deficiency in previous participation measurement tool research and provides a new framework for clearly capturing outcomes in interventions for children with ASD. For this purpose, the advantages of the PQP items developed can be summarized in three main features. First, the items reflect the perspectives of professionals and caregivers, highlighting the main difficulties faced by children with ASD, such as difficulties with ADLs and access to specialized services (Lord et al., 2022). This enables the PQP to capture the specific difficulties of ASD children regardless of age group.

Second, the PQP is able to measure participation in a reflective model. Many previous generic measurement tools have measured participation in a formative model (Chien & Brown, 2017). Tools developed with formative models are useful for

epidemiological studies because they allow us to understand the different dimensions of participation separately. However, in the reflective model, each item is expected to indicate the state of “participation.” If the model is constructed properly, obtaining a single score that reflects the state of improved participation is possible. Such an approach could be useful as one way to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention (Fitzpatrick et al., 1998). This reflective model-based participation measurement tool is consistent with novel approaches proposed in previous studies (Arvidsson et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2016). In particular, the development of this new tool for young children with ASD has the potential to bridge the gap that exists between theory and practice regarding participation for children with ASD. However, structural validity needs to be confirmed through future exploratory factor analyses to confirm that this reflective model-based measure is valid in practice. Further validation regarding the distribution of scores across different age groups is also required.

Third, the 36-item format is a concise and comprehensive assessment of participation. This has the potential to quickly and efficiently assess the state of participation, which may change as children grow older. Furthermore, it has the potential to improve the ease of handling in practice compared to other generic measurement tools for participation (Khetani et al., 2015; Rosenberg et al., 2010). This brevity is a major advantage to the practical application of PQP in practice as time

burden is a major factor hindering the clinical use of patient-reported outcomes (Lohr & Zebrack, 2009).

Limitation

Between 2020 and 2021, when the data were collected, many municipalities in Japan implemented travel restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Machida et al., 2021). This may have limited many people's diversity of events and travel-related items. To address this issue, it may be useful to reexamine the content validity of the data by comparing it with data collected during the non-pandemic period. In addition, the data collected from caregivers included only participants who used child development support services and medical institutions. Therefore, the participation status of children who did not use these services may not have been adequately assessed. In future studies, it will be important to assess the applicability of the PQP to children who do not use these services. This would allow for confirmation that the PQP adequately reflects the participation status of all children.

In this study, we expanded the target age range for the PQP, a disability-specific participation measurement tool for children with ASD, to 38–83 months and developed new items. The PQP has three main advantages: (1) it contains items specific to the challenges faced by children with ASD, (2) it is suitable for measuring outcomes due to

the adoption of the reflective model, and (3) it offers practicality in comprehensively assessing participation with fewer items.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank all the participants who participated in this study.

Funding Details: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosure Statement: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest or financial ties to disclose.

Data Availability Statement: No datasets were generated or analyzed during this study.

References

American Psychiatric Association, D. S. M. T. F., & American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5* (Vol. 5). American psychiatric association.

Anaby, D., Khetani, M., Piskur, B., van der Holst, M., Bedell, G., Schakel, F., de Kloet, A., Simeonsson, R., & Imms, C. (2022). Towards a paradigm shift in pediatric rehabilitation: Accelerating the uptake of evidence on participation into routine clinical practice. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *44*(9), 1746–1757. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2021.1903102

Arvidsson, P., Dada, S., Granlund, M., Imms, C., Shi, L. J., Kang, L. J., Hwang, A. W., & Huus, K. (2021). Structural validity and internal consistency of Picture My Participation: A measure for children with disability. *African Journal of Disability*, *10*, 763. https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v10i0.763

Askari, S., Anaby, D., Bergthorson, M., Majnemer, A., Elsabbagh, M., & Zwaigenbaum, L. (2015). Participation of children and youth with autism spectrum disorder: A scoping review. *Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *2*(1), 103–114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-014-0040-7

Beatty, P. C., & Willis, G. B. (2007). Research synthesis: The practice of cognitive interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *71*(2), 287–311.

https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfm006

Bedell, G. M., Khetani, M. A., Cousins, M. A., Coster, W. J., & Law, M. C. (2011). Parent perspectives to inform development of measures of children's participation and environment. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *92*(5), 765–773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2010.12.029

Boop, C., Cahill, S. M., Davis, C., Dorsey, J., Gibbs, V., Herr, B., Kearney, K., Metzger, L., Miller, J., & Owens, A. (2020). Occupational therapy practice framework: Domain and process fourth edition. *AJOT. American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *74*(Suppl. 2), 1–85.

Chien, C.-W., & Brown, T. (2017). Assessing children's occupations and participation. In S. R. A. Kennedy-Behr (Ed.), *Occupation-centred practice with children: A practical guide for Occupational Therapists* (pp. 133–163). Wiley-Blackwell.

Coster, W., & Khetani, M. A. (2008). Measuring participation of children with disabilities: Issues and challenges. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *30*(8), 639–648. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280701400375

Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5-TR. (2022). (5th edition, text revision. ed.). American Psychiatric Association Publishing.

Fitzpatrick, R., Davey, C., Buxton, M. J., & Jones, D. R. (1998). Evaluating patient-based outcome measures for use in clinical trials. *Health Technology Assessment*, *2*(14),

i–iv, 1–74. https://doi.org/10.3310/hta2140

Gan, S. M., Tung, L. C., Yeh, C. Y., & Wang, C. H. (2013). ICF-CY-based assessment tool for children with autism. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *35*(8), 678–685. https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2012.705946

Imms, C., Adair, B., Keen, D., Ullenhag, A., Rosenbaum, P., & Granlund, M. (2016). 'Participation': A systematic review of language, definitions, and constructs used in intervention research with children with disabilities. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, *58*(1), 29–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.12932

Imms, C., Granlund, M., Wilson, P. H., Steenbergen, B., Rosenbaum, P. L., & Gordon, A. M. (2017). Participation, both a means and an end: A conceptual analysis of processes and outcomes in childhood disability. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, *59*(1), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.13237

Khetani, M. A., Graham, J. E., Davies, P. L., Law, M. C., & Simeonsson, R. J. (2015). Psychometric properties of the young children's participation and environment measure. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *96*(2), 307–316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2014.09.031

Kim, S. Y., Yoo, E. Y., Jung, M. Y., Park, S. H., Lee, J. S., & Ji-Yeon, L. (2016). Reliability and validity of the activity participation assessment for school-age children in Korea. *Hong Kong Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *28*(1), 33–42.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hkjot.2016.08.001

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage Publications.

LaVesser, P., & Berg, C. (2011). Participation patterns in preschool children with an autism spectrum disorder. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, *31*(1), 33–39. https://doi.org/10.3928/15394492-20100823-01

Lohr, K. N., & Zebrack, B. J. (2009). Using patient-reported outcomes in clinical practice: Challenges and opportunities. *Quality of Life Research*, *18*(1), 99–107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-008-9413-7

Lord, C., Charman, T., Havdahl, A., Carbone, P., Anagnostou, E., Boyd, B., Carr, T., De Vries, P. J., Dissanayake, C., Divan, G., Freitag, C. M., Gotelli, M. M., Kasari, C., Knapp, M., Mundy, P., Plank, A., Scahill, L., Servili, C., Shattuck, P., .□.□. McCauley, J. B. (2022). The Lancet Commission on the future of care and clinical research in autism. *Lancet*, *399*(10321), 271–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01541-5

Machida, M., Nakamura, I., Kojima, T., Saito, R., Nakaya, T., Hanibuchi, T., Takamiya, T., Odagiri, Y., Fukushima, N., Kikuchi, H., Amagasa, S., Watanabe, H., & Inoue, S. (2021). Acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine in Japan during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Vaccines*, *9*(3), 210. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9030210

Matsuishi, T., Nagano, M., Araki, Y., Tanaka, Y., Iwasaki, M., Yamashita, Y., Nagamitsu, S., Iizuka, C., Ohya, T., Shibuya, K., Hara, M., Matsuda, K., Tsuda, A., & Kakuma, T. (2008). Scale properties of the Japanese version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ): A study of infant and school children in community samples. *Brain and Development*, *30*(6), 410–415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.braindev.2007.12.003

Nakamura, T., Sano, M., Koyama, S., Nagayama, H., & Sasada, S. (2022). Development and content validation of a participation measurement questionnaire for young children with autism spectrum disorder. *Japanese Journal of Occupational Therapy Research*, *25*(1), 7–14.

Rosenberg, L., Jarus, T., & Bart, O. (2010). Development and initial validation of the Children Participation Questionnaire (CPQ). *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *32*(20), 1633–1644. https://doi.org/10.3109/09638281003611086

Schiariti, V., Mahdi, S., & Bölte, S. (2018). International classification of functioning, disability and health core sets for cerebral palsy, autism spectrum disorder, and attention deficit–hyperactivity disorder. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, *60*(9), 933–941. https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.13922

Sparrow, S. S., Balla, D. A., & Cicchetti, D. V. (2005). *Vineland-II: Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales;[VABS]; Survey Forms manual; a revision of the Vineland Social*

Maturity Scale. Pearson Assessments.

Terwee, C. B., Prinsen, C., Chiarotto, A., De Vet, H., Bouter, L. M., Alonso, J., Westerman, M. J., Patrick, D. L., & Mokkink, L. B. (2018). *COSMIN methodology for assessing the content validity of Proms–user manual*. VU University Medical Center.

World Health Organization. (2001). *International classification of functioning, disability and health*. World Health Organization. https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA60550400

World Health Organization. (2007). *International classification of functioning, disability, and health: Children and youth version: ICF-CY*. World Health Organization.

Table 1. The Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers: preliminary items and subdomains

■ The first question is about your child' s self-care and health. (SC)
1. The child tries to take care of himself/herself (dressing, eating, etc.)
2. The child has difficulty in completing his/her daily routine (Distracted while eating, starting something else while getting dressed, etc.)
3. The child does not like to be well groomed (Reluctance to wear certain clothing, wash hair, brush teeth, etc.)
4. The child has a sound he doesn't like (Vacuum cleaner noise, sibling crying, sirens, etc.)
5. The child is easily fatigued
6. You are worried about the child's diet
7. You are worried about the child's defecation
8. You are worried about the child's sleep
9. You are having trouble teaching the child to take care of himself/herself (Excretion, changing clothes, eating, etc.)
10. You have a family member who will help you care for the child
11. You have a service to take care of the child, providing peace of mind (Nursery school, babysitting, etc.)
12. You are having difficulty in getting the child to seek medical attention or treatment
■ The following questions are about your child's domestic life. (DOM)
13. The child tries to clean up (toys, drawing materials, etc.)
14. You are glad that the child is willing to help (Carrying dishes, throwing away garbage, etc.)
■ The next questions are about mobility. (MOB)
15. The child runs smoothly, changing speed and direction
16. You feel unsafe when walking outdoors with the child (e.g., he/she jumps out into the road)
17. You have difficulty going out with the child (Goes away on his own, doesn't try to walk by himself, etc.)
18. You do not have access to necessary public transportation with the child (bus, train, plane, etc.)
■ The following questions are about play. (EIP)
19. The child can spend time playing by himself/herself
20. The child has opportunities for active physical play
21. The child can have a good time with his/her friends
22. The child can participate in play with rules
23. The child has a safe place to play
24. You do not enjoy playing with the child
25. You do not have many places to have fun with the child (park, children's center, etc.)

■ The following questions are about education at home and in preschools and kindergartens. (EDU)

26. The child obediently listens to adults
27. The child is not able to follow the teacher's instructions to complete the task
28. The child is active in physical activities
(Running, gymnastics, dancing, etc.)
29. The child is actively involved in creative activities (drawing, clay, crafts, etc.)
30. The child tries to use a tool that he/she has never used before.
(Pencils, jump ropes, cleaning supplies, etc.)
31. The child sometimes does not want to go to educational places (e.g. kindergarten, preschool, etc.)
32. You want to use medical and welfare services for children with disabilities, but you cannot.
33. You are always anxious when you think about the future of the child

■ The following questions are about recreational and cultural activities. (CSC)

34. The child can enjoy outings with the family (eating out, amusement parks, etc.)
35. You have difficulty traveling with the child with overnight stays
36. You have difficulty in taking the child to a family gathering
(Buddhist memorial service, New Year's Day, etc.)
37. You do not have the financial means to enjoy holidays with the child

■ The following questions are about interpersonal relationships. (IIR)

38. The child does something that others may find offensive
39. The child enjoys spending time with the family
40. The child has many troubles with other children (friends, siblings, etc.)
41. The child has a particularly close friend
42. The child has adults other than his parents who appreciate his good qualities
(Grandparents, teachers, etc.)
43. The child has people in the community who are willing to be involved with the child
(e.g., Mothers' friends)
44. You sometimes do not enjoy your time with the child

■ The last questions are about communication. (COM)

45. The child reacts when his friend calls him
46. The child understands and acts on the words and gestures that say "you can do it"
(Continue activity, smiling, etc.)
47. The child helps others in need
(Offering a hand to a child who has fallen, picking up something that has fallen, etc.)
48. The child knows his/her name written
49. The child is able to communicate refusals to the family (e.g., not going, not wanting to drink, etc.)

50. The child can answer in words when asked
51. You can understand what the child is trying to say

SC, Self-care; DOM, Domestic life; IIR, Interpersonal interactions and relationships; EDU, Education; EIP, Engagement in play; CSC, Community, social, and civic life; COM, Communication; MOB, Mobility. Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 44 are reversal items.

Table 2. Demographics of the expert participants involved in content validation and the number of codes that appeared

Participant	Sex	Profession	Practical Experience	Facilities	Relevance	Comprehensiveness	Comprehensibility
1	Male	“Participation” Researcher	None	Professional School	19	1	3
2	Female	“Participation” Researcher	21-30 years	University/ Clinic	5	4	29
3	Female	Speech-Language -Hearing Therapist	5-10 years	Clinic/Child Development Support Center	4	5	8
4	Female	Clinical Psychologist	11-20 years	Clinic/Child Development Support Center	0	2	2
5	Male	Certified Social Worker	21-3- years	University	0	1	4
6	Female	Childcare Worker	11-20 years	Child Development Support Center	0	1	5
7	Male	Occupational Therapist	11-20 years	University	2	3	15
8	Male	“Participation” Researcher	21-30 years	University	0	1	10

Practical experience was defined as the time spent working with children with ASD. Among the “Participation” researchers, participants 2 and 8 were researchers but also had experience supporting children with ASD. Participants 5 and 7 belonged to a research institute and had experience in ASD research. The other participants worked at medical institutions or welfare facilities related to supporting children with ASD.

Table 3. Demographics of caregivers involved in content validation

Participant	Relationship	Sex of child	**Moon age** of child	**Comorbid** diagnosis	IQ	**Residential** areas	Relevance (1st/2nd)	Comprehensive -ness(1st/2nd)	Comprehensib -ility(1st/2nd)
1	Mother	Female	36-41	NONE	>85	Big city A	0/0	0/0	9/2
2	Father	Male	65-71	NONE	>85	Big city A	0/0	0/0	1/1
3	Mother	Male	65-71	NONE	>85	Big city A	0/0	1/0	3/0
4	Mother	Male	65-71	NONE	71-85	Big city B	0/0	0/0	4/0
5	Mother	Male	54-59	ADHD	>85	Town C	0/0	0/0	2/0
6	Mother	Male	65-71	NONE	50-70	Big city D	0/0	0/0	1/15
7	Mother	Male	54-59	NONE	50-70	Town E	0/0	0/0	7/0
8	Mother	Male	48-53	NONE	>85	City F	0/0	0/0	1/1
9	Mother	Male	60-65	ID	50-70	City G	0/NA	0/NA	0/NA
10	Mother	Male	60-65	DCD	>85	Big city H	0/NA	0/NA	0/NA
11	Mother	Female	72-77	ADHD	50-70	Town I	0/NA	0/NA	0/NA

ADHD, Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; DCD, Developmental dyscoordination disorder; ID, Intellectual disability.

The results of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children or the Tanaka-Binet Intelligence Scale are used for the intelligence quotient. However, as there is a high correlation between the scores of both intelligence tests and the Kyoto Scale of Psychological Development, the developmental quotient is regarded as the intelligence quotient only in the results of the Kyoto Scale of Psychological Development.

Participants 2 and 3 were fathers and mothers of the same child.

Table 4. Items after content validation by caregivers, and the number of codes for each subdomain

■ First, please answer the following questions about your child	SC	DOM	IIR	EDU	EIP	CSC	COM	MOB
1. Changes clothes by himself/herself	○							
2. Finishes getting dressed	○							
3. Helps around the home		○						
4. Can play alone for more than 15 minutes					○			
5. Engages in active physical play					○			
6. Plays with friends					○			
7. Participates in games with winners and losers (Relay, Sugoroku, etc.)					○			
8. Learns social skills with friends				○				
9. Learns how to use stationery (At home, kindergarten, etc.)				○				
10. Enjoys class activities in cooperation with children of the same age				○				
11. Has favorite lessons for learning				○				

12. Has close friends (Talk a lot, play together a lot, etc.)			○					
13. Physically attacking a friend (Biting, hitting, etc.)			○					
14. Always feels safe with friends			○					
15. There is a teacher that he/she likes			○					
16. Always has a teacher by his/her side to help them develop strengths (Kindergarten, lessons, medical care, etc.)				○				
17. There is someone other than his parents who is always there to help him in his/her time of need						○		
18. Plenty of places to go out with family						○		
19. Neighbors outside of his or her immediate family are always nice to him/her						○		
20. Opportunities to participate in community gatherings (Festivals, children's meetings, etc.)						○		
■ Next, please describe how you feel.	SC	DOM	IIR	EDU	EIP	CSC	COM	MOB
21. Concerned about this child's diet	○							
22. Concerned about this child's defecation	○							

23. Concerned about this child's sleep	○							
24. Concerned about changing this child's clothes	○							
25. Playing with this child can be exhausting					○			
26. Suffering from lack of specialized support for children with disabilities (Lack of facilities, reluctance to go to facilities, etc.)				○				
27. Difficulty in sending the child to preschool or kindergarten				○				
28. Time at home with this girl is always a pleasure			○					
29. Can take this child on a trip that involves an overnight stay						○		
30. You can take this child to a gathering of relatives						○		
■ Finally, please answer the question about your child's feelings.	SC	DOM	IIR	EDU	EIP	CSC	COM	MOB
31. Reluctant to seek medical attention at a hospital	○							
32. Seems to like to keep up appearances (Wash hair, brush teeth, etc.)	○							
33. He/she seems to like mealtime.	○							

34. Seems to like helping out		○							
35. Always seems to enjoy his/her time with the family			○						
36. Always seems to enjoy time out with family						○			
Number of code occurrences (Phase 1: Experts)	SC	DOM	IIR	EDU	EIP	CSC	COM	MOB	OTH
Relevance	5	0	2	9	2	1	7	4	0
Comprehensiveness	2	1	2	7	0	2	0	0	0
Comprehensibility	16	7	15	19	11	7	0	0	1
Number of code occurrences (Phase 2: Foster parent)	SC	DOM	IIR	EDU	EIP	CSC	COM	MOB	OTH
Relevance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comprehensiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comprehensibility	2	0	19	13	8	3	0	0	3

SC, Self-care; DOM, Domestic life; IIR, Interpersonal interactions and relationships; EDU, Education; EIP, Engagement in play; CSC, Community, social, and civic life; COM, Communication; MOB, Mobility; OTH, Others. “○” indicates the subdomain to which the item corresponds. The codes related to the others are those related to the change of the directives and the change of the placement of the items and the responses. Items 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 31 are reversal items.