

Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy

Validation of the Ukrainian Caregiver-Report Version of the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS) in Children and Adolescents in Ukraine

Enya Redican, Cedric Sachser, Elisa Pfeiffer, Dmytro Martsenkovskyi, Philip Hyland, Thanos Karatzias, and Mark Shevlin
Online First Publication, August 24, 2023. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0001570>

CITATION

Redican, E., Sachser, C., Pfeiffer, E., Martsenkovskyi, D., Hyland, P., Karatzias, T., & Shevlin, M. (2023, August 24). Validation of the Ukrainian Caregiver-Report Version of the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS) in Children and Adolescents in Ukraine. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. Advance online publication. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0001570>

Validation of the Ukrainian Caregiver-Report Version of the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS) in Children and Adolescents in Ukraine

Enya Redican¹, Cedric Sachser², Elisa Pfeiffer², Dmytro Martsenkovskiy^{3, 4}, Philip Hyland⁵,
Thanos Karatzias⁶, and Mark Shevlin¹

¹ School of Psychology, Ulster University

² Clinic for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry/Psychotherapy, University of Ulm

³ Department of Psychiatry and Narcology, Bogomolets National Medical University

⁴ Department of Psychiatry and Narcology, SI "Institute of Psychiatry, Forensic Psychiatric Examination and Drug Monitoring of Ministry of Health of Ukraine", Kyiv, Ukraine

⁵ Department of Psychology, Maynooth University

⁶ School of Health and Social Care, Edinburgh Napier University

Objective: Emerging research indicates that the ongoing conflict in Ukraine has led to an increased prevalence of war-related posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in children and adolescents. The current study sought to test the psychometric properties of a Ukrainian-translated measure of PTSD for children and adolescents; the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS; Sachser et al., 2017). **Method:** Participants were an opportunistic sample of $N = 2,004$ parents living in Ukraine who provided data on themselves and one target child in their household as part of The Mental Health of Parents and Children in Ukraine Study. The latent structure of the parent-reported CATS was tested using confirmatory factor analysis, composite reliability estimates were estimated, and criterion validity was assessed. **Results:** The latent structure of the parent-reported CATS was best reflected by a three-factor model and a four-factor model in the preschool and child and adolescent samples, respectively. Estimates of internal reliability were high for both samples. Criterion validity was supported through associations with external measures of internalizing, externalizing, and attention problems. Parent-report child milestone development delays and prior psychological or pharmacological support were associated with higher average scores on the CATS symptom scales. The prevalence of probable PTSD for the preschool sample was 15.4% ($n = 77$) and the prevalence of probable PTSD for the child and adolescent sample was 14.4% ($n = 217$). **Discussion:** This study supports the psychometric properties of the Ukrainian parent-reported CATS which can be used routinely in clinical practice for the caregiver-rated assessment of PTSD.

Clinical Impact Statement

This study demonstrates that the Ukrainian parent-reported Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS) is a valid and reliable measure of posttraumatic stress disorder for children and adolescents. This is the first-ever study to test and provide support for the psychometric properties of the CATS in children and adolescents living in an active war zone. The availability of this empirically validated measure should facilitate the identification and treatment of at-risk Ukrainian children and adolescents. This measure can be used in a variety of settings in Ukraine such as in- and outpatient services, private practice, and by pediatricians, as well as in neighborhood countries that host Ukrainian refugees to ensure that these children and adolescents receive the support they need.

Keywords: war, children, adolescents, posttraumatic stress disorder, validity

The Ukrainian people have endured unimaginable loss and suffering as a result of the full-scale Russian invasion of their country on February 24, 2022. Children and their families have encountered

mass violence, trauma, destruction, and displacement (UNICEF, 2023), with it estimated that over 7,155 civilians have been killed (including 438 children) and over 11,662 civilians injured (including

Enya Redican  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8863-2234>

Enya Redican served as lead for formal analysis and writing the original draft and served in a supporting role for project administration and conceptualization. Dmytro Martsenkovskiy, Philip Hyland, Thanos Karatzias, Elisa Pfeiffer, Cedric Sachser, and Mark Shevlin contributed to study

conceptualization, project administration, and reviewing and editing of the original draft. Mark Shevlin and Philip Hyland contributed to formal analysis.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mark Shevlin, School of Psychology, Ulster University, Cromore Road, Coleraine, BT52 1SA, United Kingdom. Email: m.shevlin@ulster.ac.uk

851 children; United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, 2023). It is anticipated that the war will have profoundly detrimental impacts on the mental health of Ukrainians for generations to come (e.g., Patel & Erickson, 2022), including children and adolescents where the impacts on mental health are expected to be severe enough to persist into adulthood and on a scale that has not been seen since World War II (Elvevåg & DeLisi, 2022). Because of this, the availability of Ukrainian-translated measures of common psychological difficulties that can occur in the context of war is crucial to support mental health professionals in accurately identifying children and parents who are at risk and implementing interventions to promote recovery (Shevlin et al., 2022).

One of the most commonly observed psychological disorders in children and adolescents living in war-affected populations is posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD; Catani, 2018). Recently, a Ukrainian-translated version of the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS; Sachser et al., 2017) was developed (Ukraine: The International Trauma Consortium, 2022). The CATS measures potentially traumatic events, posttraumatic stress symptoms, and functional impairment, and can be used to identify possible diagnostic cases of PTSD, in both preschoolers (i.e., 3–6 years) and children and adolescents (i.e., 7–17 years). The symptoms comprising the CATS directly align with the PTSD criteria set forth in the fifth version of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)*; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). *DSM-5* PTSD comprises 20 symptoms organized across four symptom clusters of reexperiencing, avoidance, negative alterations in cognitions and mood (NACM), and alterations in arousal and reactivity (AR; Friedman, 2013; Miller et al., 2014). Diagnostic criteria for *DSM-5* PTSD include exposure to a Criterion A traumatic event, at least one reexperiencing symptom, at least one avoidance symptom, at least two NACM symptoms, and at least two AR symptoms. Symptoms must be associated with functional impairment and be present for a duration of at least 1 month (APA, 2013). *DSM-5* included adapted and more developmentally sensitive PTSD diagnostic criteria for children aged 6 years and younger (APA, 2013). For this adapted PTSD criteria, it is necessary that at least one avoidance or NACM symptom is present, which is a substantial shift from the standard diagnostic criteria that required at least one avoidance and two NACM symptoms (APA, 2013). The validity and reliability of the CATS as a measure of *DSM-5* PTSD in children and adolescents have been supported in numerous studies, while few studies have investigated the psychometric properties of the CATS in preschool-aged samples (for review, see Dowdy-Hazlett et al., 2021). However, no study thus far has tested the psychometric properties of the CATS in children and adolescents living in an active war situation, a crucial endeavor given that PTSD is the most common form of psychopathology among war-affected children and adolescents (Attanayake et al., 2009).

A recent study by Martsenkivskyi et al. (2022) examined the prevalence and predictors of PTSD among preschoolers (3–6 years old) and school-aged children (7–17 years old) as measured using the CATS—caregiver-report form. They found that 18.5% of preschoolers and 14.2% of school-aged children met criteria for a probable diagnosis of *DSM-5* PTSD. Further research is now necessary to determine whether the caregiver-report version of the CATS produces valid and reliable scores of probable PTSD among this population. Consequently, the aims of the current study were to test the (a) symptom structure of the Ukrainian CATS, (b) reliability of the scores from the Ukrainian CATS, and (c) examine convergent–divergent validity patterns of the Ukrainian CATS through

associations with external measures of internalizing, attention, and externalizing problems, and (d) criterion validity of the Ukrainian CATS subscales via associations with a range of predictor variables.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Data for the present study were derived from *The Mental Health of Parents and Children in Ukraine Study*, which sought to explore the impacts of Russia's war on Ukraine on the mental health and day-to-day lives of parents and their children in Ukraine. Inclusion criteria for the study included being aged 18 years or older, currently living in Ukraine, having at least one child under the age of 18 years, and being able to complete the survey in Ukrainian. Data were collected by the survey company TGM Research which maintains nationally representative survey panels in 130 countries including Ukraine. The data were collected between July 15 and September 5, 2022. Given the ongoing conflict and mass displacement of people in Ukraine, opportunistic sampling methods were used to recruit participants. Nevertheless, it was made a point to recruit participants living in different regions of Ukraine, as well as of different sexes and ages. Participants were contacted by TGM Research via email, in-app notification, or text message, and provided with information about the nature of the study. Consenting participants completed the survey online and were remunerated for their time by the survey company. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the SI Institute of Psychiatry, Forensic Psychiatric Examination and Drug Monitoring at the Ministry of Health of Ukraine.

The required sample size was determined to be 1,752, using the following assumptions: a combined prevalence rate of 24% for PTSD and complex PTSD in the general population (Steel et al., 2009), a confidence interval of 95%, and a margin of error of 2%. As a result, 2,000 people were set as our target sample size. The final sample comprised of 2,004 parents who provided data on both themselves and one target child within the household (i.e., the child who was next to celebrate their birthday). Of those 2,004 parents, 24.9% ($n = 499$) provided information on preschoolers (i.e., 3–6 years), and 75.1% ($n = 1,505$) provided information on children and adolescents (i.e., 7–17 years). Rates of trauma exposure and prevalence estimates of PTSD were estimated for the entire survey sample of preschoolers ($n = 499$) and children and adolescents ($n = 1,505$). Only those parents who reported that their child was directly or indirectly exposed to war-related traumatic stressors were included as the analytic samples (preschoolers: $n = 252$, children and adolescents: $n = 833$). The mean age of the preschool survey sample was 5.03 ($SD = 0.80$, $Mdn = 5$, range = 4–6 years) and the mean age of the child and adolescent survey sample was 11.61 ($SD = 3.14$, $Mdn = 12.00$, range = 7–17 years). Further descriptive statistics for the preschool and child and adolescent survey samples are provided in Table 1.

Measures

Posttraumatic Stress Symptoms and PTSD

The CATS (Sachser et al., 2017) is a screening measure designed to assess for potentially traumatic events, posttraumatic stress symptoms, and functional impairment according to the *DSM-5* PTSD criteria. A caregiver-report version of the CATS is available for preschool children

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Preschool and Child and Adolescent Samples

Predictors	Preschool sample (<i>n</i> = 499)	Child and adolescents (<i>n</i> = 1,505)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Child gender ^a		
Male	32.3 (<i>n</i> = 161)	31.1 (<i>n</i> = 468)
Female	28.3 (<i>n</i> = 141)	31.1 (<i>n</i> = 468)
Child with prior psychological or pharmacological support for emotional or behavioral problems	13.8 (<i>n</i> = 69)	12.4 (<i>n</i> = 186)
Child with delayed milestone development	17.6 (<i>n</i> = 88)	8.4 (<i>n</i> = 127)
Parent marital status		
Married or living with their partner	82.4 (<i>n</i> = 411)	76.5 (<i>n</i> = 1,152)
Other	17.6 (<i>n</i> = 88)	97.9 (<i>n</i> = 353)
Education parent		
School education	37.1 (<i>n</i> = 185)	37.4 (<i>n</i> = 563)
University education	62.9 (<i>n</i> = 314)	62.6 (<i>n</i> = 942)
Employment parent		
Full-time employment	32.7 (<i>n</i> = 163)	42.1 (<i>n</i> = 634)
Other	67.3 (<i>n</i> = 336)	57.9 (<i>n</i> = 871)
Current living location in Ukraine		
Western Ukraine	25.9 (<i>n</i> = 129)	24.5 (<i>n</i> = 368)
North Ukraine	26.3 (<i>n</i> = 131)	28.0 (<i>n</i> = 422)
Central Ukraine	19.8 (<i>n</i> = 99)	17.7 (<i>n</i> = 266)
Eastern Ukraine	4.8 (<i>n</i> = 24)	5.4 (<i>n</i> = 81)
Forced to move to another part of Ukraine	33.9 (<i>n</i> = 169)	27.0 (<i>n</i> = 406)
Forced to move to another country	13.0 (<i>n</i> = 65)	8.4 (<i>n</i> = 126)
Area of residence		
Rural	31.1 (<i>n</i> = 155)	23.1 (<i>n</i> = 347)
Urban	68.9 (<i>n</i> = 344)	76.9 (<i>n</i> = 1,158)
Property type		
Apartment or house	97.2 (<i>n</i> = 485)	96.5 (<i>n</i> = 1,453)
Emergency housing	2.8 (<i>n</i> = 14)	3.5 (<i>n</i> = 52)
Parent gender		
Female	67.3 (<i>n</i> = 336)	31.1 (<i>n</i> = 468)
Male	32.7 (<i>n</i> = 163)	31.1 (<i>n</i> = 468)
Parent age group (years)		
18–29	39.1 (<i>n</i> = 195)	10.5 (<i>n</i> = 158)
30–39	57.7 (<i>n</i> = 288)	78.1 (<i>n</i> = 1,175)
50–59	3.2 (<i>n</i> = 16)	11.4 (<i>n</i> = 172)
Emergency worker status		
Parent	13.4 (<i>n</i> = 67)	11.6 (<i>n</i> = 174)
Relative	42.3 (<i>n</i> = 211)	39.9 (<i>n</i> = 600)

^a Data on gender variable missing for 39.5% (*n* = 197) of preschool sample and 37.7% (*n* = 569) of the child and adolescent sample.

aged 3–6 years while both a self-report and caregiver-report version are available for children and adolescents aged 7–17 years. The preschool version of the CATS assesses the PTSD symptoms with 16 items while the child and adolescent version is comprised of 20 items. In the present study, the caregiver-report version of the preschool and child and adolescent CATS was used for both groups of young people. The trauma checklist was not implemented due to limited assessment time. But prior to completing the questionnaire, participants were asked if their child had been exposed, directly or indirectly, to any event during the war that he or she found extremely scary. Caregivers then rated the presence of symptoms using a 4-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 0 (*never*) to 3 (*almost always*). There are an additional five items that measure functional impairment associated with symptoms across multiple domains (i.e., school/work, hobbies, family relationships, general happiness, and getting along with others) that are answered on a “Yes” or “No” basis. The CATS can be used to measure symptom severity or to identify probable diagnostic status. The severity scoring method involves summing responses to the 16 questions for the

preschool sample and the 20 questions for the child and adolescent sample, producing possible scores ranging from 0 to 48 and 0 to 60, respectively. A total score ≥ 15 is indicative of a probable PTSD diagnostic status for preschoolers and a total score ≥ 21 is indicative of a probable PTSD diagnostic status for children and adolescents. Probable diagnostic status can be calculated according to the *DSM-5* PTSD model for preschoolers and the standard *DSM-5* PTSD model which can be used for children and adolescents (described in Introduction). Symptom endorsement is indicated by response values of 2 (*often*) or 3 (*almost always*). Prior research has evidenced excellent reliability of the caregiver-report CATS (e.g., Sachser et al., 2017).

Predictor Variables

Psychosocial Functioning

The Paediatric Symptom Checklist (PSC-17; Gardner et al., 1999) is a brief measure designed to evaluate a child’s emotional and

behavioral problems in the areas of attention, internalizing distress, and externalizing distress. The PSC-17 is available in both self-report and caregiver-report versions, and the latter was used in this study. The response structure of the PSC-17 was amended slightly for the present study to capture potential changes in emotional or behavioral problems since the onset of the Russian war, with caregivers rating the presence of symptoms using a 3-point Likert scale (0 = *less often*, 1 = *the same*, 2 = *more often*). The PSC-17 can be used to derive a total scale score (range = 0–34) as well as total scores on the attention subscale (range = 0–10), internalizing subscale (range = 0–10), and externalizing subscale (range = 0–14). For the purposes of the current study, total scores on the attention, internalizing, and externalizing subscales were used. In the present study, internal reliability was excellent for the total scale ($\alpha = .87$), internalizing subscale ($\alpha = .77$), and externalizing scale ($\alpha = .80$), and was adequate for the attention scale ($\alpha = .65$).

Child-Related Variables

Predictor variables included child age (in years), child gender (0 = *female*, 1 = *male*), delayed milestone development (such as delay in speech development or walking without support; 0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*), and child with prior psychological or pharmacological support for emotional or behavioral problems (0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*).

Analytic Procedures

The main analyses were conducted in four phases. First, sample descriptive statistics were estimated. Second, two alternative confirmatory factor analytic (CFA) models were tested to determine the latent structure of the CATS for the preschool sample. Model 1 was a one-factor model (all CATS items load onto a single “PTSD” latent variable), and Model 2 was a three-factor model (according to the *DSM-5* definition). Model 1 was a one-factor model (all CATS items load onto a single “PTSD” latent variable), and Model 2 was a four-factor model (according to the *DSM-5* definition). Model 1 was used as a baseline model, and Model 2 was expected to provide a better fit as symptoms should be reflective of the belonging to *DSM-5* clusters. If Model 2 was a better description of the data, this also provided evidence for the multidimensional nature of PTSD. All models were tested using the robust maximum likelihood estimator (MLR; Yuan & Bentler, 2000) in Mplus 8.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017). Model fit was assessed according to standard recommendations (Hu & Bentler, 1999) where “acceptable” model fit is indicated by a nonsignificant chi-square value; comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) and Tucker–Lewis index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973) values $\geq .90$; and root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1992) and standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1982) values $\leq .08$. The Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Sclove, 1987) was used to compare the two models with the model with the lower value being the better fitting model. A difference of at least 10 points is assumed to reflect strong evidence in favor of the model with the lower value (Raftery, 1995).

The third phase, following the identification of the best-fitting CFA model, involved calculating composite reliability estimates. Composite reliability estimates have been shown to provide a more accurate estimation of internal reliability as compared to Cronbach’s α (Raykov, 1997).

Fourth, bivariate associations between the latent variables derived from the best-fitting CFA model and age as well as total scores on the

PSC-17 subscales (i.e., internalizing, externalizing, and attention scores) were examined within a structural equation modeling framework. A series of independent-sample *t* tests were conducted to compare means across the CATS scales for the categorical variables (i.e., gender, delayed milestone development, and child with prior psychological or pharmacological support for emotional or behavioral problems). These analyses were conducted using SPSS Version 28.0. To control for the heightened risk of Type I errors given the multiple comparisons, a Bonferroni correction was applied, and a new alpha level was set for the preschool sample (.05/9 = .006) and for the child and adolescent sample (.05/12 = .004).

Results

Sample Descriptives

For those aged 3- to 6 years old, the mean CATS score was 11.38 ($SD = 7.69$, $Mdn = 8.00$, range = 0–38) and the most commonly reported functional impairment domain was general happiness (66.3%, $n = 167$). The CATS items with the highest mean scores for this sample were “being jumpy or easily startled” ($M = 1.07$, $SD = 0.86$), “upsetting thoughts or images about the war. Or reenacting an event they experienced or witnessed in play” ($M = 0.89$, $SD = 0.61$), and “problems with concentration” ($M = 0.89$, $SD = 0.85$). For 7- to 17-year-olds, the mean CATS score was 16.07 ($SD = 10.00$, $Mdn = 14.00$, range = 0–60) and the most commonly reported functional impairment domain was general happiness (77.0%, $n = 641$). The CATS items with the highest mean scores for this sample were “feeling very emotionally upset when reminded of a stressful event related to the war” ($M = 1.19$, $SD = 0.83$), “trying not to remember, think about or have feelings about the war” ($M = 1.11$, $SD = 0.95$), and “upsetting thoughts or images about the war. Or reenacting an event they experienced or witnessed in play” ($M = 1.02$, $SD = 0.75$).

CFA Results

Table 2 provides the CFA fit statistics for the preschool and child and adolescent samples. Although the chi-square statistic was significant for Models 1 and 2 in both samples, this should not be taken as evidence to reject the models as the chi-square statistic is positively associated with sample size (Tanaka, 1987). For the preschool sample Model 2 (i.e., the three-factor model) provided adequate fit to the data and provided superior fit across all fit statistics compared to Model 1 (i.e., the one-factor model). For the child and adolescent samples, Model 2 (i.e., the four-factor model) provided adequate fit to the data and provided superior fit across all fit statistics compared to Model 1 (i.e., the one-factor model). The difference in BIC values between Model 2 and Model 1 for both samples exceeded 10 points, supporting this model as best fitting.

Table 3 includes the standardized factor loadings and factor correlations for Model 2 for the preschool sample. The majority of factor loadings were positive, strong, and statistically significant ($p < .001$), ranging from .50 to .81. Factor correlations were all statistically significant ($p < .001$) and ranged from .84 to .94. Table 4 includes the factor loadings and factor correlations for Model 2 for the child and adolescent sample. All factor loadings were positive, strong, and statistically significant ($p < .001$), and ranged from .55 to .83. Factor correlations were all statistically significant ($p < .001$) and ranged from .55 to .94.

Table 2
Fit Statistics for CFA Models

Model	χ^2 (df)	TLI	CFI	RMSEA (90% CI)	SRMR	BIC
Preschool sample (<i>n</i> = 252)						
Model 1: one-factor model	262.270* (104), <i>p</i> < .001	.872	.889	.078 [.066, .089]	.056	7,781.941
Model 2: three-factor model	231.208* (1,011), <i>p</i> < .001	.892	.909	.072 [.059, .084]	.052	7,753.973
Child and adolescent sample (<i>n</i> = 833)						
Model 1: one-factor model	1,024.559* (170), <i>p</i> < .001	.845	.827	.078 [.073, .082]	.057	32,380.344
Model 2: four-factor model	626.585* (164), <i>p</i> < .001	.903	.916	.058 [.053, .063]	.044	31,875.357

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; χ^2 = chi-square test; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual; BIC = Bayesian information criterion.

* *p* < .001.

Reliability Results

The composite reliability estimates for each subscale were high for both the preschool sample (reexperiencing = .80, avoidance and NACM = .81, AR = .84) and the child and adolescent sample (reexperiencing = .83, avoidance = .77, NACM = .85, AR = .83). Moreover, composite reliability estimates were high for the overall score for both the preschool sample (.92) and the child and adolescent sample (.93).

Associations With Age and External Variables

As shown in Table 5, age was not significantly associated with any of the latent variables for the preschool sample but was weakly, positively, and significantly associated with all latent variables for the child and adolescent sample. There were moderate-to-strong, positive, and statistically significant associations between internalizing scores and all latent variables for both samples. There were

low-to-moderate, positive, and statistically significant associations between externalizing scores and the reexperiencing, NACM and avoidance, and AR latent variables for the preschool sample, while there was a low, positive, and statistically significant association between externalizing scores and the reexperiencing latent variable for the child and adolescent sample. Finally, there were strong, positive, and statistically significant associations between attention scores and all latent variables for the preschool sample, while there were low-to-moderate associations between total attention scores and all latent variables for the child and adolescent sample.

Group Differences in Average CATS Scale Scores

For the preschool sample (see Table 6), there were no associations between gender and total scores on any of the CATS scales, as well as prior psychological or pharmacological support for emotional or behavioral problems and total scores on any of the CATS scales.

Table 3
Standardized Factor Loadings for Trauma-Exposed Preschool Sample

Items	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Reexperiencing	NACM and avoidance	AR
1. Upsetting thoughts or images about the war. Or reenacting an event they experienced or witnessed in play.	0.89 (0.61)	.496		
2. Having bad dreams related to the war.	0.75 (0.71)	.614		
3. Acting, playing, or feeling as if a stressful event related to the war is happening right now.	0.85 (0.70)	.693		
4. Feeling very emotionally upset when reminded of a stressful event related to the war.	0.99 (0.77)	.751		
5. Strong physical reactions when reminded of a stressful event related to the war (sweating, heart beating fast).	0.63 (0.80)	.758		
6. Trying not to remember, think about or have feelings about the war.	0.69 (0.85)		.503	
7. Avoiding anything that is a reminder of the war (activities, people, places, things, talks).	0.58 (0.82)		.508	
8. Increase in negative emotional states (afraid, angry, guilty, ashamed, confusion).	0.87 (0.81)		.781	
9. Losing interest in activities s/he enjoyed before a stressful event. Including not playing as much.	0.69 (0.78)		.773	
10. Acting socially withdrawn.	0.40 (0.68)		.589	
11. Reduction in showing positive feelings (being happy, having loving feelings).	0.46 (0.61)		.682	
12. Being irritable. Or having angry outbursts without a good reason and taking it out on other people or things.	0.75 (0.81)			.699
13. Being overly alert or on guard.	0.74 (0.77)			.728
14. Being jumpy or easily startled.	1.07 (0.86)			.812
15. Problems with concentration.	0.89 (0.85)			.703
16. Trouble falling or staying asleep.	0.85 (0.77)			.633
Factor correlations				
Reexperiencing	—	—		
Avoidance and NACM		.84	—	
AR		.89	.96	—

Note. NACM = negative alterations in cognition and mood; AR = alterations in arousal and reactivity.

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers. This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

Table 4
Standardized Factor Loadings for Trauma-Exposed Child and Adolescent Sample

Items	M (SD)	RE	Avoidance	NACM	AR
1. Upsetting thoughts or images about the war. Or reenacting an event they experienced or witnessed in play.	1.02 (0.75)	.583			
2. Having bad dreams related to the war.	0.88 (0.68)	.710			
3. Acting, playing, or feeling as if a stressful event related to the war is happening right now.	0.78 (0.73)	.724			
4. Feeling very emotionally upset when reminded of a stressful event related to the war.	1.19 (0.83)	.741			
5. Strong physical reactions when reminded of a stressful event related to the war (sweating, heart beating fast).	0.79 (0.86)	.751			
6. Trying not to remember, think about or have feelings about the war.	1.11 (0.95)		.747		
7. Avoiding anything that is a reminder of the war (activities, people, places, things, talks).	0.92 (0.92)		.834		
8. Not being able to remember an important part of a stressful event they experienced during the way	0.44 (0.67)			.547	
9. Negative changes in how s/he thinks about self, others or the world after a stressful event related to the war.	0.73 (0.76)			.700	
10. Thinking the stressful event happened because s/he or someone else did something wrong or did not do enough to stop it.	0.34 (0.65)			.547	
11. Having very negative emotional states (afraid, angry, guilty, ashamed).	0.73 (0.74)			.753	
12. Losing interest in activities s/he enjoyed before the stressful event.	0.88 (0.82)			.714	
13. Feeling distant or cutoff from people around her/him.	0.69 (0.79)			.718	
14. Not showing positive feelings (being happy, having loving feelings).	0.64 (0.74)			.680	
15. Being irritable. Or having angry outbursts without a good reason and taking it out on other people or things.	0.84 (0.76)				.688
16. Risky behavior or behavior that could be harmful.	0.37 (0.63)				.599
17. Being overly alert or on guard.	0.83 (0.74)				.646
18. Being jumpy or easily startled.	1.00 (0.76)				.733
19. Problems with concentration.	0.91 (0.80)				.695
20. Trouble falling or staying asleep.	0.98 (0.81)				.617
Factor correlations					
Reexperiencing		—			
Avoidance		.57	—		
NACM		.81	.81	—	
AR		.84	.55	.94	—

Note. RE = reexperiencing; NACM = negative alterations in cognition and mood; AR = alterations in arousal and reactivity.

There was a significant association between delayed milestone development and total scores on the avoidance and NACM scale as well as the AR scale. For the child and adolescent sample (see Table 6), there was no association between gender and any of the CATS scales. Those with delayed milestone development had significant higher scores on the reexperiencing, NACM, and AR scales, while those with prior psychological or pharmacological support for emotional or behavioral problems had significantly higher scores on all scales.

Discussion

The primary objective of this study was to assess the validity and reliability of the parent-reported Ukrainian CATS among children and

adolescents living in Ukraine during the Russian war. This was the first-ever study to examine the psychometric properties of the CATS in children and adolescents living in an active war situation. For the preschool sample, a three-factor model consistent with the *DSM-5* model of PTSD for children aged 6 years and older was found to provide the best fit to the data. Moreover, consistent with prior research using the English, Norwegian, and German translations of the parent-reported CATS (Sachser et al., 2017), a four-factor model consistent with the *DSM-5* model of PTSD was found to provide an acceptable representation of the symptom structure of the Ukrainian CATS for the child and adolescent sample. All items were loaded robustly onto their respective latent variables for both samples, and all latent variables were significantly correlated with each other. For the preschool sample, all latent variables were highly correlated with one another ($>.84$), indicating poor distinguishability between these latent variables. Similarly, for the child and adolescent sample, all latent variables were highly correlated with one another ($>.81$), except for avoidance and reexperiencing ($r = .57$). Nevertheless, the support of the three-factor model in the preschool sample and the four-factor model in the child and adolescent sample indicates that the parent-reported Ukrainian CATS is a valid and appropriate tool for capturing the symptom content of PTSD as described in the *DSM-5* model. Similar to prior studies (e.g., Akkuş et al., 2021; Sachser et al., 2017, 2018), the Ukrainian CATS demonstrated high levels of internal reliability in both samples.

The second objective of this study was to examine convergent–divergent validity patterns of the Ukrainian CATS in very young children and older children and adolescents. Findings demonstrated moderate-to-strong associations between internalizing scores and all of the CATS latent variables. Moreover, there were strong associations between attention scores and all CATS latent variables (i.e.,

Table 5
Standardized Bivariate Correlations for the Latent Factors and Mental Health Outcomes

Latent factors	Age	Internalizing	Externalizing	Attention
Preschool sample				
Reexperiencing	-.018	.397***	.214**	.404***
Avoidance and NACM	.001	.442***	.349***	.450***
AR	-.011	.427***	.286***	.520***
Child and adolescent sample				
Reexperiencing	.149***	.370***	.169***	.275***
Avoidance	.170***	.237***	.034	.133***
NACM	.163***	.572***	.250	.273***
AR	.058***	.454***	.323	.434***

Note. NACM = negative alterations in cognition and mood; AR = alterations in arousal and reactivity
** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

experienced trauma prior to the war, with research demonstrating prior trauma exposure as a significant risk factor for later PTSD (Copeland et al., 2007).

There are some limitations associated with this study. First, given the ongoing conflict and the mass displacement of people in Ukraine, it was not possible to obtain a representative sample. Nevertheless, steps were taken to ensure representativeness of the sample with respect to sex, age, and living location in Ukraine. Second, findings from the present study are based on parental reports. Prior research has indicated that the use of parent reports alone can lead to underreporting of PTSD symptoms (Scheeringa et al., 2006), while symptoms of PTSD in young children can often go unrecognized by parents (Meiser-Stedman et al., 2017). Prior research has shown moderate-to-high correlations between children's self-reports and parent reports (Sachser et al., 2017), and thus, future research may benefit from investigating the psychometric properties of a self-report version of the Ukrainian CATS. The gender variable in the current study had a sizable missingness rate for both samples (39.5% of the preschool sample and 37.7% of the child and adolescent sample). This was due to an error in the initial survey where the gender of the child was not inquired about. Efforts were made to recontact participants to determine the gender of their child, with responses obtained from 61.8% of the participants. Hence, the findings regarding gender differences may not be generalizable to the sample as a whole. Finally, the trauma checklist that is part of the CATS was not implemented in the current study due to time constraints with the implementation of the survey and the broad scope of the survey, and hence, it was not possible to ascertain the link to the war or other traumatic experiences.

In conclusion, this study was the first to examine the psychometric properties of the CATS in a war-affected child and adolescent population. Findings from the present study support the validity and reliability of the parent-reported Ukrainian version of the CATS. Given the urgency of addressing the psychological impact of the Russian war on Ukraine, the availability of an empirically validated measure of PTSD for young people should facilitate the identification and treatment of at-risk children and adolescents. This measure could not only be utilized in a variety of settings in Ukraine including in- and outpatient services, private practice, and by pediatricians, but could also be utilized in neighborhood countries such as Poland which has hosted the vast majority of Ukrainian refugees. Using this measure will facilitate the effective identification of children who need mental health treatment, which would ultimately facilitate entry into the psychiatric/psychotherapeutic care system.

References

Akkuş, P., Serdaroglu, E., Kömürlüoğlu, A., Asena, M., Bahadır, E., Özdemir, G., Karahan, S., & Özmert, E. (2021). Screening traumatic life events in preschool aged children: Cultural adaptation of Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS) caregiver-report 3–6 years version. *The Turkish Journal of Pediatrics*, *63*(1), 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.24953/turkjped.2021.01.011>

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>

Attanayake, V., McKay, R., Joffres, M., Singh, S., Burkle, F., & Mills, E. (2009). Prevalence of mental disorders among children exposed to war:

A systematic review of 7,920 children. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, *25*(1), 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13623690802568913>

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238>

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *21*(2), 230–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005>

Catani, C. (2018). Mental health of children living in war zones: A risk and protection perspective. *World Psychiatry*, *17*(1), 104–105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20496>

Connor, D. F., Ford, J. D., Arnsten, A. F., & Greene, C. A. (2015). An update on posttraumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents. *Clinical Pediatrics*, *54*(6), 517–528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0009922814540793>

Copeland, W. E., Keeler, G., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2007). Traumatic events and posttraumatic stress in childhood. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *64*(5), 577–584. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.64.5.577>

Dowdy-Hazlett, T., Killian, M., & Woods, M. (2021). Measurement of traumatic experiences of children within survey and intervention research: A Systematic Review of the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *131*. Article 106259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106259>

Elvevåg, B., & DeLisi, L. E. (2022). The mental health consequences on children of the war in Ukraine: A commentary. *Psychiatry Research*, *317*, Article 114798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2022.114798>

Friedman, M. J. (2013). Finalizing PTSD in DSM-5: Getting here from there and where to go next. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *26*(5), 548–556. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21840>

Gardner, W., Murphy, M., Childs, G., Kelleher, K., Pagano, M., Jellinek, M., & Chiapetta, L. (1999). The PSC-17: A brief paediatric symptom checklist with psychosocial problem subscales. *Ambulatory Child Health*, *5*, 225–236.

Garza, K., & Jovanovic, T. (2017). Impact of gender on child and adolescent PTSD. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *19*(11), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-017-0830-6>

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>

Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1982). Recent developments in structural equation modeling. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *19*(4), 404–416. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151714>

Martsenkovskiy, D., Karatzias, T., Hyland, P., Shevlin, M., Ben-Ezra, M., McElroy, E., Vang, M. L., Vallières, F., Lorberg, B., Martsenkovskiy, I., & Cloitre, M. (2022). Parent-reported posttraumatic stress reactions in children and adolescents: Findings from the mental health of parents and children in Ukraine study. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/7wtr9>

McLaughlin, K. A., Koenen, K. C., Hill, E. D., Petukhova, M., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A. M., & Kessler, R. C. (2013). Trauma exposure and post-traumatic stress disorder in a national sample of adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *52*(8), 815–830.e14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2013.05.011>

Meiser-Stedman, R., Smith, P., Yule, W., Glucksman, E., & Dalgleish, T. (2017). Posttraumatic stress disorder in young children 3 years posttrauma: Prevalence and longitudinal predictors. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *78*(3), 334–339. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.15m10002>

Miller, M. W., Wolf, E. J., & Keane, T. M. (2014). Posttraumatic stress disorder in DSM-5: New criteria and controversies. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *21*(3), 208–220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cpsp.12070>

Muthén, L. K., Muthén, B. O. (1998–2017). *Mplus user's guide* (8th ed.).

Nooner, K. B., Linares, L. O., Batinjane, J., Kramer, R. A., Silva, R., & Cloitre, M. (2012). Factors related to posttraumatic stress disorder in adolescence. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, *13*(3), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012447698>

- Patel, S. S., & Erickson, T. B. (2022). The new humanitarian crisis in Ukraine: Coping with the public health impact of hybrid warfare, mass migration, and mental health trauma. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*, 16(6), 2231–2232. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2022.70>
- Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayesian model selection in social research. *Sociological Methodology*, 25, 111–163. <https://doi.org/10.2307/271063>
- Raykov, T. (1997). Estimation of composite reliability for congeneric measures. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 21(2), 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01466216970212006>
- Sachser, C., Berliner, L., Holt, T., Jensen, T. K., Jungbluth, N., Risch, E., Rosner, R., & Goldbeck, L. (2017). International development and psychometric properties of the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen (CATS). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 210, 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.12.040>
- Sachser, C., Berliner, L., Holt, T., Jensen, T. K., Jungbluth, N., Risch, E., Rosner, R., & Goldbeck, L. (2018). Comparing the dimensional structure and diagnostic algorithms between DSM-5 and ICD-11 PTSD in children and adolescents. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 27(2), 181–190. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-017-1032-9>
- Scheeringa, M. S., Wright, M. J., Hunt, J. P., & Zeanah, C. H. (2006). Factors affecting the diagnosis and prediction of PTSD symptomatology in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 163(4), 644–651. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.2006.163.4.644>
- Sclove, S. L. (1987). Application of model-selection criteria to some problems in multivariate analysis. *Psychometrika*, 52(3), 333–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294360>
- Shevlin, M., Hyland, P., Karatzias, T., Makhshvili, N., Javakhishvili, J., & Roberts, B. (2022). The Ukraine crisis: Mental health resources for clinicians and researchers. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 35(3), 775–777. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.22837>
- Steel, Z., Chey, T., Silove, D., Marnane, C., Bryant, R. A., & van Ommeren, M. (2009). Association of torture and other potentially traumatic events with mental health outcomes among populations exposed to mass conflict and displacement: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 302(5), 537–549. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1132>
- Tanaka, J. S. (1987). ‘How big is big enough?’ Sample size and goodness of fit in structural equation models with latent variables. *Child Development*, 58(1), 134–146. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130296>
- Trickey, D., Siddaway, A. P., Meiser-Stedman, R., Serpell, L., & Field, A. P. (2012). A meta-analysis of risk factors for post-traumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32(2), 122–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2011.12.001>
- Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 38(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291170>
- Ukraine: The International Trauma Consortium. (2022). *Trauma measures glob*. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from <https://www.traumameasuresglobal.com/ukraine>
- UNICEF. (2023, February 21). *War in Ukraine: Support for children and families*. Retrieved March 2, 2023, from <https://www.unicef.org/emergencies/war-ukraine-pose-immediate-threat-children#what-happening>
- United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2023, February 6). *Ukraine: Civilian casualty update 6 February 2023*. Retrieved March 2, 2023, from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/news/2023/02/ukraine-civilian-casualty-update-6-february-2023#:~:text=From%2024%20February%202022%20to%205%20February%202023%2C%20OHCHR%20recorded,7%2C155%20killed%20and%2011%2C662%20injured>
- Yuan, K.-H., & Bentler, P. M. (2000). Three likelihood-based methods for mean and covariance structure analysis with nonnormal missing data. *Sociological Methodology*, 30(1), 165–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0081-1750.00078>

Received April 20, 2023

Revision received June 30, 2023

Accepted July 12, 2023 ■