



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Exploring the relationship between quality of life and mental health problems in children: implications for measurement and practice

Citation for published version:

Sharpe, H, Patalay, P, Fink, E, Vostanis, P, Deighton, J & Wolpert, M 2016, 'Exploring the relationship between quality of life and mental health problems in children: implications for measurement and practice', *European child & adolescent psychiatry*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 659-667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-015-0774-5>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1007/s00787-015-0774-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-015-0774-5)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

European child & adolescent psychiatry

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 **Exploring the relationship between quality of life and mental health problems in**
2 **children: Implications for measurement and practice**

3
4 Helen Sharpe¹, Praveetha Patalay¹, Elian Fink¹, Panos Vostanis², Jessica Deighton¹, Miranda
5 Wolpert¹

6
7 1: University College London and the Anna Freud Centre

8 2: University of Leicester

9
10 Correspondence to: Dr Helen Sharpe, 12 Maresfield Gardens, London, NW3 5SU, United
11 Kingdom, +44 (0) 20 7443 2263, helen.sharpe@annafreud.org

12
13
14 **ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT VERSION**

15 **The final publication is available at Springer via**
16 **<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-015-0774-5>.**

Abstract

Purpose: Quality of life is typically reduced in children with mental health problems. Understanding the relationship between quality of life and mental health problems and the factors that moderate this association is a pressing priority.

Methods: This was a cross sectional study involving 45,398 children aged 8 – 13 years from 880 schools in England. Self-reported quality of life was assessed using nine items from the KIDSCREEN-10 and mental health was assessed using the Me and My School questionnaire. Demographic information (gender, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status) was also recorded.

Results: Quality of life was highest in children with no problems and lowest in children with both internalising and externalising problems. There was indication that quality of life may be reduced in children with internalising problems compared with externalising problems. Approximately 12% children with mental health problems reported high quality of life. The link between mental health and quality of life was moderated by gender and age but not by socioeconomic status or ethnicity.

Conclusions: This study supports previous work showing mental health and quality of life are related but not synonymous. The findings have implications for measuring quality of life in child mental health settings and the need for approaches to support children with mental health problems that are at particular risk of poor quality of life.

Keywords: quality of life, mental health, child, adolescent

Exploring the relationship between quality of life and mental health problems in children: Implications for measurement and practice

Children with mental health problems are known to be at risk for poor quality of life [13]. Those referred to mental health services, for example, report a level of quality of life that is highly correlated with the severity of their mental health difficulties [3]. However, whilst quality of life and mental health are strongly related, it is clear that the two are not synonymous [2, 6]. As such, untangling the nature of the relationship between mental health and quality of life in young people is a pressing priority.

Understanding what moderates the relationship between mental health and quality of life has important implications for understanding how to improve quality of life in the face of mental health problems. Little work has considered what characterises individuals for whom experiencing mental health problems does not go hand in hand with poor quality of life, and how we may break the cycle between the two. In one exception, Bastiaansen et al. [1] studied a sample of children referred to a clinic for mental health problems, and found that higher quality of life was associated with being male, having less severe mental health problems, not having chronic physical health problems, not experiencing stressful life events, having good social support from classmates and having strong self-esteem.

This existing research needs to be understood within the context of a number of broader challenges facing those studying the link between quality of life and mental health. First, studies relying on clinical samples may over-estimate the link between mental health problems and poor quality of life, because children for whom symptoms have the greatest impact on quality of life are arguably those most likely to be referred to services [8]. It is of importance, therefore, to also study these relationships in community samples. The simple association between quality of life and mental health in young people has been demonstrated in the general population [6, 14, 23]. For instance, in a sample of 2,703 Dutch children (aged 8-12 years), Bot et al. [6] found that parent-reported psychosocial problems (based on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire) were negatively associated with quality of life. This finding suggests that associations between mental health and quality of life are present across the full range of clinical severity, and not confined to the minority of children that access specialist services. What these studies have not addressed, however, is factors that may moderate the association between mental health and quality of life.

1 Second, greater attention needs to be paid to child-reports of quality of life in both clinical
2 and population groups, as many studies rely on parents' perceptions of their child's quality of
3 life [13]. Given that quality of life is fundamentally a subjective phenomenon, relying on
4 proxy reports from others is problematic. This constraint is underlined by findings from
5 clinical samples that show only small-to-moderate association between quality of life ratings
6 between parents or clinicians and child self-reports [3].

7 A third challenge has been untangling whether the observed associations between mental
8 health and quality of life are simply a reflection of item overlap [13], i.e., relying on similar
9 questions to measure common components of mental health and quality of life (e.g., feeling
10 happy), which can result in an artificially inflated association. However, several pieces of
11 evidence suggest that the observed associations are not artefacts of item overlap. For
12 example, 10% of children with mental health problems report high quality of life [6] and the
13 quality of life of children with mental health problems can improve with treatment, even if
14 symptoms remain high [2]. Moreover, accounting for item overlap by removing the items
15 with greatest conceptual similarity between the scales as part of sensitivity analyses has
16 produced similar findings to studies where this correction was not applied [14]. However,
17 item overlap has not been accounted for when exploring moderators of the relationship
18 between mental health and quality of life in children.

19 This study aimed to address this research gap by exploring factors that moderated the
20 association between quality of life and mental health in a large community sample of
21 children, whilst taking into account item overlap. In particular, it aimed to answer three
22 research questions (RQ) in relation to 8-13 year olds:

- 23 • RQ1: How is self-reported quality of life associated with self-reported mental health
24 problems?
- 25 • RQ2: Is it possible to identify children with mental health problems that also have
26 high quality of life?
- 27 • RQ3: What factors moderate the association between mental health and quality of
28 life?

29 It is hoped that by addressing these questions we can contribute to the wider debate about
30 how quality of life should be considered, measured and supported in relation to interventions
31 in mental health generally and in child mental health specifically [9, 16, 24].

Methods

Participants

The study involved 45,398 children drawn from 676 primary and 204 secondary schools from 98 local authorities across England. Details of the wider study, from which the data reported here are drawn, are reported separately [28]. Children were in year 4 ($n=15,013$, $M_{\text{age}} = 8.71$ years, $SD = 0.29$), year 5 ($n=8,231$, $M_{\text{age}} = 9.72$ years, $SD = 0.30$), year 7 ($n=14,337$, $M_{\text{age}} = 11.71$ years, $SD = 0.29$), and year 8 ($n=7,817$, $M_{\text{age}} = 12.71$ years, $SD = 0.29$). The majority were from White backgrounds (78%), 10% were Asian, 6% Black, 4% Mixed and 2% from other ethnic groups. Half of the sample (50%) were girls. The median Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) score [11] was 0.28, meaning that the average child in the sample was living in an area in which 28% of children were income deprived. These demographic features are largely reflective of the school-aged population in England (e.g., national average = 82% children from White backgrounds)[12], although deprivation is notably over-represented in this sample (national average = 0.20)[21].

Procedure

Parental consent was sought prior to data collection. Participants completed assessments using a secure online system at school. Teachers facilitated the completion of the survey and were given a standardised information sheet to read to participants. Children provided assent before proceeding to the questionnaire. Demographic information for participants was obtained from the National Pupil Database. The university ethics committee granted ethical permission for the wider study.

Measures

Quality of life

Quality of life was assessed using nine items from the KIDSCREEN-10 [26]. This measure provides an assessment of health-related quality of life and involves endorsing items such as “have you felt fit and well?” on a five-point scale, from “not at all” to “extremely”. The item not included in this study focused on parental relations and home life (“Have your parent(s) treated you fairly?”). This item was excluded because it was deemed outside of the aim of the wider study, which focused on experiences at school [28]. As such, it was not considered appropriate to ask children about experiences with their parents. The KIDSCREEN-10 has good psychometric properties when used with European children and adolescents [26]. In this sample, the internal consistency of the nine-item measure was acceptable ($\alpha = 0.75$) and

1 comparable to the established internal consistency for the 10-item measure ($\alpha = 0.82$)
2 [26]. In order to be able to compare the results when taking into account item overlap, scores
3 were standardised such that they ranged between 1 and 5, with higher values representing
4 better quality of life.

5 Mental health

6 Mental health problems were assessed using the Me and My School Questionnaire [10, 22],
7 which consists of a 10-item emotional difficulties subscale (e.g., “I worry a lot”) and a 6-item
8 behavioural difficulties subscale (e.g., “I get very angry”). Students responded to each item
9 by endorsing the response options “never”, “sometimes” or “always”. Validation studies for
10 this measure demonstrate robust psychometric properties [10, 22], and internal consistency
11 for the two subscales was high in the current study (internalising $\alpha = 0.76$, externalising
12 $\alpha = 0.79$).

13 Participants were considered to be at risk of mental health problems if they scored above the
14 ‘borderline’ cut-off for the subscales (score of 10 or above for the internalising subscale,
15 score of 6 or above for the externalising subscale)[10]. This resulted in participants falling
16 into one of four categories: ‘no problems’ (below cut-off for both subscales), ‘internalising
17 problems’ (above cut-off for internalising subscale only), ‘externalising problems’ (above
18 cut-off for externalising subscale only) or ‘internalising and externalising problems (above
19 cut-off for both subscales).

20 Demographic information

21 Demographic information available for the sample include gender, age (to the nearest month),
22 ethnicity (White, Black, Asian, Mixed, other or not known), and socio-economic status, as
23 measured by the IDACI score for the area in which the participant lived.

24 *Analysis*

25 All analyses were conducted using STATA12 [25]. Given the large sample size and multiple
26 comparisons in analyses we set α to 0.01 in order to control for Type I errors. First,
27 ANOVA was used to compare quality of life between the four mental health groups
28 (described in ‘mental health’, above; RQ1). Second, in order to compare those with low and
29 high quality of life, children were divided into quintiles. The bottom quintile was deemed
30 ‘low’ quality of life, quintiles 2-4 deemed ‘average’ quality of life, and the top quintile
31 deemed ‘high’ quality of life. Chi-square tests were then used to compare the proportion of
32 children with high, low and average quality of life across the four mental health groups

1 (RQ2). Finally, for RQ3, mixed effects models were used to examine factors moderating the
2 association between mental health and quality of life. Mixed effects models were necessary
3 because the data were hierarchically structured with participants clustered within schools. A
4 baseline mixed effects model (including only school as a random effect) showed that there
5 was school level variation in quality of life (intra-class correlation = 0.04). As such, random
6 effects accounting for school level variation were included in further analyses. In order to
7 examine moderators of the association between mental health and quality of life, interaction
8 terms between demographic factors and mental health status were included in the mixed
9 effects model predicting quality of life. Note that all interactions were included in the same
10 model. The significance of particular interaction terms in the model was determined using the
11 Wald test.

12 In order to account for item overlap between the mental health and quality of life measures,
13 the main analyses were rerun with items removed from the quality of life measure that had
14 strong conceptual overlap with mental health. These items were “Have you felt sad?” and
15 “Have you felt lonely?”. Differences in the findings between the two analyses are reported
16 below.

17 **Results**

18 ***RQ1: How is self-reported quality of life associated with self-reported mental health*** 19 ***problems?***

20 There was a significant difference between the quality of life that children reported for those
21 with and without mental health problems, $F(3, 45394) = 660.35, p < 0.001$. Planned
22 comparisons between the four groups (Table 1), showed that those with internalising
23 problems only or externalising problems only had lower quality of life than those with no
24 problems ($ps < 0.001, d = 0.39/0.43$), and those with both internalising and externalising
25 problems had lower quality of life than those with either of these problems in isolation ($ps <$
26 $0.001, d = 0.25/0.22$).

27 [Insert **Table 1** about here]

28 When taking into account item overlap, the same broad pattern emerged: those with no
29 problem reported the greatest quality of life ($M = 3.97, SD = 0.62$) and those with both
30 internalising and externalising problems reported the lowest quality of life ($M = 3.13, SD =$
31 0.86). One difference from the main analysis was that those with internalising problems only

1 now had significantly lower quality of life ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 0.74$) compared with those with
2 externalising problems only ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.73$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.26$), whereas previously
3 the two had been equivalent.

4 ***RQ2: Is it possible to identify children with mental health problems that also have high***
5 ***quality of life?***

6 There was a significant difference between the proportion of children in low, average and
7 high quality of life between the four mental health groups, $\chi^2(6) = 1900$, $p < 0.001$ (Table 2).
8 As expected, there were greater numbers of children with mental health problems reporting
9 low quality of life compared to those with no problems. Of particular interest here, however,
10 is that approximately 12% of children with mental health problems (both internalising and/or
11 externalising) reported high quality of life. This equates to 1,576 young people (of 13,098 in
12 total) across the three mental health groups.

13 [Insert **Table 2** about here]

14 When taking into account item overlap, the results for young people with no problems and
15 externalising problems only were similar to the main analysis (21.44% and 11.09% reporting
16 high quality of life respectively). For children with internalising problems only, the number
17 of children reporting high quality of life dropped to 7.40% ($n = 385$), and for children with
18 both internalising and externalising problems, the number of children reporting high quality
19 of life dropped to 5.42% ($n = 139$).

20 ***RQ3: What factors moderate the association between mental health and quality of life?***

21 Results from the mixed effects models are shown in Table 3. Interaction terms in the model
22 showed that age and gender were moderators of the relationship between mental health and
23 quality of life.

24 First, the Wald test demonstrated that the overall interaction between age and mental health
25 status for predicting quality of life was significant, $\chi^2(3) = 12.46$, $p = 0.006$. Looking more
26 closely at the estimated marginal means showed that for all groups there was an overall
27 negative association between age and quality of life. However, this association was less
28 pronounced for children with externalising problems only compared with the other three
29 groups (Figure 1). As can be seen from the estimated marginal means shown in Figure 1, the
30 size of this effect is very small: whereas children with no problems aged 12.7 years are on

1 average 0.14 units on the KIDSCREEN lower than children aged 8.7 years (score ranges
2 from 1 to 5), this difference is only 0.09 units for children with externalising problems only.

3 [Insert **Figure 1** about here]

4 Second, the interaction between gender and mental health status for predicting quality of life
5 was significant, $\chi^2(3) = 37.81, p < 0.001$. Estimated marginal means, i.e. the mean response
6 for each variable adjusting for other variables in the model, showed that there was no link
7 between gender and quality of life for children with no problems and children with
8 internalising problems only. In contrast, girls with externalising problems (regardless of the
9 presence of internalising problems) showed lower quality of life compared with boys (Figure
10 2). Again, this effect was very small: as shown on Figure 2, the difference between girls and
11 boys with no problems was 0.02 units on the KIDSCREEN, compared with a difference of
12 0.10 units between boys and girls with externalising problems.

13 [Insert **Figure 2** about here]

14 In contrast, there was no moderating effect of socio-economic status, $\chi^2(3) = 6.68, p = 0.08$,
15 or ethnicity, $\chi^2(3) = 0.90, p = 0.82$, on the association between mental health status and
16 quality of life. Given the significant age and gender interactions, we ran an exploratory model
17 including a three-way interaction (mental health x age x gender), but this interaction was not
18 significant, $\chi^2(4) = 7.07, p = 0.13$, and so for parsimony only the models involving the two-
19 way interactions are reported here. When accounting for item overlap in the measures, the
20 results examining potential moderators of the association between quality of life and mental
21 health remained unchanged.

22 **Discussion**

23 In line with earlier studies, self-reported mental health problems were found to be strongly
24 related to self-reported quality of life in this large community sample of young people aged
25 between 8 and 13 years old in England. Experiencing both internalising and externalising
26 problems was associated with worse quality of life than experiencing either of these
27 difficulties in isolation. The effect sizes for these differences were small-medium. These
28 current findings align well with existing literature showing that the existence of co-
29 morbidities predicts worse quality of life in children with mental health problems [4, 18].

1 When taking into account item overlap, there was an indication that internalising problems on
2 their own were associated with lower quality of life to a greater extent than externalising
3 problems on their own. Previous research has also found that internalising problems are more
4 strongly related to quality of life than externalising problems [18], adding some weight to this
5 finding. One explanation is that externalising problems may have a greater impact on family
6 members than on the young person themselves [8, 17]. However, when comparing quality of
7 life between children with depressive disorder and those with conduct disorder or ADHD,
8 Sawyer et al. [23] reported a differential impact of quality of life from the different
9 conditions: whereas depressive disorders had greater impact on distress in the child and peer
10 activities, conduct disorder and ADHD had greater impact on the relationship with their
11 caregiver. As such, it may be that the broad measure of health-related quality of life used in
12 this study is masking more subtle differences between the impact of internalising and
13 externalising problems.

14 Despite the strong link between mental health and quality of life, approximately 12% of
15 children with mental health problems reported high quality of life (that is, quality of life in
16 the top quintile for the sample). This demonstrates that poor quality of life and mental health
17 difficulties need not necessarily go hand in hand. Taking into account item overlap resulted in
18 fewer children with internalising problems reporting high quality of life. This mirrors the
19 findings above that internalising problems may have a greater impact on quality of life than
20 externalising problems.

21 Given that poor quality of life and mental health problems did not always co-occur,
22 understanding the factors that moderate the link between the two seems a valuable
23 contribution. Current findings exploring the role of demographic factors showed that age and
24 gender moderated this relationship. For all children in the sample, quality of life tended to
25 reduce with age, but this effect was less marked for children with externalising problems.
26 That is, there was a greater difference between the quality of life of children with no
27 problems and children with externalising problems at age 8-9 years compared with age 12-13
28 years. The reduction of quality of life from late childhood to early adolescence is well
29 documented [5, 15] and so the general downward trend observed in this sample aligns with
30 this broader work. Note that the size of this effect was very small, which was to be expected
31 because the data were drawn from the community rather than a clinical population. The
32 extent to which these small differences are clinically meaningful is worthy of future

1 investigation, but it is worth highlighting that even a small difference that affects a large
2 number of people in the population may still have important implications for public health.

3 Bastiaansen et al. [1] also found an interaction between age and mental health status in
4 predicting quality of life, but their results were somewhat different to those found here. In
5 their clinical sample, the strength of the association between psychopathology and quality of
6 life *increased* with age. However, it is notable that the age range in this clinical study was
7 greater than in the current study (8-18 years compared with 8-13 years respectively). The fact
8 that our finding was specific to externalising problems also sets it apart. One explanation
9 could be that the greater impact of externalising problems on quality of life in the younger
10 children may reflect a cohort more dominated by externalising behaviours that begin in
11 childhood [19, 20]. In contrast to the younger group, externalising problems in the older
12 children may be more likely to include adolescent-limited antisocial behaviour, which, being
13 more normative [19, 20], may have less of an impact on quality of life. Further research to
14 explore this finding is clearly needed.

15 Regarding gender, we found evidence that the link between mental health problems and
16 reduced quality of life was stronger for girls compared with boys. Specifically, for young
17 people with no problems or with internalising problems only, there was no link between
18 gender and quality of life. In contrast, girls with externalising problems (whether with
19 additional internalising problems or not) reported lower quality of life than boys with the
20 same problems. Again, the effect size was very small. Several studies have also demonstrated
21 that the impact of psychopathology on quality of life is greater for girls compared with boys.
22 For example, Lack et al. (2009) reported that quality of life was more greatly reduced in girls
23 with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) compared to boys. Similarly, Bastiaansen et al.
24 [1] found an interaction between severity of psychopathology and gender, such that the
25 impact of psychopathology on quality of life was larger for girls than boys.

26 Both of these studies interpreted these findings on the grounds that girls tend to present with
27 internalising problems more frequently, and that this is likely to have greater impact on
28 perceived quality of life than externalising problems (which are more common in boys) [1,
29 18]. However, the current study may provide a rather different explanation. Given that we
30 considered internalising and externalising problems separately, it is clear from these data that
31 it is actually those girls with externalising problems that experience the greatest reduction in
32 quality of life compared with their male peers. Here, then, it seems that experiencing

1 problems that are less typical for your gender (in this case externalising for girls) is more
2 problematic in terms of associations with quality of life. It may be, for example, that there are
3 greater impacts on friendships for girls with externalising problems. Future research on the
4 mechanisms underpinning this finding would be valuable.

5 ***Strengths and limitations of this study***

6 This study has a number of notable strengths. First, the large community sample involving
7 over 45,000 children in England meant that it was both well powered to detect small effects
8 and largely representative of the English population. This was the first study to consider
9 moderating factors of the link between quality of life and mental health in a community
10 sample. As noted above, relying solely on clinical samples in previous research has been
11 problematic, as those children for whom mental health problems have greatest impact on their
12 quality of life are most likely to be referred into services. Considering this question in a large
13 community sample is, therefore, of considerable merit.

14 Second, as noted by Dey, Landolt et al. [13] there is a need for research on quality of life and
15 mental health to take into account the fact that there is considerable conceptual and
16 measurement overlap between these constructs. A strength of this study is that we have
17 conducted sensitivity analyses to help to untangle whether the role of item overlap on the
18 findings. The differences that emerged between the analyses suggest that this was a valuable
19 approach to take, as failing to take into account item overlap appeared to over-estimate the
20 quality of life of children with internalising problems.

21 Finally, this study included child self-reports on their own quality of life. Given that quality
22 of life is a subjective phenomenon, reliance on proxy reports from carers or clinicians may
23 not be optimal. Indeed, previous research has demonstrated that there may be systematic
24 differences between the ways in which parents and children perceive the child's quality of
25 life [13, 17].

26 Despite these strengths, there are also some considerable limitations that are important to
27 acknowledge. First, having multiple informants of both mental health and quality of life
28 would have allowed us to explore a more nuanced picture of the link between these two
29 factors. Second, our measure of quality of life was limited in that we were missing one item
30 from the KIDSCREEN-10. As such, despite good internal consistency for the 9-item measure
31 employed in the current study, the measure will not have fully captured the broad construct of
32 quality of life. Further research is clearly needed using the full 10 items of the KIDSCREEN-

1 10 and other measures of quality of life to corroborate the findings of the current study.
2 Given that previous research shows age and gender differences in response to the different
3 aspects of quality of life [5], having a more detailed measure of quality of life would be
4 useful in untangling whether the moderating factors vary across the different facets of quality
5 of life, including, for example, distinguishing between physical and psychological well-being.

6 Third, given the very large scale of the study, we were limited in the quantity of data that
7 were available for each child. This meant that we were restricted to examining demographic
8 features as potential moderators of the link between quality of life and mental health.
9 Previous research has shown that aspects of the child, their parents, family and wider social
10 network all contribute to quality of life [1]. Therefore, although the present study makes a
11 valuable contribution to this field, it necessarily had limited scope. Finally, the cross-
12 sectional nature of the study precludes us from forming causal conclusions based on these
13 findings. It may be, for example, that both externalising problems in girls and relatively
14 poorer quality of life are driven by some third factor rather than externalising problems
15 driving poor quality of life, or the two being mutually reinforcing. Examining this in
16 longitudinal data would enhance our understanding of these associations.

17 ***Implications***

18 These findings have a number of implications for those working with young people at risk of
19 mental health problems. Most straightforwardly, they highlight the known link between
20 mental health problems and impaired quality of life, underlining the relevance of measuring
21 quality of life as a key outcome of mental health interventions [9, 16, 24]. This is especially
22 significant given the acknowledgment that, alongside decreasing symptoms, a key goal of
23 intervention may be to ensure that mental health difficulties have minimal impact on
24 functioning and quality of life [7, 24]. This may be particularly relevant for those children
25 with mental health problems that show little change over time.

26 In terms of measurement, these findings also confirm that mental health and quality of life are
27 not synonymous, suggesting that the measurement of mental health symptoms cannot stand
28 as a proxy for poor quality of life or vice versa. Nonetheless, the conceptual overlap between
29 these phenomena cannot be ignored, and so those measuring both need to take steps to
30 account for this (such as the sensitivity analyses adopted here).

31 The findings suggest the potential importance of intervention to support those young people
32 at particular risk of low quality of life. In addition, the link between quality of life and mental

1 health implies that enhancing quality of life may be a means of preventing mental health
2 problems. There is clearly a need for further research to identify those factors that most foster
3 resilience in young people with mental health problems to gain or maintain high quality of
4 life in the face of their difficulties [27]. Further exploring the potential explanations for why
5 quality of life is particularly impacted for certain young people with mental health problems
6 would help to guide those interventions.

7 Based on our interpretations discussed above, it may be that a central feature of being at
8 increased risk for low quality of life is being ‘unusual’ for your peer group (i.e., being a child
9 compared to an early adolescent with externalising, or a girl compared to a boy with
10 externalising problems). It could be, therefore, that fostering positive peer relations and social
11 support in young people with mental health problems may buffer the extent to which they
12 experience reduced quality of life. Empirical work exploring this possibility of breaking the
13 cycle between mental health problems and poor quality of life would clearly be very
14 valuable.

15 ***Conclusions***

16 In summary, whilst mental health problems were strongly related to poorer quality of life in
17 this community sample of young people, the two constructs were not synonymous. Quality of
18 life was particularly reduced in younger children with externalising problems and in girls
19 with externalising problems. The results highlight the potential relevance of quality of life
20 measures to help understand the impact of mental health problems on the lives of young
21 people and to help us to identify children with mental health problems that may require
22 particular interventions. Finding ways to promote quality of life in those with mental health
23 problems is an important next step from this research.

24

1

Acknowledgements

2 The authors thank the Department for Children, Schools and Families (now Department for
3 Education), England, for funding the research. They are grateful to the members and advisors
4 of the research group involved in the wider project, and the staff and students of participating
5 schools for their contributions to this research.

6

7

Conflict of interest

8 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Bastiaansen D, Koot HM, Ferdinand RF (2005) Determinants of quality of life in children with psychiatric disorders. *Quality of Life Research* 14:1599-1612
2. Bastiaansen D, Koot HM, Ferdinand RF (2005) Psychopathology in children: Improvement of quality of life without psychiatric symptom reduction? *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 14:364-370
3. Bastiaansen D, Koot HM, Ferdinand RF, Verhulst FC (2004) Quality of Life in Children With Psychiatric Disorders: Self-, Parent, and Clinician Report. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 43:221-230
4. Becker A, Roessner V, Breuer D, Döpfner M, Rothenberger A (2011) Relationship between quality of life and psychopathological profile: data from an observational study in children with ADHD. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 20:267-275
5. Bisegger C, Cloetta B, von Bisegger U, Abel T, Ravens-Sieberer U (2005) Health-related quality of life: gender differences in childhood and adolescence. *Sozial- und Präventivmedizin* 50:281-291
6. Bot M, De Leeuw Den Bouter B, Adriaanse M (2011) Prevalence of psychosocial problems in Dutch children aged 8–12 years and its association with risk factors and quality of life. *Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences* 20:357-365
7. Costello EJ, Maughan B (2014) Annual Research Review: Optimal outcomes of child and adolescent mental illness. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*
8. Dallos G, Keresztény Á, Miklósi M, Gáboros J, Balázs J (2014) Why are children and adolescents referred for psychiatric assessment without fulfilling diagnostic criteria for any psychiatric disorder? *Child and Adolescent Mental Health* 19:199-207
9. Deighton J, Croudace T, Fonagy P, Brown J, Patalay P, Wolpert M (2014) Measuring mental health and wellbeing outcomes for children and adolescents to inform practice and policy: a review of child self-report measures. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health* 8:14
10. Deighton J, Tymms P, Vostanis P, Belsky J, Fonagy P, Brown A, Martin A, Patalay P, Wolpert M (2013) The development of a school-based measure of child mental health. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment* 31:247-257
11. Department for Communities and Local Government (2009) *The English Indices of Deprivation 2009*. HMSO, London

- 1 12. Department for Education (2009) Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics, January
2 2009. In: Department for Education (ed) Stationery Office, London
- 3 13. Dey M, Landolt MA, Mohler-Kuo M (2012) Health-related quality of life among
4 children with mental disorders: a systematic review. *Quality of Life Research*
5 21:1797-1814
- 6 14. Dey M, Mohler-Kuo M, Landolt MA (2012) Health-related quality of life among
7 children with mental health problems: a population-based approach. *Health and*
8 *Quality of Life Outcomes* 10:73-80
- 9 15. Goldbeck L, Schmitz T, Besier T, Herschbach P, Henrich G (2007) Life satisfaction
10 decreases during adolescence. *Quality of Life Research* 16:969-979
- 11 16. Jacob J, Edbrooke-Childs J, Holley S, Law D, Wolpert M (2015) Horses for courses?
12 A qualitative exploration of goals formulated in mental health settings by young
13 people, parents, and clinicians. *Clinical Child Psychology and*
14 *Psychiatry*:1359104515577487
- 15 17. Klassen A, Miller A, Fine S (2006) Agreement between parent and child report of
16 quality of life in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Child: Care,*
17 *Health and Development* 32:397-406
- 18 18. Lack C, Storch E, Keeley M, Geffken G, Ricketts E, Murphy T, Goodman W (2009)
19 Quality of life in children and adolescents with obsessive-compulsive disorder: base
20 rates, parent-child agreement, and clinical correlates. *Social Psychiatry and*
21 *Psychiatric Epidemiology* 44:935-942
- 22 19. Moffitt TE (2009) A review of research on the taxonomy of life-course persistent
23 versus adolescence-limited antisocial behavior. In: Cullen FT, Wright JP, Blevins KR
24 (eds) *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory*. Transaction Publishers, New
25 Jersey
- 26 20. Odgers CL, Moffitt TE, Broadbent JM, Dickson N, Hancox RJ, Harrington H,
27 Poulton R, Sears MR, Thomson WM, Caspi A (2008) Female and male antisocial
28 trajectories: From childhood origins to adult outcomes. *Development and*
29 *Psychopathology* 20:673-716
- 30 21. Office of National Statistics (2010) English indices of deprivation 2010:
31 supplementary indices - children and older people. London

- 1 22. Patalay P, Deighton J, Fonagy P, Vostanis P, Wolpert M (2014) Clinical validity of
2 the Me and My School questionnaire: a self-report mental health measure for children
3 and adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health* 8:1-7
- 4 23. Sawyer MG, Whaites L, Rey JM, Hazell PL, Graetz BW, Baghurst P (2002) Health-
5 related quality of life of children and adolescents with mental disorders. *Journal of the*
6 *American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 41:530-537
- 7 24. Shepherd G, Boardman J, Rinaldi M, Roberts G (2014) Supporting recovery in mental
8 health services: Quality and Outcomes. In: *Implementing Recovery Through*
9 *Organisational Change*, London
- 10 25. StataCorp. (2011) *Stata Statistical Software: Release 12*. StataCorp LP., College
11 Station, TX
- 12 26. The KIDSCREEN Group Europe (2006) *The KIDSCREEN Questionnaires - Quality*
13 *of life questionnaires for children and adolescents. Handbook*. Pabst Science
14 Publishers, Lengerich
- 15 27. Ungar M (2015) Practitioner Review: Diagnosing childhood resilience—a systemic
16 approach to the diagnosis of adaptation in adverse social and physical ecologies.
17 *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 56:4-17
- 18 28. Wolpert M, Deighton J, Patalay P, Martin A, Fitzgerald-Yau N, Demir E, Fugard A,
19 Belsky J, Fielding A, Fonagy P (2011) *Me and my school: Findings from the national*
20 *evaluation of Targeted Mental Health in Schools*. Nottingham: DFE Publications

21

22

1

2 **Table 1: Quality of life by mental health status**

	n	Quality of life – full measure Mean (SD)
No problems	32,300	3.49 (0.47)
Internalising problems only	5,204	3.30 (0.56)
Externalising problems only	5,330	3.28 (0.57)
Internalising and externalising problems	2,564	3.15 (0.65)

3

4

5 **Table 2: Percentage of children with low, average and high quality of life by mental**
6 **health status.**

	No problems % (<i>n</i>)	Internalising problems only % (<i>n</i>)	Externalising problems only % (<i>n</i>)	Internalising and externalising problems % (<i>n</i>)
Low quality of life	17.40 (5,619)	32.67 (1,700)	32.83 (1,750)	44.81 (1,149)
Average quality of life	66.11 (21,355)	54.82 (2,853)	55.38 (2,952)	43.60 (1,118)
High quality of life	16.49 (5,326)	12.51 (651)	11.78 (628)	11.58 (297)

7

Table 3: Coefficients from mixed effects model testing interaction of demographic factors and mental health status for predicting quality of life

		b	SE	<i>p</i>
Mental health ^a	Internalising	-0.20	0.01	<0.001
	Externalising	-0.19	0.01	<0.001
	Internalising & externalising	-0.32	0.01	<0.001
Age		-0.03	0.002	<0.001
Gender ^b		-0.02	0.006	0.005
SES		0.002	0.002	0.18
Ethnicity ^c		0.02	0.007	0.04
Mental health ^a x age	Internalising x age	-0.01	0.005	0.04
	Externalising x age	0.01	0.005	0.01
	Internalising & externalising x age	-0.002	0.007	0.75
Mental health ^a x gender ^b	Internalising x gender	-0.01	0.02	0.34
	Externalising x gender	-0.08	0.02	<0.001
	Internalising & externalising x gender	-0.09	0.02	<0.001
Mental health ^a x SES	Internalising x SES	0.008	0.004	0.05
	Externalising x SES	0.003	0.004	0.43
	Internalising & externalising x SES	0.01	0.005	0.07
Mental health ^a x ethnicity ^c	Internalising x ethnicity	-0.003	0.02	0.89
	Externalising x ethnicity	0.009	0.02	0.59
	Internalising & externalising x ethnicity	0.02	0.03	0.44
Constant		3.50	0.005	<0.001

SES = socio-economic status. a: reference category = no problems, b: reference category = male, c: reference category = White.

Figures




Figure 1: Interactions between age and mental health status for predicting quality of life




Figure 2: Interactions between gender and mental health status for predicting quality of life