

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320764294>

Psychometric Properties of Voice Activity Participation Profile—Persian Version (VAPPP)

Article · October 2017

DOI: 10.1016/j.jvoice.2017.07.021

CITATIONS

4

READS

107

5 authors, including:



Maryam Faham

Shiraz University of Medical Sciences (SUMS)

15 PUBLICATIONS 29 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Zahra Ghayoumi-Anaraki

Mashhad University of Medical Sciences

26 PUBLICATIONS 33 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Abbas Ebadi

Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences

513 PUBLICATIONS 2,442 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Erin P Silverman

University of Florida

22 PUBLICATIONS 158 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



children in disasters and emergencies [View project](#)



bilingualism and language impairment [View project](#)

Psychometric Properties of Voice Activity Participation Profile—Persian Version (VAPPP)

*Maryam Faham, †Zahra Ghayoumi Anaraki, ‡Akram Ahmadi, §Abbas Ebadi, and ||Erin Pearson Silverman, *Shiraz, †Mashhad, and ‡§Tehran, Iran, and ||Gainesville, Florida

Summary: Objectives. Individuals with voice disorders may experience limits in activity and restricted participation in daily activities. The aim of this study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the Voice Activity Participation Profile—Persian Version (VAPPP), a questionnaire which specifically investigates activity limitation and participation restriction in Persian-speaking individuals with voice disorders.

Method. We completed a translation procedure according to World Health Organization guidelines, prior to administering the questionnaire to 208 participants (156 patients with dysphonia and 52 controls), each of whom completed the questionnaire. We examined various psychometric properties including item analysis, factor analysis, internal consistency, discriminant validity, criterion-related validity, and test-retest reliability were investigated for this questionnaire.

Results. Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the 27 items on the VAPPP were distributed across four factors and that the first question, which assesses self-perceived dysphonia severity, was grouped separately. All the four subscales and total VAPPP have high internal consistency and test-retest reliability based on Cronbach's alpha coefficients and the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). Job effects ($\alpha = 0.85$; ICC = 0.96), daily communication effects ($\alpha = 0.96$; ICC = 0.83), social communication effects ($\alpha = 0.91$; ICC = 0.93), emotional effects ($\alpha = 0.94$; ICC = 0.76), and total score ($\alpha = 0.97$; ICC = 0.88) are presented. VAPPP scores in patients with dysphonia were significantly different from those of the healthy control group ($P < 0.001$). The VAPPP total score has a high correlation to the Voice Handicap Index ($r = 0.86$; $P < 0.001$)

Conclusion. The VAPPP is a reliable and valid tool for evaluating the quality of life of patients with dysphonia in Iran.

Key Words: Voice—Quality of life—Psychometric properties—Voice Activity Participation Profile—Persian Version—Dysphonia.

INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of voice disorders is estimated to be 3%–9% in the United States,¹ with effects on communication, quality of life (QOL), and subjective social, economic, and emotional functioning.^{2–5} There are different procedures for assessing voice disorders including acoustic, audio-perceptual, aerodynamic, and imaging methods,⁶ mainly grouped as objective and subjective assessments.⁷ Objective voice assessments assess voice quality^{2,8} and include instruments to examine voice production.⁹ However, there is increasing evidence that objective assessments cannot determine voice disorder-related effects on daily living or functional participation and perceived handicap, which patients experience because of dysphonia.^{5,10–12} Because of this, subjective QOL assessments emerged. Speech and language pathologists use subjective assessments to quantify the effects of voice disorders. One such assessment involves measuring QOL in patients with voice disorders.^{2,13} These tools can help us to quantify disability level in a way that objective measures are unable to.¹⁴

Self-reported voice measures quantify the impact of voice disorders on QOL in patients with dysphonia.^{14,15} World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations for health status assessments hold that these types of assessments should be used in clinical settings.¹² Tools that exist for measuring QOL in patients with dysphonia are the Voice Handicap index (VHI),¹⁶ Voice-Related Quality of Life (V-RQOL),¹⁷ Voice Activity Participation Profile (VAPP),⁵ and Iranian Voice Quality of Life Profile (IVQLP).¹⁸ The VHI is a self-report questionnaire that contains 30 items to assess QOL in patients with dysphonia.¹⁶ It is a reliable and valid tool¹⁹ for investigating the effects of various therapeutic procedures in this population.¹³

Ma and Yiu (2001) developed the (VAPP) as a QOL assessment tool to quantify the effects of dysphonia on patients' activities and participation, based on WHO ICIDH-2 Beta-1 guidelines. The VAPP consists of 28 items in five sections that examine the *severity of the voice disorder* (Section 1), *job* (Section 2, four items), *daily communication* (Section 3, 12 items), *social communication* (Section 4, four items), and *emotions* (Section 5, seven items). Participation restriction and activity limitation are two QOL features addressed by the VAPP. This VAPP was originally developed in Chinese,⁵ and then translated and adapted for use with Finnish,²⁰ Brazilian,²¹ Italian,¹⁴ and Korean populations.²² Most of the above-mentioned instruments are written in English and require adaptation and cultural and linguistic validation for use with non-English-speaking patients.^{7,14,23} Although there are some Persian assessment tools such as the Persian version of the VHI,¹⁹ the Persian version of the V-RQOL,¹⁷ and the IVQLP,¹⁸ this tool (VAPP) is the only questionnaire that measures activity

Accepted for publication July 26, 2017.

From the *Department of Speech and Language Pathology, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran; †Department of Speech Therapy, School of Paramedical Sciences, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran; ‡Department of Speech and Language Pathology, School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran; §Behavioral Sciences Research Center and Nursing Faculty, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran; and the ||University of Florida, College of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Gainesville, Florida.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Akram Ahmadi, Department of Speech and Language Pathology, School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: slp347@gmail.com

Journal of Voice, Vol. ■■, No. ■■, pp. ■■–■■
0892-1997

© 2017 The Voice Foundation. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2017.07.021>

limitation and participation restriction. These critical issues are identified within the International Classification of Functionality, Incapacity, and Health by the WHO. Activity limitation and participation restriction are relatively new concepts introduced through the new ICIDH-2 model. Of all 28 items in this questionnaire, 16 items measure daily communication effects (12 items) and social communication effects (four items). Most items focus on activity limitation and participation restriction, and there are a high number of items in these two sections compared with the whole of questionnaire. These concepts were not included in former tools such as the VRQOL and the VHI, and the VAPP was developed after these concepts emerged. Knowing about activity limitation and participation restriction helps speech and language pathologists determine intervention direction.⁵

We decided to adapt and validate the VAPP as a self-report QOL measure to Persian because of its focus on activity limitation and participation restriction; so the purpose of this study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the Persian version of the VAPP in people with voice disorders, for research and clinical purposes.

METHOD

The present work is a methodological and cross-sectional descriptive study evaluating the psychoanalytical features of the VAPP, a 28-item questionnaire that measures voice activity limitation and participation restriction in patients with dysphonia. The items are rated on a visual analog scale (VAS; as a horizontal line 100 mm long) representing a score from 0 to 10. Items are distributed over five sections, and each section produces a score: self-perceived voice problem (one question); job (four questions); daily communication (12 questions); social communication (four questions); and emotion (seven questions). The minimum possible total score is zero, and the maximum is 280.⁵ Patients younger than 18 years and those who had received voice therapy within the two preceding were excluded from the study.

There are different guidelines for questionnaire adaptation, such as criteria recommended by the Scientific Advisory Committee of Medical Outcomes Trust¹⁴ and the WHO guidelines for QOL assessments.²⁴ Generally, a multistep process is recommended.^{7,14} This process involves forward translation, back translation, committee review, and a pretesting step.^{7,14,25}

Translation procedure

After obtaining permission from the developers,⁵ a standard translation of the 28-item questionnaire into Persian was completed by two native translators according to WHO guidelines. We then combined and integrated the initial translations into one unified document. Three expert voice therapists, with at least 5 years of experience, assisted during this stage, so that the best phrases were chosen. To control the quality of the translation, a translator who was bilingual in English and Persian translated the final version from Persian to English. Then, we submitted the reverse-translated English version to the above-mentioned expert panel for an examination and discussion of any discrepancies between the two versions. Finally, the Persian version of the questionnaire was revised again by expert translators to remove any

TABLE 1.
Videostroboscopic Findings in Participants with Voice Disorders

Pathology	Number (%)	Pathology	Number (%)
Polyps	14(6.7)	MTD	18(8.7)
Nodules	11(5.3)	Laryngitis	16(7.7)
True vocal fold cysts	4(1.9)	ADSD	9(4.3)
Sulcus vocalis	1(0.5)	Cancer	32(15.4)
True vocal fold paralysis	11(5.3)	ABSD	1(0.5)

grammatical or semantic discrepancies. The final version evaluates the impact of dysphonia on an individual's QOL and is called the Voice Activity and Participation Profile—Persian Version (VAPPP).

Participants

We recruited patients with voice disorders and healthy controls without voice disorders for this study. We selected patients with dysphonia from among all patients referred to three otorhinolaryngology clinics in Shiraz, Tehran (Amir-Alam Hospital), and Mashhad. All patients were diagnosed with a voice disorder by an otorhinolaryngologist and speech and language pathologist, and none had undergone any previous voice treatment. Every attempt was made to recruit patients with different types of voice disorders (Table 1).

All participants provided written consent for study participation. This study was approved by the Ethic Committee of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences.

Psychometric properties of the VAPPP

Face and content validity of the VAPPP

Face validity was determined in a qualitative manner. The VAPPP scale was presented to 15 adult patients with voice disorders (seven women and eight men). They read all 28 items and answered them. Patients were also asked to identify items that were not applicable or easy to understand. This step was essential for ensuring the questionnaire's quality and obtaining appropriate feedback from individuals responding to the translated questions.²⁶ The content validity of the questionnaire was determined qualitatively by expert specialists.

Item analysis

The correlation between the total score of the items within a questionnaire and each item separately is the *discrimination coefficient*. The higher an item's discrimination coefficient, the more discriminative the item. The item's role in test reliability was reviewed by examining the internal consistency coefficient after item elimination. That is to say, the items were determined inappropriate if Cronbach's alpha coefficient increased item elimination, and the item was determined appropriate if the alpha coefficient decreased.

Factor analysis

Factor analysis evaluated if the items were distributed over the subgroups as per the original questionnaire by Ma and Yiu. We performed the explanatory factor analysis using a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling test, Bartlett's test, an analysis of the main elements, a scree plot, and a varimax rotation. We established a minimum factorial load of 0.4. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed using the chi-square, Normed Fit Index (NFI), Parsimony Normed Fit Index, and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) by *Lisrel 8.8* (Scientific Software International, Cook County, Illinois).

Internal consistency

We calculated internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the questionnaire and each section. If the coefficient was greater than or equal to 0.7, the test is considered reliable.

Discriminant validity

A common method for determining construct validity is to compare the scores of groups who are known to differ according to the variables of interest. In this study, the main variable was presence of dysphonia. To determine the discriminant validity of the study, the mean scores of the two groups were compared using an independent *t* test.

Criterion-related validity

We compared the scale scores with an external clinical criterion (in this study, the VHI) using Spearman's correlation test because the VHI is a non-parametric measure that uses an ordinal scale. The VHI is a validated self-administered inventory assessing patients' self-perceived voice handicap.

Test-retest reliability

We administered the VAPPP twice, to each voice patient, within a 2-week interval. This time interval was considered short enough to avoid substantial voice changes and long enough so that participants would not recall their previous responses.²⁷ The reproducibility was tested by means of the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC).

Statistics

The *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, Version 20.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois) was used for the analysis of descriptive data, the explanatory factor analysis, Cronbach's alpha

coefficient for internal consistency and item analysis, the ICC for test-retest reliability, Spearman's correlation test for criterion-related validity, and the independent *t*-test for discriminative validity.

The numerical results of Cronbach's alpha coefficient were respectively interpreted as satisfactory, 0.7; good if greater than 0.8; and excellent, if greater than 0.9. For the confirmatory factor analysis, *Lisrel 8.8* (Scientific Software International) was used and χ^2 -df was acceptable if the value was 1–5; an acceptable value for the NFI and the CFI should be greater than 0.9²⁸

RESULTS

Participants

A total of 208 individuals were allocated to the following two groups: those with dysphonia (n = 156; 68F/88M; mean age in years, 42.28; range, 18–73), and those without dysphonia (n = 52; 25F/27M; mean age in years, 38.87; range, 18–69). Of the 156 individuals with voice disorders, 39 (18.8%) had dysphonia with no significant videostroboscopic findings such as mass, irregularity of the vocal folds' edges, absence of glottal wave, and signs of MTD. Other findings are presented in [Table 1](#).

Face and content validity

All participants could easily answer the questions and required no further explanation or help; all of the items were diagnosed as applicable, meaning that the final version of the VAPPP is clear and easy to answer. The only change that occurred at this stage included using a numbered line instead of a simple VAS line because this appeared to assist patients when scored their feelings.

Item analysis

The items' roles were analyzed by the variation of Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The total Cronbach's alpha value ($\alpha > 0.97$) did not increase when any item was eliminated, meaning all the items' internal consistency increased ([Table 2](#)).

Factor analysis

We assessed the construct validity of the VAPPP by the exploratory factor analysis. The adequacy of the sample size was confirmed based on the three factors that KMO (0.94) and Bartlett's test of sphericity (0.37; $P < 0.0001$).

Initially based on scree plots and the extracted values, the item loads in the VAPPP were distributed over the explanatory factor

TABLE 2.
Changes in Cronbach's Alpha Value Following Item Elimination

Number	α	Number	α	Number	A	Number	A
1	0.96	8	0.96	15	0.96	22	0.96
2	0.96	9	0.96	16	0.96	23	0.96
3	0.97	10	0.96	17	0.96	24	0.96
4	0.96	11	0.96	18	0.96	25	0.96
5	0.96	12	0.96	19	0.96	26	0.96
6	0.96	13	0.96	20	0.96	27	0.96
7	0.96	14	0.96	21	0.96	28	0.96

TABLE 3.
Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the VAPPP

Index	Estimated Value	Index	Estimated Value
χ^2	1239.97	NFI	0.95
Degrees of freedom	318	PNFI	0.86
<i>P</i>	<0.001	CFI	0.96

Abbreviation: PNFI, Parsimony Normed Fit Index.

analysis accounted for 72.64% of variables (12.84% of variances). In the original version of the questionnaire, all 27 items (except Question 1) were distributed over four factors. We completed the confirmatory factor analysis using *Lisrel* 8.8 (Scientific Software International). The factor loading in the four-factor model was good and acceptable (Table 3).

Internal consistency analysis

High alpha coefficients reflected high internal consistency for effect on job (0.85), effect on daily communication (0.96), effect on Social Communication (0.91), effect on Emotion (0.94), and Total Score (0.97).

Reliability of test-retest

We measured the reliability of test-retest results by the ICC. The results are presented in Table 4 for Total score and all four subscales. As seen in Table 4, the 95% confidence interval in the *effects on daily communication* subscale is the widest (lower, 31; upper, 96) among all four subscales.

Discriminant validity

The VAPPP discriminated well between the two groups. Individuals with dysphonia had scores that were significantly higher

TABLE 4.
Test-Retest Results

Subscales	ICC	95% CI	
		Lower	Upper
Effect on job	0.96	0.83	0.99
Effect on daily communication	0.83	0.31	0.96
Effect on social interaction	0.93	0.69	0.98
Effect on emotion	0.76	0.55	0.95
Total VAPPP	0.88	0.45	0.97

Abbreviation: CI, confidential Interval.

than those without dysphonia, based on independent *t*-test results (Table 5).

Criterion-related validity

Spearman's correlation score showed there is high correlation ($r = 0.89$; $P = 0.001$) between Total VAPPP score and Total VHI score.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Persian version of the VAPP to develop a valid and reliable tool for measuring QOL in patients with dysphonia, and, to quantify treatment effects in this population.²⁹ Participants included individuals with dysphonia referred to (and diagnosed by) hospital otorhinolaryngologist and speech and language pathologists. Many QOL assessment tools have been developed and validated in English. These tools must be cross-culturally adapted and proven linguistically equivalent for use in other languages.¹⁴ We followed guidelines for the Process of Translation and Adaptation of Instruments, as set forth by the WHO, to create the Persian version of the VAPP. This process includes forward translation, expert panel reverse-translation, and pretesting prior to arriving at a final version.³⁰

Validity refers to how well a test measures what it is designed to measure.³¹ We demonstrated the construct validity of the Persian version of the VAPP by realizing significant VAPPP mean score differences between individuals with and without dysphonia. All VAPPP questions discriminated between those with and without dysphonia. These results are similar to other studies,^{5,14,22} with the exception of Sukanen et al.²⁰ They reported that questions 3, 10, 11, and 24 did not discriminate between individuals with dysphonia and those with no dysphonia. We evaluated the convergent validity by correlating participant VAPPP and VHI scores. There was a high correlation between participant scores on the Persian version of the VHI and the VAPPP. Reliability is the degree to which an assessment tool produces stable and consistent results.³¹ The VAPPP had a high internal consistency and a high Cronbach's alpha. These findings are consistent with similar studies.^{14,22}

CONCLUSION

The VAPPP is a reliable and valid tool for assessing QOL, specifically activity limitation and participation restriction, in Persian patients. The questionnaire poses low administrative

TABLE 5.
Total VAPPP Differences between Voice Disorder and Non-Voice Disorder Groups

Groups	Effect on Job	Effect on Daily Communication	Effect on Social Interaction	Effect on Emotion	Total VAPPP
Voice disorder	11.11	45.26	13.15	32.22	107.01
No voice disorder	0.15	0.05	0.0	0.02	0.25
<i>P</i>	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

burden; most patients can complete it within 10 minutes. The VAPPP can be used to measure QOL and the effects of various therapies for persons with dysphonia in clinical and research settings.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Mr. Ali Ghorbani and Dr. Farhad Torabinezhad for their invaluable assistance with translation. This research was supported by Shiraz University of Medical Sciences (Code: 95-01-06-12917)

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at doi:10.1016/j.jvoice.2017.07.021.

REFERENCES

1. Branski RC, Cukier-Blaj S, Pusic A, et al. Measuring quality of life in dysphonic patients: a systematic review of content development in patient-reported outcomes measures. *J Voice*. 2010;24:193–198.
2. Krishcke S, Weigelt S, Hoppe U, et al. Quality of life in dysphonic patients. *J Voice*. 2005;19:132–137.
3. Faham M, Jalilevand N, Torabinezhad F, et al. Relationship between voice complaints and subjective and objective measures of vocal function in Iranian female teachers. *J Voice*. 2016;doi:10.1016/j.jvoice.2016.10.011.
4. Baracca G, Cantarella G, Forti S, et al. Validation of the Italian version of the singing Voice Handicap Index. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2014;271:817–823.
5. Ma EP, Yiu EM. Voice Activity and Participation Profile assessing the impact of voice disorders on daily activities. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2001;44:511–524.
6. Shipley KG, McAfee JG. *Assessment in Speech-Language Pathology: A Resource Manual*. Boston: Cengage Learning; 2015.
7. Guillemin F, Bombardier C, Beaton D. Cross-cultural adaptation of health-related quality of life measures: literature review and proposed guidelines. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1993;46:1417–1432.
8. Dejonckere PH, Bradley P, Clemente P, et al. A basic protocol for functional assessment of voice pathology, especially for investigating the efficacy of (phonosurgical) treatments and evaluating new assessment techniques. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2001;258:77–82.
9. Robb MP. *Intro: A Guide to Communication Sciences and Disorders*, 1 edition. San Diego: Plural Publishing; 2010.
10. Malki KH, Mesallam TA, Farahat M, et al. Validation and cultural modification of Arabic Voice Handicap Index. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2010;267:1743–1751.
11. Mojiri F, Ahmadi A, Hasanzadeh A. Comparing Voice Handicap Index (VHI) scores in vocally-impaired teachers and non-professional voice patients. *J Res Rehabil Sci* 2013;9.
12. Ricarte A, Oliveira G, Behlau M. Validation of the voice activity and participation profile protocol in Brazil. *CoDAS*; 2013: SciELO Brasil.
13. Faham M, Ahmadi A, Drinnan M, et al. The effects of a voice education program on VHI scores of elementary school teachers. *J Voice*. 2016; doi:10.1016/j.jvoice.2015.09.009.
14. Fava G, Paolillo NP, Oliveira G, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation, validation, and cutoff point of the Italian version of the voice activity and participation profile: Profilo di Attività e Partecipazione Vocale. *J Voice*. 2015;29:130, e11-. e19.
15. Benninger MS, Ahuja AS, Gardner G, et al. Assessing outcomes for dysphonic patients. *J Voice*. 1998;12:540–550.
16. Jacobson BH, Johnson A, Grywalski C, et al. The Voice Handicap Index (VHI) development and validation. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 1997;6:66–70.
17. Moradi N, Saki N, Aghadoost O, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Voice-Related Quality of Life into Persian. *J Voice*. 2014;28:842, e1-.e9.
18. Dehqan A, Yadegari F, Asgari A, et al. Development and Validation of an Iranian Voice Quality of Life Profile (IVQLP) based on a classic and Rasch Rating Scale Model (RSM). *J Voice*. 2017;31:113, e19-. e29.
19. Moradi N, Pourshahbaz A, Soltani M, et al. Cross-cultural equivalence and evaluation of psychometric properties of Voice Handicap Index into Persian. *J Voice*. 2013;27:258, e15-. e22.
20. Sukanen O, Sihvo M, Rorarius E, et al. Voice Activity and Participation Profile (VAPP) in assessing the effects of voice disorders on patients' quality of life: validity and reliability of the Finnish version of VAPP. *Logoped Phoniatr Vocol*. 2007;32:3–8.
21. Behlau M, Oliveira G, Alves dos Santos LM, et al. Validação no Brasil de protocolos de auto-avaliação do impacto de uma disfonia. *Pró-Fono Revista de Atualização Científica*; 2009.
22. Lee SJ, Choi H-S, Kim H, et al. Korean Version of the Voice Activity and Participation Profile (K-VAPP): a validation study. *Commun Sci Disord*. 2016;21:695–708.
23. Guyatt GH. The philosophy of health-related quality of life translation. *Qual Life Res*. 1993;2:461–465.
24. Group W. The World Health Organization Quality of Life assessment (WHOQOL): position paper from the World Health Organization. *Soc Sci Med*. 1995;41:1403–1409.
25. Acquadro C, Conway K, Hareendran A, et al. Literature review of methods to translate health-related quality of life questionnaires for use in multinational clinical trials. *Value Health*. 2008;11:509–521.
26. Jovanović V, Gavrilov-Jerković V. More than a (negative) feeling: validity of the perceived stress scale in Serbian clinical and non-clinical samples. *Psihologija*. 2015;48:5–18.
27. Kleemola L, Helminen M, Rorarius E, et al. Voice activity and participation profile in assessing the effects of voice disorders on quality of life: estimation of the validity, reliability and responsiveness of the Finnish version. *Folia Phoniatr Logop*. 2011;63:113–121.
28. Kline RB. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: Guilford; 2005.
29. Ruotsalainen JH, Sellman J, Lehto L, et al. Interventions for treating functional dysphonia in adults. *Cochrane Libr*. 2007;(3):CD006373.
30. World Health Organization. Process of translation and adaptation of instruments; 2009. Available from: http://www.who.int/sub-stance_abuse/research_tools/translation/en/
31. Anastasi A. *Psychological Testing*. New York: Macmillan; 1976.