

Measuring positive health using the My Positive Health (MPH) and Individual Recovery Outcomes Counter (I.ROC) dialogue tools: a panel study on measurement properties in a representative general Dutch population

van Druten, Vera P. MA RN^{1,2}, Metz, Margot J. PhD^{1,3}, Mathijssen, Jolanda J.P. PhD¹, van de Mheen, Dike PhD¹, van Vliet, Marja PhD⁴, Rudd, Bridey PhD^{5,6}, de Vries, Esther MD PhD^{1,2}, Nahar – van Venrooij, Lenny M.W. PhD^{1,2}

Affiliations

¹ Tranzo Scientific Centre for Care and Wellbeing, Tilburg University, Tilburg, the Netherlands.

² Jeroen Bosch Academy Research, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, 's Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands.

³ GGz Breburg, Specialist Mental Health Care Organisation, Tilburg, The Netherlands.

⁴ Institute for Positive Health, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

⁵ Penumbra Mental Health, Edinburgh, United Kingdom.

⁶ The Mental Health Foundation, Glasgow, United Kingdom.

Corresponding author

van Druten, Vera P.

+31735532065

v.p.vandruten@tilburguniversity.edu

STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

Funding: The study was funded by the Jeroen Bosch Hospital, 's-Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands.

Conflicts of interests: MvV co-developed the MPG and worked at the Institute for Positive Health at the start of this study. BR previously worked at Penumbra Scotland, where the IROC was developed.

Author contributions: VvD conducted most of the statistical analyses and wrote the article. LN-vV, MM and EdV wrote the protocol, planned and supervised the research, statistical analyses and the writing process. JM conducted CFA together with VvD, supervised the statistical analyses and reviewed the manuscript. EdV, BR, MvV, MM, DvdM, LN-vV reviewed the manuscript.

Ethical approval: The study was conducted in accordance with current public regulations, laws, and the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was given by each participant to be included as a LISS-panel member.

Data availability: All data from the LISS panel are anonymised and available upon request for researchers and policymakers. For more information see: <https://www.lissdata.nl/access-data>.

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Using the ‘positive health’ perspective has emerged in general healthcare. Conceptual similarities exist with the ‘recovery’ perspective in mental healthcare. Both concepts are multidimensional and focus on capability. The My Positive Health (MPH) and Individual Recovery Outcomes Counter (I.ROC) tools were developed for *dialogues*. These tools might be useful for *quantitatively measuring the positive health* construct for monitoring and scientific purposes as well. We aimed to investigate this.

Method

An observational cross-sectional study was conducted in a representative general Dutch population (the LISS panel) to investigate factor structures and internal consistency from the 42-items MPH and 12-items I.ROC. After randomly splitting the dataset, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were applied. Spearman correlation coefficient between both tools’ total scores was calculated.

Results

2,457 participants completed the questionnaires. A six-factor structure was extracted for MPH (PH42) and a two-factor structure for I.ROC (I.ROC12). Explained variances were 68.1% and 56.1%, respectively. CFA resulted in good fit indices. Cronbach’s alphas were between 0.74 to 0.97 (PH42) and 0.73 to 0.87 (I.ROC12). Correlation between the total scores was 0.77.

Conclusion

Both PH42 and I.ROC12 are useful to quantitatively measure positive health aspects which can be summarised in sum scores in a general population. The dimensions found in this study and the corresponding item division differed from the dimensions of the original dialogue tools. Further research is recommended focussing on item reduction for PH42, factor structure of I.ROC and assessment of construct validity (in a general population) in more depth.

KEYWORDS

Positive health, recovery, patient-centred outcomes research, patient reported outcome measures, measurement properties, factor analysis.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

INTRODUCTION

In 2011, Huber et al. introduced a new, dynamic perspective on health: “*health as the ability to adapt and self-manage in the face of social, physical, and emotional challenges*” (Huber et al., 2011). This new perspective differs from the original WHO definition of health (The World Health Organization (WHO), 2006). It focusses on someone’s capability instead of incapability, which means that people with disabilities or chronic diseases are no longer automatically seen as ‘not healthy’ (Huber et al., 2011; van Druten et al., 2022). Huber’s perspective laid the foundations for positive health, in which health is regarded as a broad construct and as an asset to living a meaningful life (Huber et al., 2016).

In the last decades, comparable focus shifts have taken place in mental healthcare for the recovery perspective. It was broadened including not only clinical recovery (reducing symptoms), but also social recovery (the role(s) someone fulfils in society), and personal recovery (living a satisfying and meaningful life) (Anthony, 1993; Davidson & Roe, 2007; Leamy et al., 2011). Taking a closer look into positive health and recovery concepts shows that both perspectives focus on a comparable multidimensional construct of health including the ability to adapt to changing conditions (Anthony, 1993; Davidson & Roe, 2007; Huber et al., 2011; Leamy et al., 2011).

To apply these perspectives of health in daily living and practice dialogue tools were developed. The My Positive Health (MPH) *dialogue* tool was developed to help citizens, patients and healthcare professionals to guide their conversation, to self-reflect and to encourage the person in question to make personalised health improvements. MPH consists of 42 items about health based on information emerged from a large study including interviews about what health is to citizens, patients and other stakeholders (Huber et al., 2016). It visually presents health in six dimensions: bodily functions, mental wellbeing, meaningfulness, quality of life, social and societal participation and daily functioning (Huber et al., 2016; Institute for positive health, n.d.). For recovery, the Individual Recovery Outcomes Counter (I.ROC) *dialogue* tool was developed, specifically for mental health related consultations (Ion et al., 2013; Monger et al., 2013). I.ROC also aims to support the conversation about broad health, self-reflection, and to make personalised recovery improvements (Rudd et al., 2020). The I.ROC consists of 12 questions visually presented in 4 domains; home, opportunity, people and empowerment (Ion et al., 2013; Monger et al., 2013). Looking at the underlying aspects representing health in the MPH and I.ROC dialogue tools it can be concluded that the content of these dialogue tools is also almost the same. Both are used as self-reported questionnaires in preparation for, or as guide during, the conversation with healthcare professionals.

57 To facilitate the evaluation of working with this positive health approach comprehensible quantitative
58 outcome measures are needed. The MPH dialogue tool and its dimensions were not developed to *measure*
59 positive health but to facilitate the conversation about positive health (Huber et al., 2016). Earlier research about
60 measuring positive health revealed concerns about relevance, comprehensiveness and comprehensibility of the
61 positive health model (Prinsen & Terwee, 2019). Subsequently, a shortened measurement scale, consisting of 17
62 out of the 42 items of the dialogue tool (PH17) was developed (Van Vliet et al., 2021). Although fit indices were
63 adequate (Doornenbal et al., 2021), caution should be taken when generalising these results, because the original
64 study of van Vliet et al. (Van Vliet et al., 2021) in which the PH17 was developed was based on research among
65 citizens in just one part of the Netherlands, an eastern Dutch region, and the response rate was very low (25%)
66 (Doornenbal et al., 2021; Van Vliet et al., 2021). In contrast to the MPH, the I.ROC is already further developed
67 for measuring purposes. Studies for the I.ROC as measurement tool among different mental healthcare
68 populations showed good internal consistency, test-retest reliability and concurrent validity, but with differing
69 factor structures (Beckers et al., 2022; Dickens et al., 2017; Monger et al., 2013; Roze et al., 2020; Rudd, 2018;
70 Rudd et al., 2020; Sportel et al., 2023). However, neither for MPH or I.ROC research at measurement properties
71 has been conducted in a representative general population as yet.

72 Because of the similarities between both tools, it was hypothesised that they might both serve as a
73 measurement tool for positive health. As a first step to develop such a generic measurement tool for positive
74 health this study assessed measurement properties including factor structures and internal consistencies of both
75 the MPH and I.ROC dialogue tools among a large Dutch cohort representative for a general population. It was
76 aimed to identify if these dialogue tools measure multidimensional aspects of positive health which can be
77 summarised in sum scores. Additionally, coherence between the MPH and the I.ROC was assessed.

78 **METHODS**

79 **Study design**

80 An observational cross-sectional research design was used to evaluate factor structures and internal consistency
81 of the MPH and I.ROC. Correlation between the MPH and the I.ROC dialogue tools was calculated in a
82 representative cohort from the general Dutch population, the Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social
83 sciences (LISS) panel.

84 **Participants**

85 The LISS panel (<http://www.lissdata.nl>) is a non-commercial online longitudinal research panel, operational
86 since 2007 and includes a representative sample of approximately 7,000 individuals from approximately 5,000
87 households from the Dutch general population. The panel includes both healthy people and people with health
88 conditions, all living at home. The panel was carefully composed based on a true probability distribution drawn
89 from the population register by Statistics Netherlands (Scherpenzeel & Das, 2010). To become a LISS panel
90 member, at least one person in the household should master the Dutch language. To minimise selection bias,
91 households were provided with a computer and internet connection if they could not otherwise participate.

92 **Data collection**

93 LISS panel members complete monthly online questionnaires and are paid for each completed questionnaire.
94 Response rates for this panel are high. For example, 5,714 (83.6%) LISS panel members completed a LISS core
95 study module about health in November 2020 (<https://www.lissdata.nl/research/liss-core-study>). For this study,
96 the selected study population was asked to additionally fill out the MPH and I.ROC dialogue tool questionnaires.
97 Rule of thumb for sample size calculation is four to ten respondents per item of a questionnaire with a minimum
98 of 100 patients according to de Vet et al. (2018). A study population of 2,500 respondents is adequate to assess
99 factor structures of the data and their goodness of fit in two separate groups (n=1250). To achieve the required
100 number (n=2500) counting on a response rate of 75%, 3,246 adults (≥ 18 years, one per household) of the LISS
101 panel were randomly selected.

102 **Dialogue tools MPH and I.ROC**

103 The MPH dialogue tool consists of 42 statements scored on an 11-point scale ranging from 0 'totally disagree' to
104 10 'totally agree'. The I.ROC dialogue tool consists of 12 items on a six-point scale from 1 'never' to 6 'all the
105 time'. Higher scores represent better health (see Supplementary tables 1 and 2). In this study both dialogue tools
106 are used as self-reported questionnaires.

107 **Evaluation of measurement properties/analytical plan**

108 First, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to explore factor structures and generate sum scores per factor.
109 For this purpose, the extraction method principal component analysis (PCA) was applied. PCA (also called
110 exploratory factor analysis) is a statistical technique used for analysing the interrelations among a set of variables
111 (or questions in the questionnaire) and for explaining these interrelations in terms of a reduced number of
112 variables, called factors (de Vet et al., 2018; Floyd & Widaman, 1995; Velicer & Jackson, 1990). Next, to assess
113 if the extracted factor structure also holds in another group, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was applied in

114 another part of the sample. The dataset was randomly split; group 1 for EFA and group 2 for CFA. Last, per
115 factor internal consistency was explored, and coherence between the total scores of both tools was assessed.
116 Statistical analyses were performed using software package IBM SPSS version 27, except for CFA which was
117 analysed with IBM SPSS Amos version 27.

118 **Exploratory factor analysis**

119 Step 1: associations between all items were assessed with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test
120 correlation in data group 1; these should be >0.5 with significance level <0.05 to have sufficient correlations for
121 factor analysis. Items that do not correlate with any other item (<0.2) were discussed for its content. Item
122 correlations of >0.9 might measure the same thing. Items with low or high correlations (<0.2 and >0.9) could be
123 retained or deleted, depending on the qualitative content discussion about the importance for the construct to be
124 measured.

125 Step 2: the number of factors was identified with Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation rotation, because
126 items and factors were not expected to be independent from each other. The number of factors was determined
127 with a criterion eigenvalue >1 and inspection of the scree plot for confirmation. Highest factor loadings of items
128 were used as guidance to divide the items over the factors with a minimum threshold of 0.32 (21). Factor
129 loadings of >0.71 are considered excellent, >0.63 very good, >0.55 good and >0.45 fair (Tabachnick & Fidell,
130 2007). Since our aim was not to reduce items but to assess structures and to generate sum scores, we chose the
131 relatively low cut-off point for factor loadings of >0.32 for including items (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

132 Step 3: item content and factor structure were discussed by the research team. The items were assigned to
133 the factors on which they loaded the highest, unless an item conceptually fitted better in another factor according
134 to the research team; then they were relocated.

135 Step 4: inter-item correlations per factor were assessed; values should be between 0.2 and 0.5. Inter-item
136 correlations greater than 0.7 suggest that they may measure the same thing (de Vet et al., 2018).

137 **Confirmatory factor analysis**

138 Step 5: Extracted factor structures were assessed for goodness of fit using CFA. Maximum likelihood (ML) was
139 used as estimation method. Goodness of fit indices included chi-square (X^2). A non-significant X^2 is desirable,
140 however in a large sample, the X^2 is usually significant. Comparative fit index (CFI) and Root mean square error
141 of approximation (RMSEA) were therefore also used. CFI values between 0.90 and 0.95 are indicators of
142 acceptable fit and >0.95 indicates superior model fit (Byrne, 2010; Hu & Bentler, 1999). RMSEA values <0.05

143 represent good fit, 0.05-0.08 acceptable fit, >0.08 medium fit and >0.1 poor fit (Byrne, 2010; Hu & Bentler,
144 1999).

145 ***Internal consistency***

146 Step 6: Cronbach's alphas were calculated to further explore internal consistency; values of factors between 0.7
147 and 0.9 with a minimum of 3 items were considered good (de Vet et al., 2018).

148 ***Total scores and sum scores per factor***

149 Step 7: To describe the distribution of the data, mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, maximum,
150 skewness and kurtosis (< -1 and < 1) of the factor scores and total scores were calculated. If $\geq 15\%$ of the
151 respondents scored lowest possible scores this suggests that floor effects exists (de Vet et al., 2018). If $\geq 15\%$ of
152 the respondents scored highest possible scores this suggests ceiling effects (de Vet et al., 2018).

153 ***Correlation between total scores***

154 Step 8: Correlation between the total scores of MPH and I.ROC was calculated with Spearman's correlation
155 coefficient to assess if coherence exists between the tools. A value >0.4 suggests moderate to strong correlation
156 (de Vet et al., 2018).

157 **Ethical considerations**

158 The study was conducted in accordance with current public regulations, laws, and the principles of the
159 Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was given by the METC Brabant (Tilburg, the Netherlands, study
160 number NW2024-15). Informed consent was given by each participant to be included as a LISS panel member
161 and for each monthly questionnaire (Scherpenzeel & Das, 2010). The General Data Protection Regulation
162 (GDPR) was followed. All data from the LISS panel are anonymised and open access available for researchers
163 and policymakers upon request.

164 **RESULTS**

165 **Characteristics of the respondents**

166 The response rate was high (76%) with 777 respondents not responding. Twelve respondents did not fill out the
167 questionnaires completely and this small number was excluded, leaving 2,457 respondents for the analyses.
168 Characteristics of the included respondents are shown in Table 1. The response group (n=2,457) was randomly
169 split in group 1 for EFA (n=1,199) and group 2 for CFA (n=1,258) as described in the Methods section.

Table 1: characteristics of the respondents.

Total (n=2457)

		n (% of total)
Gender (W)		1,327 (54)
Age (mean ± SD)		53.3±17.8
Educational level ¹	Low	603 (24.5)
	Middle	867 (35.3)
	High	980 (39.9)
	Missing	7 (0.3)
Personal monthly income (median) (IQR)	Euro	3,000 (2,205)
	Missing	133 (5.4)
Healthcare use ²	None	751 (30.6)
	General practitioner	705 (28.7)
	Medical specialist	977 (39.8)
	Missing	24 (1.0)

n: number, w: women, SD: standard deviation, IQR: interquartile range.

¹ Educational level. Low: primary education, prevocational secondary education, first three years of senior general secondary education, first three years of pre-university education and senior secondary vocational education level 1. Middle: four or five years of senior general secondary education, four, five or six years of pre-university education and senior secondary vocational education, level 2, 3 or 4. High: higher vocational education and university education.

² Healthcare use. None: no visit at the general practitioner or medical specialist. General practitioner: visiting the general practitioner. Medical specialist: visiting a medical specialist at the hospital, psychiatrist, psychologist or psychotherapist

170

171 **My Positive Health (MPH)**

172 *Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)*

173 Step 1: KMO and Bartlett's test was statistically significant (0.97; $p < .01$). Item correlations showed that item 3
174 (having complaints or pain) of the MPH dimension Bodily Functions (BF) did not correlate (<0.2) with 15 items
175 from the MPH dimensions Mental Wellbeing (MW), Meaningfulness (MF), Quality of Life (QL), Social and
176 societal Participation (SP) and Daily Functioning (DF): MW10, MW13, MF21, QL27, QL28, SP29, SP31, SP32,
177 SP33, SP35, DF36, DF37, DF40, DF41, DF42 (for content of these items see Table 2). Based on relevance of the
178 content and its correlation with other items, item BF3 was not deleted.

179 Step 2: the extraction method PCA and Oblimin rotation revealed a six-factor structure with an
180 eigenvalue >1 explaining 68.1% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged from 0.36 to 0.94. After careful
181 consideration within the research team, the factors were named: 'Acceptance, meaningfulness and satisfaction
182 with life', 'Physical health and functioning', 'Self-management', 'Social network and societal roles', 'Personal
183 development' and 'Cognition'. For details of factors, items and factor loadings see Table 2.

184 Step 3: the research team discussed item distribution among the factors on its content; no changes were
185 made based on the discussion.

186 Step 4: inter-item correlations showed that 48.1% of the correlations within the factor 'Acceptance,
187 meaningfulness and satisfaction with life', 14.3% within the factor 'Physical health and functioning', 4.8%
188 within the factor 'Self-management', 25% within the factor 'Social network and societal roles', none within the

189 factor ‘Personal development’ and 33.3% within the factor ‘Cognition were >0.7 (For more details see
190 Supplementary tables 3 to 8.).

Table 2: factor loadings from the exploratory factor analysis of MPH

Pattern Matrix MPH		Factor					
		Acceptance, meaningfulness and satisfaction with life	Physical health and functioning	Self- management	Social network and societal roles	Personal development	Cognition
Item number of the dialogue tool	Item description						
BF1	Feeling healthy	0.195	0.769	0.027	-0.032	0.016	0.028
BF2	Feeling fit	0.206	0.781	0.052	-0.039	-0.002	0.003
BF3	Having complaints or pain	-0.031	0.450	-0.097	0.062	-0.018	0.193
BF4	Sleeping pattern	0.395	0.422	-0.061	0.022	-0.276	0.254
BF5	Eating pattern	0.241	0.364	0.248	0.087	-0.250	0.197
BF6	Physical condition	0.069	0.783	0.046	0.021	0.048	-0.013
BF7	Exercise	-0.107	0.877	0.061	0.049	0.109	-0.118
MW8	Being able to remember things	0.129	0.057	0.120	0.074	0.140	0.654
MW9	Being able to concentrate	0.303	0.021	0.161	0.027	0.099	0.610
MW10	Being able to communicate	-0.297	0.095	0.250	0.327	0.157	0.429
MW11	Being cheerful	0.653	0.159	-0.040	0.154	0.089	0.102
MW12	Accepting yourself	0.572	0.037	0.206	0.054	0.043	0.145
MW13	Being able to handle changes	0.106	-0.034	0.045	0.131	0.518	0.259
MW14	Having control	0.534	0.026	0.201	0.105	0.163	0.123
MF15	Having a meaningful life	0.573	0.049	0.045	0.249	0.183	0.005
MF16	Being high-spirited	0.673	0.105	0.046	0.129	0.102	0.033
MF17	Wanting to achieve ideals	0.310	0.161	-0.115	-0.008	0.643	0.051
MF18	Feeling confident about own future	0.558	0.161	0.033	0.093	0.344	-0.019
MF19	Accepting life	0.645	-0.039	0.165	0.048	0.135	0.087
MF20	Being grateful	0.624	0.008	0.114	0.135	0.160	0.002
MF21	Continue learning	0.182	0.118	0.020	0.002	0.660	0.017
QL22	Enjoyment	0.676	0.086	0.021	0.253	0.060	-0.013
QL23	Being happy	0.699	0.082	-0.004	0.260	0.034	-0.023
QL24	Feeling good	0.708	0.235	-0.009	0.097	0.051	0.005
QL25	Feeling well-balanced	0.751	0.064	0.129	0.053	0.047	0.036
QL26	Feeling safe	0.393	0.074	0.185	0.256	0.028	0.078
QL27	Living conditions	0.335	-0.044	0.224	0.423	-0.140	-0.017
QL28	Having enough money	0.219	0.035	0.598	0.147	-0.121	-0.231
SP29	Social contacts	0.111	0.013	-0.038	0.786	0.013	0.051
SP30	Being taken seriously	-0.023	-0.021	0.047	0.792	0.081	0.092
SP31	Doing fun things together	0.043	0.070	-0.070	0.899	-0.014	-0.043
SP32	Having the support of others	-0.014	-0.013	-0.036	0.939	-0.038	0.015
SP33	Belonging	0.099	-0.015	0.018	0.864	-0.070	-0.028
SP34	Doing meaningful things	0.228	0.212	0.103	0.401	0.181	-0.169
SP35	Being interested in society	0.011	-0.002	0.181	0.418	0.263	-0.011
DF36	Looking after yourself	-0.171	0.290	0.633	0.052	0.092	0.065
DF37	Knowing your limitations	0.001	0.014	0.754	0.017	0.011	0.233
DF38	Knowledge of health	-0.022	0.157	0.651	0.088	0.019	0.201
DF39	Managing time	0.132	0.001	0.634	-0.062	0.073	0.238
DF40	Managing money	0.147	-0.036	0.828	0.001	-0.069	-0.070
DF41	Being able to work	-0.089	0.526	0.291	0.058	0.266	-0.223
DF42	Asking for help	0.065	-0.044	0.452	0.178	0.175	-0.154

Extraction method Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.

Items with factor loadings >0.32 are preserved. In bold: items belonging to the subscale on behalf of highest factor loading.

BF: bodily functions, MW: mental wellbeing, MF: meaningfulness, QL: quality of life, SP: social and societal participation, DF: daily functioning (Huber et al., 2016).

192 **Confirmatory factor analysis**

193 Step 5: the extracted six-factor structure had an acceptable fit in CFA with significant X^2 (5290.328; degrees of
194 freedom 790; $p \leq 0.01$), CFI of 0.90 and RMSEA of 0.067 with a 90% confidence interval of 0.066 to 0.069.

195 **Internal consistency of MPH**

196 Step 6: Cronbach's alphas of the extracted factors ranged from 0.74 to 0.97; 0.969 (Acceptance, meaningfulness
197 and satisfaction with life), 0.866 (Physical health and functioning), 0.860 (Self-management), 0.923 (Social
198 network and societal roles), 0.742 (Personal development) and 0.801 (Cognition).

199 **Sum scores per factor and total score of MPH**

200 Step 7: Results are shown in Table 3. No floor or ceiling effect was present on the factors or total score; no more
201 than 8.3% of the respondents scored the highest possible score and none of the respondents scored the lowest
202 possible score (data not shown).

Table 3: Total scores and sum scores per factor of PH42 for the total response group (n=2457)

	Acceptance, meaningfulness and satisfaction with life (min-max score on the factor 0-130)	Physical health and functioning (min-max score on the factor 0-80)	Self- management (min-max score on the factor 0-70)	Social network and societal roles (min-max score on the factor 0-80)	Personal development (min-max score on the factor 0-30)	Cognition (min-max score on the factor 0-30)	Total score (min-max score on the total score 0- 420)
Mean	98.4	57.5	58.2	62.9	21.9	23.8	322.6
Median	102	60	59	64	22	24	330
SD	20.4	13.0	8.6	11.4	4.8	4.3	53.4
Skewness	-0.95	-0.7	-1.0	-1.02	-0.68	-0.91	-0.79
Kurtosis	1.12	0.408	1.31	1.64	0.47	1.09	0.75
Min	9	7	18	4	3	2	104
Max	130	80	70	80	30	30	420

203

204 **Individual Recovery Outcomes Counter (IROC)**

205 **Exploratory factor analysis**

206 Step 1: KMO and Bartlett's test was significant (0.92; $p \leq 0.01$). Item correlations showed that only item 8
207 (Social network) did not correlate (<0.2) with items 2 (life skills) and 3 (safety and comfort). Based on relevance
208 of the content and its correlation with other items, item PE8 was not deleted.

209 Step 2: the extraction method PCA with Oblimin rotation revealed a two-factor structure with an
210 eigenvalue >1 explaining 56.1% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged from 0.37 to 0.87. After careful
211 consideration within the research team, the factors were named: 'Wellbeing, control, network and
212 meaningfulness' and 'Health, safety and abilities' (Table 4).

213 Step 3: the research team concurred on item distribution for 11 items. Item 5 (exercise and activity)
214 loaded almost equally on both factors. This item was relocated to the factor 'Health, safety and abilities'

215 following discussion about the content of the I.ROC dimensions and related items. For details of factors, items
216 and factor loadings see Table 4.

217 Step 4: for both factors all inter-item correlations were <0.7 (see Supplementary tables 9 and 10).

Table 4: Factor loadings from the exploratory factor analysis of I.ROC

Pattern Matrix I.ROC		Factor	
		Wellbeing, control, network and meaningfulness	Health, safety and abilities
Item number of questionnaire	Description		
HO1	Mental health	0.453	0.438
HO2	Life skills	-0.098	0.872
HO3	Safety and comfort	0.116	0.677
OP4	Physical health	0.213	0.633
OP5	Exercise and activity	0.375	0.369
OP6	Purpose and direction	0.577	0.238
PE7	Personal network	0.671	0.058
PE8	Social network	0.778	-0.270
PE9	Valuing myself	0.697	0.147
EM10	Participation and control	0.775	0.026
EM11	Hope for the future	0.730	0.124
EM12	Self-management	0.675	0.159

Extraction method Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Items with factor loadings >0.32 are preserved. In bold: items belonging to the subscale.

HO: Home, OP: opportunity, PE: people, EM: empowerment (Ion et al., 2013; Monger et al., 2013).

218

219 *Confirmatory factor analysis*

220 Step 5: the two-factor structure extracted from EFA had an acceptable fit in CFA with significant X^2 (321.503;
221 degrees of freedom 47; $p \leq 0.01$), CFI of 0.96 and RMSEA of 0.068 with a 90% confidence interval of 0.061 to
222 0.075.

223 *Internal consistency of I.ROC*

224 Step 6: Cronbach's alphas of the extracted factors were 0.87 (Wellbeing, control, network and meaningfulness)
225 and 0.73 (Health, safety and abilities).

226 *Sum scores per factor and total scores of I.ROC*

227 Step 7: Results are shown in Table 5. No more than 9.3% of the respondents scored the highest score on one of
228 the factors or the total score and no respondents scored the lowest score (data not shown).

Table 5: Total scores and sum scores per factor of I.ROC12 for the total response group (n=2457)

	Wellbeing, control, network and meaningfulness (min-max score on the factor 8-48)	Health, safety and abilities (min-max score on the factor 4-24)	Total score (min-max score on the total score 12-72)
Mean	35.5	20.0	55.4
Median	36	20	56
SD	6.5	3.0	8.8

Skewness	-0.45	-0.89	-0.55
Kurtosis	0.11	0.73	0.27
Min	10	7	21
Max	48	24	72

229

230 **Correlation between total scores of MPH and I.ROC**

231 Step 8: Spearman correlation coefficient between total scores of MPH and I.ROC was 0.77 and significant
232 ($P \leq 0.01$).

233

DISCUSSION

234 This study assessed whether the original items of the *dialogue* tools MPH and I.ROC can be used for *measuring*
235 *multiple aspects of positive health summarised in sum scores* among a general (Dutch) population. For the MPH
236 tool, factor analysis resulted in a six-factor structure including all 42 items and for the I.ROC tool in a two-factor
237 structure including all 12 items. For both tools, CFA confirmed acceptable fit to the data. Internal consistency
238 was good, except for two of the extracted factors of the MPH tool in which internal consistency was too high
239 (>0.9). The total scores of the tools were highly correlated (0.77). To differentiate the original dialogue tools
240 MPH and I.ROC from the measurement tools, these measurement tools (questionnaires) are further called the
241 PH42 and I.ROC12. These results imply important points for consideration as described below.

242 It is important to realise that different methodological approaches are used to identify dimensions
243 depending on the aim of the instrument; i.e., whether it is meant to be a dialogue tool or a quantitative
244 measurement tool. These different aims may lead to different results. The study of Huber et al. (2016) intended
245 to get more insight in what health meant for different stakeholder groups (patients, practitioners, citizens and
246 policymakers) using a qualitative research design. The indicators of health that emerged from this study led to
247 the operationalisation of the concept of positive health (Huber et al., 2016). The concept was further elaborated
248 and an MPH dialogue tool including six dimensions was developed, aiming to support the conversation about
249 someone's health in daily practice from a positive health perspective as well as to support self-evaluation (Huber
250 et al., 2016). The aim of our study was to evaluate the items of the MPH and I.ROC dialogue tools for
251 quantitative measuring purposes among a general population by assessing their factor structure and generating
252 factor sum scores. In addition, the aim was not to reduce items, as long as the items did not hamper a clear
253 interpretation. Therefore, the more conservative cut-off point for factor loadings of >0.32 (Tabachnick & Fidell,
254 2007) instead of the >0.5 cut-off point aiming to reduce items (de Vet et al., 2018), was chosen. Compared to the
255 MPH dialogue tool, we identified differences in the division of items over the dimensions of the investigated

256 PH42 measurement tool. Both the MPH dialogue tool and the PH42 measurement tool correspond to the positive
257 health construct. The results showed that the measurement tool is still multidimensional while no items (and thus
258 aspects of positive health) were deleted. Similar issues were seen for the I.ROC dialogue tool. Initially, the four
259 dimensions of the I.ROC dialogue tool were also developed for visual presentation and to guide the conversation
260 (Monger et al., 2012). In the current study differences in the division of items over two dimensions of the
261 I.ROC12 measurement tool were identified. For *quantitative measuring* purposes the dimensions retrieved from
262 our study are the best fit.

263 The factor structure found for I.ROC12 in our general population did not correspond with the results
264 from earlier research aiming to develop a measurement tool based on the I.ROC for a mental healthcare
265 population. While our study resulted in two factors, these studies resulted in one up to three factors (Beckers et
266 al., 2022; Dickens et al., 2017; Monger et al., 2013; Rudd et al., 2020). These differences can most likely be
267 explained by the differences in the study populations, because perceptions and values of aspects of health may
268 differ between a mental healthcare population and the general population (van Druten et al., 2022). Furthermore,
269 cross-cultural measurement invariance between our Dutch population and the Scottish populations, in which the
270 I.ROC was developed and first validated, may be present indicating that comparable groups of respondents
271 among different cultures score differently on a questionnaire (de Vet et al., 2018). Also, while this study was
272 being performed, the COVID-19 pandemic struck, which can have led to different scores particularly on the
273 questions about social network and activities. However, the PH17 which was developed pre-COVID showed a
274 factor structure comparable to the PH42 (Van Vliet et al., 2021). In contrast to the I.ROC12, for the PH42, no
275 research into factor structures in other than a general population has been conducted so far. If the PH42 and
276 I.ROC12 will be used in other populations, more research is needed to assess if the found factor structures for the
277 PH42 and the I.ROC12 also hold.

278 Although the PH42 seems useful for measurement purposes, the results imply that future research into
279 item reduction is advisable. Two factors ‘Acceptance, meaningfulness and satisfaction with life’ and ‘Social
280 network and societal roles’ had high internal consistency (>0.9) meaning that a redundancy of items is present;
281 there was also a high amount of inter-item correlations (>0.7) in these factors (48.7% and 25%), meaning that
282 some items might measure the same thing. Furthermore, it should be stressed that PH42 includes items that
283 loaded substantially (>0.3) on more than one factor (6/42). These items were judged not to hamper a clear
284 interpretation of the factor and were therefore retained. These results imply added value of item reduction for the
285 PH42 to develop a clarified, comprehensible and comprehensive measurement tool.

286 We conclude the PH42 to be the first choice for quantitatively measuring the multidimensional concept of
287 positive health in a general population. The I.ROC12 – although developed for a different purpose (recovery) –
288 is a potential alternative. We found a high coherence between the total scores of the tools supporting that they
289 measure a comparable construct. The I.ROC12 is shorter, however, the PH42 gives more information and the
290 explained variance of the PH42 is higher. The results of our study offer some support for the use of the PH17
291 (Van Vliet et al., 2021) as a shorter alternative: all except one item of the dimensions of the PH17 showed
292 overlap with the dimensions of the PH42. However, Van Vliet et al. (2021) did not apply the preferred
293 methodological approach for item reduction as published by de Vet et al. (2018), when developing the PH17.
294 This approach implies item reduction based on repeated factor analyses after removal of each item including
295 judgement of factor loadings and inter-item correlations, content discussion, and maintaining acceptable internal
296 consistencies. As a next step in the validation process of both the PH42 and I.ROC12 in a general population,
297 assessment of construct validity in more depth is recommended.

298 This study has some limitations. A minor limitation of the selection procedure was that at least one
299 member of the household had to master the Dutch language, whereby migrants were relatively underrepresented.
300 Also, the members of the participating households had to be able to use a computer, which may have led to some
301 selection bias. However, this study is robust in terms of its large sample size, the high response rate and the
302 representativeness of the general Dutch population (Scherpenzeel & Das, 2010).

303 CONCLUSION

304 The results of this study suggest that both the PH42 and the I.ROC12 are useful to quantitatively measure aspects
305 of positive health which can be summarised in sum scores in a general population. For both tools, the dimensions
306 and item division differed from the original dialogue tools. This means that for quantitative measurement
307 purposes the dimensions found in our study should be used instead of the dimensions of the dialogue tools. The
308 PH42 is the first choice, however the I.ROC12 is an adequate alternative. For the PH42, further research into
309 item reduction is recommended. For both tools, future research should focus on assessing construct validity (in a
310 general population) in more depth.

311

312 REFERENCES

313 Anthony, W. (1993). Recovery from mental illness: The guiding vision of the mental health service system in the

- 314 1990s. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 4, 11–23.
- 315 Beckers, T., Koekkoek, B., Hutschemaekers, G., Rudd, B., & Tiemens, B. (2022). Measuring personal recovery
316 in a low-intensity community mental healthcare setting: validation of the Dutch version of the individual
317 recovery outcomes counter (I.ROC). *BMC Psychiatry*, 22(1), 38. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-022-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-022-03697-6)
318 03697-6
- 319 Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural Equational Modeling with AMOS blue book*.
- 320 Central Committee on research involving human subjects (CCMO). (n.d.). *Questionnaire research*.
- 321 Davidson, L., & Roe, D. (2007). Recovery from versus recovery in serious mental illness: One strategy for
322 lessening confusion plaguing recovery. *Journal of Mental Health*, 16(4), 459–470.
323 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638230701482394>
- 324 de Vet, H. C. W., Terwee, C. B., Mokkink, L. B., & Knol, D. L. (2018). *Measurement in Medicine*. Cambridge
325 university press: United Kingdom.
- 326 Dickens, G. L., Rudd, B., Hallett, N., Ion, R. M., & Hardie, S. M. (2017). Factor validation and Rasch analysis
327 of the individual recovery outcomes counter. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 41(1), 74–85.
328 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2017.1375030>
- 329 Doornenbal, B. M., Vos, R. C., Van Vliet, M., Kiefte-De Jong, J. C., & van den Akker-van Marle, M. E. (2021).
330 Measuring positive health: Concurrent and factorial validity based on a representative Dutch sample.
331 *Health and Social Care in the Community*, November, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13649>
- 332 Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor Analysis in the Development and Refinement of Clinical
333 Assessment Instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 286–299. [https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-](https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.286)
334 3590.7.3.286
- 335 Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional
336 criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55.
337 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 338 Huber, M., Knottnerus, J. A., Green, L., Horst, H. v d, Jadad, A. R., Kromhout, D., Leonard, B., Lorig, K.,
339 Loureiro, M. I., Meer, J. W. M. v d, Schnabel, P., Smith, R., Weel, C. v, & Smid, H. (2011). How should
340 we define health? *British Medical Journal*, 343(2), d4163–d4163. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4163>
- 341 Huber, M., van Vliet, M., Giezenberg, M., Winkens, B., Heerkens, Y., Dagnelie, P. C., & Knottnerus, J. A.
342 (2016). Towards a patient-centred operationalisation of the new dynamic concept of health. *British*
343 *Medical Journal Open*, 6(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-201501009110.1136/bmjopen-2015->

344 010091

345 Institute for positive health. (n.d.). *Mijn positieve gezondheid*. <https://mijnpositievegezondheid.nl/>

346 Ion, R., Monger, B., Hardie, S., Henderson, N., Cumming, J., Hardie, S., & Cumming, J. (2013). A tool to
347 measure progress and Outcome in Recovery. *British Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 2, 211–215.

348 Leamy, M., Bird, V., Boutillier, C. Le, Williams, J., & Slade, M. (2011). Conceptual framework for personal
349 recovery in mental health: systematic review and narrative synthesis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 199(6),
350 445–452. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.110.083733>

351 Monger, B., Hardie, S. M., Ion, R., Cumming, J., & Henderson, N. (2013). The Individual Recovery Outcomes
352 Counter: preliminary validation of a personal recovery measure. *The Psychiatrist*, 37(7), 221–227.
353 <https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.112.041889>

354 Monger, B., Ion, R., Henderson, N., Cumming, J., & Hardie, S. (2012). Outcome measurement in a Scottish
355 mental health charity. *Mental Health Today (Brighton, England)*, April, 24–27.

356 Prinsen, C. A. C., & Terwee, C. B. (2019). Measuring positive health: for now, a bridge too far. *Public Health*,
357 170, 70–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2019.02.024>

358 Roze, K. C. M., Tijsseling, C., Rudd, B., & Tiemens, B. G. (2020). Measuring Recovery in Deaf, Hard-of-
359 Hearing, and Tinnitus Patients in a Mental Health Care Setting: Validation of the I.ROC. *The Journal of*
360 *Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 25(2), 178–187. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enz043>

361 Rudd, B. (2018). *A holistic psychometric analysis of the individual recovery outcomes counter: balancing user*
362 *needs in the use of personal outcome measures*. Abertay University, School of Social and Health Sciences.

363 Rudd, B., Karatzias, T., Bradley, A., Fyvie, C., & Hardie, S. (2020). Personally meaningful recovery in people
364 with psychological trauma: Initial validity and reliability of the Individual Recovery Outcomes Counter
365 (I.ROC). *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 29(3), 387–398.
366 <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12671>

367 Scherpenzeel, A. C., & Das, M. (2010). “True” Longitudinal and Probability-Based Internet Panels: Evidence
368 From the Netherlands. In *Social and Behavioral Research and the Internet: Advances in Applied Methods*
369 *and Research Strategies*. (pp. 77–104). Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis.

370 Sportel, B. E., Aardema, H., Boonstra, N., Arends, J., Rudd, B., Metz, M. J., Castelein, S., & Pijnenborg, G. H.
371 M. (2023). Measuring recovery in participants with a schizophrenia spectrum disorder: validation of the
372 Individual Recovery Outcomes Counter (I.ROC). *BMC Psychiatry*, 23(1), 296.
373 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04763-3>

- 374 Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- 375 The World Health Organization (WHO). (2006). *The World Health Organization (WHO)* (Issue April 1948).
376 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203029732>
- 377 van Druten, V. P., Bartels, E. A., van de Mheen, D., de Vries, E., Kerckhoffs, A. P. M., & Nahar-van Venrooij,
378 L. M. W. (2022). Concepts of health in different contexts: a scoping review. *BMC Health Services*
379 *Research*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-07702-2>
- 380 Van Vliet, M., Doornenbal, B. M., Boerema, S., & Van Den Akker-Van Marle, E. M. (2021). Development and
381 psychometric evaluation of a Positive Health measurement scale: A factor analysis study based on a Dutch
382 population. *BMJ Open*, 11(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040816>
- 383 Velicer, W. F., & Jackson, D. N. (1990). Component Analysis versus Common Factor Analysis: Some Issues in
384 Selecting an Appropriate Procedure. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25(1), 1–28.
- 385