

Psychological characteristics of young adults with temporomandibular disorders, somatization and combined conditions: A multidimensional evaluation

by Carolina Damayanti Marpaung

Submission date: 08-Mar-2024 09:59AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2268178739

File name: JOR_Genap_2022_drg_Maya.pdf (705.87K)

Word count: 7951

Character count: 42581

Psychological characteristics of young adults with temporomandibular disorders, somatization and combined conditions: A multidimensional evaluation

Adrian Ujin Yap^{1,2,3} | Ni Luh Dewi³ | Carolina Marpaung³

¹Department of Dentistry, Ng Teng Fong General Hospital and Faculty of Dentistry, National University Health System, Singapore, Singapore

²National Dental Research Institute Singapore, National Dental Centre Singapore and Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore Health Services, Singapore, Singapore

³Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

Correspondence

Carolina Marpaung, Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Jl Kyai Tapa no 260, Jakarta 1140, Indonesia.
Email: carolina@trisakti.ac.id

Funding information

Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia, Grant/Award Number: 0142/PUF/FGK/2021-202

Abstract

Background: Temporomandibular disorders and somatization have shown interrelation in many studies. The physical and psychological factors which contributed to the occurrence and relation of both conditions are yet to be determined.

Objectives: The personality traits, coping styles and psychological distress of young adults with temporomandibular disorder (TMD) and somatic symptoms were characterized together with the determination of psychological risk factors for TMDs, somatization and combined conditions.

Methods: Participants were recruited from university-attending young adults. TMD and somatic symptoms were appraised with the short-form Fonseca Anamnestic Index and Patient Health Questionnaire-15. Psychological variables were assessed with the Big Five Personality Inventory-10, Brief-COPE Inventory and Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales-21. Data were evaluated using chi-squared/non-parametric tests and logistic regression analyses ($\alpha = .05$).

Results: Among the 507 participants (mean age 22.2 ± 1.5 years), 46.4% reported no TMD/somatic symptoms (NS) while 7.5%, 34.5% and 11.6% had TMDs only (TS), somatization only (SS) and combined TMDs-somatization (CS), respectively. Significant differences in conscientiousness ($NS > SS$), agreeableness ($NS, TS > CS$; $NS > SS$), dysfunctional coping, general distress, depression, anxiety and stress ($CS \geq SS > NS$) were discerned. Multivariate analyses indicated that the odds of TS were increased by anxiety (OR = 1.10; 95% CI = 1.01–1.21), while the odds of SS/CS were affected by anxiety (OR = 1.15; 95% CI = 1.06–1.25/OR = 1.34; 95% CI = 0.19–1.52) and problem-focused coping (OR = 0.71; 95% CI = 0.56–0.89/OR = 0.55; 95% CI = 0.39–0.78).

Conclusion: Though individuals with TMDs and somatization have dissimilar psychological profiles, anxiety constantly increased their likelihood. Problem-focused coping strategies may help alleviate psychosocial and physical stressors associated with TMDs and somatization.

KEYWORDS

coping, personality, psychological distress, somatic symptoms, temporomandibular disorders

1 | BACKGROUND

Temporomandibular disorders (TMDs) are a cluster of more than 30 health conditions involving the stomatognathic system. The cardinal features of TMDs consist of temporomandibular joint (TMJ) pain, masticatory muscle pain, TMJ noises during jaw movement/function and limitations in jaw movement.^{1,2} TMDs are a significant and increasingly prevalent public health problem affecting 5%–16% of the general population. Furthermore, up to 75% of people have subclinical signs and/or symptoms of TMDs.^{3,4} Gender differences in TMD prevalence exist, and women, notably those aged 20–40 years old, have a greater risk of developing TMDs than men.^{2–5} The individual and societal burden of TMDs is substantial with impairment of both general and oral health-related quality of life.^{6,7} TMDs have multiple 'biopsychosocial' contributing factors including age, gender, genetics, oral parafunction, pain sensitivity, somatic symptoms, somatization (the tendency to experience psychological distress as physical/somatic symptoms) and psychological distress.^{1,8} TMD patients have high frequencies of somatic symptoms including headaches, neck and back pain, somatization, as well as psychological distress which encompass depression, anxiety and stress.^{9–14} East and Southeast Asians are more susceptible to somatization than Westerners as they are socialized to emphasize somatic rather than psychological symptoms because of the social stigma attached to mental problems.^{15–17}

The perception and moderation of psychological distress might be influenced by the independent and interactive effects of personality and coping.¹⁸ Personality is the set of unique thoughts, feelings and behaviours that differentiates a person, and personality traits are usually assessed based on the 'five-factor model'. The five personality dimensions (OCEAN) are openness (the tendency to be creative and curious), conscientiousness (the tendency to be self-disciplined and goal-oriented), extraversion (the tendency to be self-confident and sociable), agreeableness (the tendency to be cooperative and empathetic) and neuroticism (the tendency to experience negative emotions). Coping is the set of predictable strategies mobilized by a person to mitigate negative situations/emotions and dispositional coping styles are considered functional or dysfunctional depending on the use of problem/emotion-focused or maladaptive coping strategies correspondingly.^{19,20} The few studies investigating the association of TMDs with personality and coping suggested that individuals with TMDs have 'neurotic/distressed' personalities and utilized more maladaptive coping strategies than functional ones.^{21–25} Only one study, involving a relatively modest sample of TMD patients, simultaneously analysed the psychological variables of personality, coping and distress.²¹ Though patients with joint and muscle conditions had comparable psychological and coping profiles, their personality predictors differed.²¹ Nonetheless, many TMD sufferers have combined joint and muscle symptoms.^{26,27}

Young adulthood is the unique development period when young people are traditionally expected to shoulder adult responsibilities

and engage in work and/or higher education. Young adults constitute a substantial proportion of TMD patients and their mental health appears to have declined over the past decade.^{27,28} Additionally, those with chronic pain were found to have poorer psychosocial functioning and quality of life than their peers without pain.²⁹ Young adults with TMDs may not necessarily have somatic complaints, and the converse is also true for those with somatization.¹¹ Thus far, no study has synchronously evaluated the three related psychological variables in community-based young adults with TMD and/or somatic symptoms.

Given the aforesaid, the objectives of this study were three folds: (1) to characterize the psychological variables, namely personality traits, coping styles and psychological distress, associated with young adults with TMD and/or somatic symptoms, (2) to explore the interrelationships between physical and psychological variables and (3) to determine the risk factors for TMDs, somatization and combined TMDs-somatization in young adults. The research hypotheses were, (a) young adults with TMDs and somatic symptoms have elevated levels of neuroticism, dysfunctional coping behaviours and/or psychological distress, (b) neurotic personality traits and dysfunctional coping styles are associated with higher levels of distress and (c) the odds of TMDs, somatization and combined conditions are influenced by specific psychological factors.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Study participants

Data for this study were accrued from an ongoing investigation on the relationship between TMDs/oral parafunction and psychosocial functioning, which was endorsed by the ethics committee of the Faculty of Dentistry, Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia (ID: 013/S3/KEPK/FKG/9/2021). Young adults were recruited from the largest private university in the country using a non-probabilistic voluntary sampling technique. The inclusion criteria were age 18–24 years and proficiency in English, while the exclusion criteria included prior oro-facial trauma/orthognathic surgery and ongoing care for debilitating psychological and/or physical disorders. At least 318 participants were needed for the study based upon a 95% confidence level, 5% precision, university enrolment of 20638 students and 70% prevalence of TMD/somatic symptoms in young adults.^{4,30} Potential participants were sought through public internet postings as well as personal networks. They were supplied with the study details and informed consent was obtained before administering a comprehensive online survey. The latter comprised demographic information, the Short-form Fonseca Anamnestic Index (SFAI), Patients Health Questionnaire-15 (PHQ-15), Big Five Personality Inventory-10 (BFI-10), Brief-COPE (coping orientations to problems experienced) Inventory (BCI) and Depression, Anxiety, Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21).^{19,20,31–33}

2.2 | Study measures

2.2.1 | Physical measures

Temporomandibular disorder symptoms were established with the SFAI which consisted of two pain (TMJ and masticatory muscle pain) and three function-related (TMJ noises, jaw opening and side-movement difficulties) items. In addition to evaluating both TMD pain and functional disturbance, the SFAI also has good psychometric properties and high diagnostic accuracy when referenced to both the Diagnostic Criteria (DC/TMD) and Research Diagnostic Criteria for TMDs (RDC/TMD) standards.^{31,34,35} A three-point response scale was used to score the items, where 'no' = 0 points, 'sometimes' = 5 points and 'yes' = 10 points. Somatic symptoms were ascertained with the PHQ-15 which involved the 15 most prevalent items for severe forms of somatization.³² They encompass dizziness, fatigue, sleeping problems, bodily pains (head, stomach, chest, arms, legs or joints), as well as cardiopulmonary and gastrointestinal symptoms. The validity and reliability of the PHQ-15 are well recognized, and it is equivalent or superior to other inventories for screening somatic symptoms and severe somatization.^{32,36–38} A three-point response scale was used to score the items, where 'no bothered at all' = 0 points, 'bothered a little' = 1 point and 'bothered a lot' = 2 points. Both TMD and somatic symptoms were assessed over 30 days. TMDs and somatization were deemed present when total SFAI and PHQ-15 scores were ≥ 15 and ≥ 5 points, respectively. Higher total scores specify greater TMD and somatic symptom (somatization) severity.³⁹ The participants were categorized into the following four groups for statistical evaluation: NS—no TMDs or somatization; TS—TMDs only; SS—somatization only; and CS—combined TMDs somatization (concurrent presence of both conditions).

2.2.2 | Psychological measures

Personality traits were examined with the BFI-10 which contained two items for individual OCEAN dimensions.¹⁹ Its between and within-person measurement properties have been confirmed in cross-sectional and longitudinal studies.^{19,40} A five-point Likert scale, spanning from 'disagree strongly' = 1 point to 'agree strongly' = 5 points, was used to score the items with one question in each dimension being reverse-scored. Dimension scores were computed, with higher scores indicating a greater tendency towards the specific traits.

Dispositional coping styles were appraised using the BCI which comprised two items for each of the 14 coping strategies utilized in response to 'problems experienced'. It is one of the most widely used and validated measures for coping.^{20,41} A four-point Likert scale, spanning from 'I haven't been doing this at all' = 1 point to 'I've been doing this a lot' = 4 points, was used to score the items. The 14 strategies were clustered into the following three coping styles: problem-focused coping (active coping, planning and instrumental support),

emotion-focused (acceptance, emotional support, humour, positive reframing and religion) and dysfunctional coping (behavioural disengagement, denial, self-distraction, self-blame, substance use and venting).^{20,42} Coping style scores were computed by tallying the points for identified strategies, with higher scores indicating increased utilization of functional (problem and emotion-focused) or dysfunctional coping behaviours.

Psychological distress was assessed with DASS-21 which had seven items for each subscale, specifically depression, anxiety and stress.³³ The DASS-21 has good measurement properties and is frequently employed in clinical and research settings.^{33,43} It was demonstrated to have a bifactor structure comprising a general distress factor and the three subscale factors.⁴³ A four-point Likert scale spanning from 'did not apply to me at all' = 0 points to 'applied to me very much, or most of the time' = 3 points was used to score the items. Total DASS-21 and subscale scores are computed with greater scores indicating higher levels of general distress, depression, anxiety and stress correspondingly. Cut-off points for classifying the severity of the depression, anxiety and stress subscales (normal to extremely severe) are reflected in the DASS manual.³³

2.3 | Statistical analyses

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software version 27.0 (IBM Corporation) was used to analyse the data with the significance level set at 0.05. Categorical data were presented as frequencies with percentages and evaluated with the chi-squared test. Numerical data were presented as means/medians with standard deviations (SDs)/interquartile ranges (IQRs) and inspected for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk's test. As non-normal data distributions were observed, numerical data were assessed with the Kruskal-Wallis/post hoc Mann-Whitney U tests and Spearman's rank-order correlation. Correlation coefficients (r_s) of .1, .4 and .7 functioned as the cut-off points for weak, moderate and strong correlations between physical and psychological variables.⁴⁴ Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were performed to determine the factors associated with TMDs, somatization and combined conditions. Insignificant factors were isolated using a step-wise variable selection process with a threshold of $p < .10$ in the multivariate model. Forward and backward step-wise analyses were carried out to confirm the model. Outcomes were presented as odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs).

3 | RESULTS

A total of 515 young adults volunteered for the study, of which eight were excluded due to age (≥ 25 years old). The mean age of the final sample ($n = 507$), which consisted of 85.6% women, was 22.2 ± 1.5 years. Among the study participants, 46.4% reported no TMD/somatic symptoms (NS), whereas 7.5%, 34.5% and 11.6% had TMDs, somatization and combined conditions, correspondingly.

While differences in gender distribution were insignificant, the NS group was slightly older than the SS and CS groups (Table 1).

Table 2 displays the mean/median BFI-10, BCI and DASS-21 scores for the different groups. Significant differences in personality scores were observed for conscientiousness (NS > SS) and agreeableness (NS, TS > CS; NS > SS).

Concerning coping styles, the SS and CS groups utilized significantly more dysfunctional coping when compared to the NS group. The SS and CS groups also had significantly higher levels of general distress, depression, anxiety and stress than the NS group. Additionally, significant differences in anxiety were also observed between the SS and CS groups (CS > SS).

Tables 3 and 4 reflect the results of correlation and logistic regression analyses. The correlation between SFAI and PHQ-15 scores, albeit significant, was weak ($r_s = .19$), as were the correlations between physical and psychological variables ($r_s = -.18$ to $.29$). Neuroticism and dysfunctional coping were moderately correlated to general distress and the three DASS subscales ($r_s = .44$ – $.60$ and $.47$ – $.52$ accordingly). Moderate to strong correlations were noted between problem and emotion-focused coping style scores ($r_s = .76$) as well as among the various DASS constituent scores ($r_s = .62$ – $.95$). Notable variances in the outcomes of univariate analyses were observed for the TS, SS and CS groups. While TMDs were associated only with anxiety, somatization, as well as combined conditions, were related to several psychological variables (Table 4). Multivariate analyses indicated that the odds of TMDs were increased by anxiety (OR = 1.10; 95% CI = 1.01–1.21). However, the odds of somatization were increased by dysfunctional coping (OR = 1.55; 95% CI = 1.06–2.26) and anxiety (OR = 1.15; 95% CI = 1.06–1.25), and reduced by problem-focused coping (OR = 0.71; 95% CI = 0.56–0.89) and depression (OR = 0.91; 95% CI = 0.84–0.99). Additionally, the odds of combined TMDs-somatization were increased by anxiety (OR = 1.34; 95% CI = 0.19–1.52) but reduced by agreeableness (OR = 0.72; 95% CI = 0.57–0.91), problem-focused coping (OR = 0.55; 95% CI = 0.39–0.78) and depression (OR = 0.81; 95% CI = 0.71–0.92).

4 | DISCUSSION

This study is one of the first to explore personality traits, coping styles and distress concurrently in young adults with TMDs and somatization as separate and mutual entities. As young adults with somatization and combined conditions had significantly greater dysfunctional coping and distress scores, the first research hypothesis was partly supported. The second and third research hypotheses were also maintained given the moderately strong correlations between neuroticism/dysfunctional coping and distress scores and the effect of explicit psychological variables on the odds of TMDs and/or somatization. University students, as a young adult population, were selected because of their vulnerability to psychological distress, which can vary from normal mood fluctuations to serious mental disorders.⁴⁵ The study participants, like other Southeast Asian young adults, may have a greater propensity to communicate psychological distress as somatic symptoms, including TMDs, than their Western counterparts.^{11,15,16}

4.1 | Physical conditions

The overall prevalence rates of TMDs and somatization were 19.1% (97 out of 507) and 46.2% (234 out of 507), which were consistent with the high rates reported in the general population.^{3,46,47} Of the 97 participants with TMDs, 60.8% (59/97) experienced somatic symptoms. Conversely, among the 234 individuals with somatization, only 25.2% had TMD symptoms. Therefore, about three-fifths of young adults with TMDs have comorbid somatization, whereas only a quarter with somatization have TMDs. This explained the weak correlation between SFAI and PHQ-15 scores in this and other studies.¹¹ Given the high prevalence of somatization in TMD patients (up to 76.6%), much of the psychological distress accompanying TMDs could be facilitated by somatization.^{9,10} The latter was reinforced by the 4–6 times higher depression/anxiety in persons with somatic symptoms than in the general population

TABLE 1 Demographic characteristics of the study sample.

Variables	n (%)	Age		p-value ^a , Post hoc	Gender		
		Mean (SD)	Median (IQR)		Male, n (%)	Female, n (%)	p-value ^b
Total	507 (100)	22.2 (1.5)	22.0 (3)		73 (14.4)	434 (85.6)	-
No TMDs or somatization (NS)	235 (46.4)	22.4 (1.4)	22.0 (2)	.006 NS > SS, CS	42 (17.9)	193 (82.1)	.052
TMDs only (TS)	38 (7.5)	22.2 (1.4)	22.0 (1)		8 (21.1)	30 (78.9)	
Somatization only (SS)	175 (34.5)	22.0 (1.6)	22.0 (2)		18 (10.3)	157 (89.7)	
Combined TMDs-somatization (CS)	59 (11.6)	21.9 (1.6)	22.0 (2)		5 (8.5)	54 (91.5)	

Note: Bold indicates $p < .05$.

Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation.

^aResults of Kruskal–Wallis tests.

^bResults of chi-squared test.

TABLE 2 Mean/median psychological variable scores for the various groups.

Physical/psychological variables	No TMDs or somatization (NS)	TMDs only (TS)	Somatization only (SS)	Combined TMDs-somatization (CS)	p-value, Post hoc ^a
Personality					
Openness (OP)					
Mean (SD)	6.4 (1.5)	6.5 (1.6)	6.3 (1.4)	6.5 (1.3)	.764
Median (IQR)	6.0 (2)	6.0 (2)	6.0 (2)	6.0 (1)	
Conscientiousness (CP)					
Mean (SD)	6.8 (1.4)	6.4 (1.4)	6.4 (1.3)	6.5 (1.2)	.038
Median (IQR)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	6.0 (1)	6.0 (1)	NS > SS
Extraversion (EP)					
Mean (SD)	6.9 (1.7)	7.3 (1.7)	6.8 (1.6)	6.6 (1.3)	.160
Median (IQR)	7.0 (2)	7.5 (3)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	
Agreeableness (AP)					
Mean (SD)	7.2 (1.4)	7.2 (1.5)	6.7 (1.6)	6.5 (1.5)	.013
Median (IQR)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (1)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (1)	NS, TS > CS; NS > SS
Neuroticism (NP)					
Mean (SD)	6.5 (1.8)	6.6 (1.8)	6.9 (1.4)	7.0 (1.6)	.124
Median (IQR)	7.0 (3)	6.5 (3)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	
Coping styles					
Problem-focused (PC)					
Mean (SD)	5.9 (1.1)	6.0 (1.3)	5.7 (1.1)	5.6 (1.1)	.097
Median (IQR)	6.0 (1.3)	6.0 (1.8)	6.0 (1.3)	5.7 (1.3)	
Emotion-focused (EC)					
Mean (SD)	5.7 (1.0)	5.7 (1.1)	5.5 (1.0)	5.6 (0.9)	.279
Median (IQR)	5.6 (1.0)	5.9 (1.4)	5.6 (1.2)	5.6 (1.2)	
Dysfunctional (DC)					
Mean (SD)	3.9 (0.7)	4.0 (0.8)	4.0 (0.7)	4.2 (0.8)	.013
Median (IQR)	3.8 (1.0)	3.8 (1.0)	4.0 (1)	4.2 (1.2)	CS, SS > NS
Psychological distress					
General (GD)					
Mean (SD)	12.6 (10.3)	15.2 (10.1)	16.0 (9.1)	18.4 (10.9)	<.001
Median (IQR)	9.0 (13)	13.0 (15)	15.0 (12)	16.0 (12)	CS, SS > NS
Depression (DD)					
Mean (SD)	3.0 (3.6)	3.5 (3.5)	3.6 (3.4)	3.9 (3.8)	<.001
Median (IQR)	2.0 (4)	3.0 (4)	2.0 (4)	3.0 (4)	CS, SS > NS
Anxiety (AD)					
Mean (SD)	3.9 (3.4)	5.2 (3.5)	5.2 (3.1)	6.5 (3.8)	<.001
Median (IQR)	3.0 (4)	4.0 (4)	5.0 (4)	6.0 (5)	CS > SS > NS
Stress (SD)					
Mean (SD)	5.7 (4.4)	6.4 (4.5)	7.1 (3.8)	8.0 (4.3)	<.001
Median (IQR)	5.0 (6)	5.0 (8)	7.0 (4)	8.0 (6)	CS, SS > NS

Note: Bold indicates $p < .05$.

Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation.

^aResults of Mann-Whitney U tests.

as well as the variance in psychological characteristics between the TS and CS groups (TMDs without and with somatization) and stronger correlation between PHQ-15 and DASS than SFAI and DASS observed in this study.⁴⁸

4.2 | Psychological factors

Both personality traits and dispositional coping had been linked to psychological distress. While they jointly accounted for 40%–50%

TABLE 3 Correlations between physical and psychological variables.

Variables	TM	SM	OP	CP	EP	AP	NP	PC	EC	DC	GD	DD	AD
TM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SM	0.19**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OP	0.06	0.04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CP	-0.11*	-0.12	-0.23**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EP	-0.02	-0.06	-0.16**	0.16**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AP	-0.05	-0.18**	0.01	-0.01	0.08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NP	0.07	0.13**	0.20**	0.19**	-0.27**	0.04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PC	-0.01	-0.12**	-0.05	0.14**	0.13**	0.05	-0.12**	-	-	-	-	-	-
EC	0.02	-0.08	-0.08	0.06	0.20**	0.11*	-0.16**	0.76**	-	-	-	-	-
DC	0.08	0.18**	0.17**	0.20**	-0.06	-0.08	0.23**	0.33**	0.31**	-	-	-	-
GD	0.12*	0.28**	0.27**	0.25**	-0.28**	-0.03	0.57**	-0.04	-0.05	0.52**	-	-	-
DD	0.08	0.23**	0.26**	0.26**	-0.34**	-0.07	0.44**	-0.12**	-0.10*	0.47**	0.84**	-	-
AD	0.16**	0.29**	0.22**	0.21**	-0.19**	-0.01	0.49**	0.02	0.02	0.45**	0.89**	0.62**	-
SD	0.10*	0.27**	0.24**	0.22**	-0.24**	-0.03	0.60**	-0.01	-0.04	0.48**	0.95**	0.71**	0.79**

Note: Results of Spearman's correlation. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ and Bold indicates correlation coefficient $> .4$.

Abbreviations: SM, somatic symptom scores with the Patient Health Questionnaire-15 (PHQ-15); TM, TMD symptom scores with the Short-form Fonseca Anamnestic Index (SFAI); personality: AP,

agreeableness; CP, conscientiousness; EP, extraversion; NP, neuroticism; OP, openness; coping: DC, dysfunctional; EC, emotion-focused; PC, problem-focused; distress: AD, anxiety; DD, depression; GD, general SD, stress.

TABLE 4 Risk factors for the presence of TMDs, somatization and combined conditions.

Variables	Univariate		Multivariate	
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value ^a	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value ^b
TMDs only				
Gender				
Male	Reference			
Female	0.82 (0.35–1.91)	.639		
Personality				
Openness	1.07 (0.85–1.35)	.567		
Conscientiousness	0.83 (0.65–1.06)	.128		
Extraversion	1.16 (0.94–1.43)	.161		
Agreeableness	1.08 (0.84–1.38)	.539		
Neuroticism	1.02 (0.84–1.24)	.819		
Coping				
Problem-focused	1.07 (0.78–1.46)	.696		
Emotion-focused	1.10 (0.78–1.56)	.592		
Dysfunctional	1.28 (0.82–2.01)	.274		
Psychological distress				
Depression	1.04 (0.95–1.14)	.380		
Anxiety	1.10 (1.01–1.21)	.032	1.10 (1.01–1.21)	.032
Stress	1.04 (0.96–1.12)	.343		
Somatization only				
Gender				
Male	Reference			
Female	1.90 (1.05–3.43)	.034		
Personality				
Openness	0.95 (0.83–1.09)	.470		
Conscientiousness	0.82 (0.71–0.95)	.009		
Extraversion	0.97 (0.86–1.09)	.619		
Agreeableness	0.85 (0.75–0.98)	.020		
Neuroticism	1.14 (1.01–1.29)	.029		
Coping				
Problem-focused	0.83 (0.69–0.99)	.048	0.71 (0.56–0.89)	.003
Emotion-focused	0.87 (0.71–1.06)	.164		
Dysfunctional	1.38 (1.05–1.81)	.022	1.55 (1.06–2.26)	.023
Psychological distress				
Depression	1.06 (0.99–1.12)	.055	0.91 (0.84–0.99)	.038
Anxiety	1.12 (1.06–1.19)	<.001	1.15 (1.06–1.25)	.001
Stress	1.09 (1.04–1.14)	.001		
Combined TMDs somatization				
Gender				
Male	Reference			
Female	2.35 (0.89–6.23)	.086		
Personality				
Openness	1.06 (0.87–1.29)	.589		
Conscientiousness	0.84 (0.68–1.03)	.091		
Extraversion	0.89 (0.74–1.07)	.216		

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Variables	Univariate	p-value ^a	Multivariate	p-value ^b
	Odds ratio (95% CI)		Odds ratio (95% CI)	
Agreeableness	0.78 (0.63–0.95)	.014	0.72 (0.57–0.91)	.005
Neuroticism	1.17 (0.99–1.39)	.061		
Coping				
Problem-focused	0.79 (0.60–1.03)	.080	0.55 (0.39–0.78)	.032
Emotion-focused	0.90 (0.67–1.21)	.484		
Dysfunctional	1.68 (1.15–2.45)	.007		
Psychological distress				
Depression	1.07 (0.99–1.15)	.078	0.81 (0.71–0.92)	.001
Anxiety	1.20 (1.11–1.29)	<.001	1.34 (0.19–1.52)	<.001
Stress	1.11 (1.05–1.19)	.001		

Note: Bold indicates $p < .05$.

^aResults of univariate logistic regression analyses.

^bResults of multivariate logistic regression analyses.

of the variance in psychopathology, coping was found to mediate the relationship between personality and distress.^{18,49} This clarified the moderately strong correlations of neuroticism and dysfunctional coping to general distress, depression, anxiety and stress. The bifactor structure of the DASS-21 was validated by the strong correlations between general distress and the three subscales.⁴³ Participants with TMDs had dissimilar psychological profiles when compared to those with somatization. While differences in psychological characteristics were insignificant between the TS and NS (reference) groups, the SS group presented significantly lower conscientiousness and agreeableness, and greater dysfunctional coping, general distress, depression, anxiety and stress than the NS group. The CS group exhibited substantially lower agreeableness than both TS and NS groups, and greater dysfunctional coping and psychological distress than the NS group. Consequently, participants having somatization without and with TMDs were reckoned to possess comparable psychological characteristics.

Findings regarding young adults with TMDs were in contrast to prior studies specifying that TMDs were associated with neurotic personalities, more frequent use of dysfunctional coping strategies and higher levels of psychological distress.^{9–11,21,22–25} Besides variations in race, participant selection, diagnostic criteria and psychological measures, disparities could be attributed to the exclusion of somatization as a plausible factor for distress. In this study, a conscious effort was made to distinguish participants with TMDs, somatization and combined conditions to scrutinize the bearing of somatization on psychological characteristics. Like TMDs, studies that simultaneously examined all three psychological variables in persons with somatization are scant. Nevertheless, somatization had been related to neuroticism, agreeableness, dysfunctional coping, depression, anxiety and stress.^{50,51} Except for neuroticism, findings corroborated those of earlier studies and were ascribed to cognitive-affective amplification of somatosensory responses.

This may develop through stress-mediated neuroplasticity as well as inflammatory neuromodulation and is subjected to genetic and environmental factors.^{50,52} Neuroticism was not related to somatization in this study. This phenomenon could be qualified by the exclusion of young adults with debilitating psychological disorders, such as bipolar disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder and schizophrenia, and the generally normal depression (0–4 points), mild-to-moderate anxiety (4–7 points) and normal-to-mild stress (0–9 points) observed among the participants.

4.3 | Risk factors for TMDs and/or somatization

After adjusting for confounding effects in the multivariate model, anxiety increased the odds of TMDs, somatization and combined conditions by 10%, 15% and 34%, while depression reduced the odds of somatization and combined conditions by 9% and 19% correspondingly. Anxiety was thus the main emotional risk factor for TMDs and somatization in community-based young adults. Findings were consistent with those of other community-based studies demonstrating a stronger association between anxiety and TMD/somatic symptoms than depression and stress.^{50,53,54} The apparent 'protective effect' of depression was an aberrant outcome that can be credited to the largely normal level of depression in the study sample as specified by the DASS severity classification.³³ Depression is usually more severe in patient populations and is anticipated to have interactive effects with anxiety.^{9,10,48,55}

While dysfunctional coping increased the odds of somatization by 55%, problem-focused coping reduced the odds of somatization and combined conditions by 29% and 45%, respectively. The relation to dysfunctional coping, which is associated with low self-esteem, low optimism and greater distress, was not surprising as somatization might be a maladaptive coping technique where somatic complaints are utilized to communicate psychological

distress.^{16,56,57} Moreover, poor verbal ability/skills were reported to play a role in the development of multiple functional somatic symptoms because of the augmented use of dysfunctional coping strategies.⁵⁷ Problem-focused coping reduced the risk of somatization without and with TMDs substantially. Therefore, the management of TMDs and somatization should incorporate the training and practice of problem-focused coping strategies for alleviating accompanying psychosocial stressors, pain and functional disability. Problem-focused coping strategies may be more effective in agreeable (the tendency to be cooperative, compliant and kind) and conscientious (the tendency to be goal-oriented, self-disciplined and reliable) patients given the influence of these traits on the interactions with healthcare providers.⁵⁸ Agreeableness also reduced the odds of combined conditions by 28%. It has been linked to effortful control and high levels of agreeableness have been shown to decouple the relation between neuroticism and somatic symptoms.⁵⁹

4.4 | Study limitations

This analytical observational study had some limitations. First, the temporal and causal relationships between physical conditions and psychological distress cannot be determined with the cross-sectional design employed. While personality traits and coping styles remain fairly constant, TMD, somatic, depressive, anxiety and stress symptoms could fluctuate over the assessment period. Second, the study sample, which comprised mainly of women, involved only students from a private University and is not representative of all young adults in the country. The predominance of female responders is partly due to the greater inclination for women to participate in research surveys than men and might result in possible gender bias.⁶⁰ Future research could incorporate a longitudinal design, working young adults and more male participants. The study should also be replicated in other racial/ethnic groups as well as TMD patient populations. Third, participants with TMD pain and/or dysfunction were not differentiated. Though this could yield greater insights into the psychological aspects of pain, it involves numerous test groups and requires considerably more participants for accurate comparisons. Lastly, the physical and psychological measures were self-reported and disposed to various sources of information partialities including recall, social desirability, confirmation and other biases.⁶¹

5 | CONCLUSION

The prevalence of TMDs, somatization and combined TMDs-somatization in the study sample was 7.5%, 34.5% and 11.6%, respectively. Young adults with TMDs were found to have dissimilar psychological profiles to their peers with somatization and combined conditions. Those with somatization, without and with TMDs, presented significantly lower agreeableness, greater

dysfunctional coping, general distress, depression, anxiety and stress. As almost three-fifths of young adults with TMDs had comorbid somatization, whereas only a quarter with somatization had TMDs, much of the purported psychological distress accompanying TMDs could be facilitated by somatization. Multivariate analyses indicated that anxiety was the main emotional risk factor for TMDs and somatization in community-based young adults. While dysfunctional coping increased the likelihood of somatization, problem-focused coping reduced the risk of somatization without and with TMDs. The management of TMDs and somatization should thus incorporate the training and practice of problem-focused coping strategies for alleviating associated psychosocial stressors, pain and functional disability. Findings added to understanding of the multifaceted interaction between personality, coping and distress in young adults with TMDs and/or somatization and underscored the importance of psychological screening as part of comprehensive patient care.

18 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Adrian Ujin Yap contributed to conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, validation, visualization, writing the original draft. Ni Luh Dewi contributed to investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, software, validation and review and editing. Carolina Marpaung contributed to conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, software, supervision, validation and review and editing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Hanin I, Pragustine Y and Fitriyanur A for their assistance with the data collection.

16 FUNDING INFORMATION

This study was funded by grant number: 0142/PUF/FKG/2021-202 from Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia.

4 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

PEER REVIEW


The peer review history for this article is available at <https://www.webofscience.com/api/gateway/wos/peer-review/10.1111/joor.13570>.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

ORCID

Adrian Ujin Yap  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0361-6209>

Ni Luh Dewi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6265-0805>

Carolina Marpaung  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9621-6257>

REFERENCES

- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Health and Medicine Division, Board on Health Care Services, et al., eds. *Temporomandibular Disorders: Priorities for Research and Care*. National Academies Press (US); 2020.
- List T, Jensen RH. Temporomandibular disorders: old ideas and new concepts. *Cephalalgia*. 2017;37(7):692-704. doi:10.1177/0333102416686302
- Manfredini D, Guarda-Nardini L, Winocur E, Piccotti F, Ahlberg J, Lobbezoo F. Research diagnostic criteria for temporomandibular disorders: a systematic review of axis I epidemiologic findings. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2011;112(4):453-462. doi:10.1016/j.tripleo.2011.04.021
- Ryan J, Akhter R, Hassan N, Hilton G, Wickham J, Ibaragi S. Epidemiology of temporomandibular disorder in the general population: a systematic review. *Adv Dent Oral Health*. 2019;10:555787. doi:10.19080/ADOH.2019.10.555787
- Bueno CH, Pereira DD, Pattussi MP, Grossi PK, Grossi ML. Gender differences in temporomandibular disorders in adult populational studies: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2018;45(9):720-729. doi:10.1111/joor.12661
- Pigozzi LB, Pereira DD, Pattussi MP, et al. Quality of life in young and middle age adult temporomandibular disorders patients and asymptomatic subjects: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2021;19(1):83. doi:10.1186/s12955-021-01727-7
- Bitiniene D, Zamaliauskiene R, Kubilius R, Leketas M, Gailius T, Smirnovaite K. Quality of life in patients with temporomandibular disorders. A systematic review. *Stomatologija*. 2018;20(1):3-9.
- Slade GD, Fillingim RB, Sanders AE, et al. Summary of findings from the OPPERA prospective cohort study of incidence of first-onset temporomandibular disorder: implications and future directions. *J Pain*. 2013;14(12 Suppl):T116-T124. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2013.09.010
- Felin GC, Tagliari CVDC, Agostini BA, Collares K. Prevalence of psychological disorders in patients with temporomandibular disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2022;S0022-3913(22)00482-6.[published online ahead of print]. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2022.08.002
- De La Torre Canales G, Câmara-Souza MB, Muñoz Lora VRM, et al. Prevalence of psychosocial impairment in temporomandibular disorder patients: a systematic review. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2018;45(11):881-889. doi:10.1111/joor.12685
- Yap AU, Sultana R, Natu VP. Somatic and temporomandibular disorder symptoms - idioms of psychological distress in Southeast Asian youths. *Cranio*. 2021;1-8. [published online ahead of print]. doi:10.1080/08869634.2021.1982496
- Kleykamp BA, Ferguson MC, McNicol E, et al. The prevalence of comorbid chronic pain conditions among patients with temporomandibular disorders: a systematic review. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2022;153(3):241-250.e10. doi:10.1016/j.adaj.2021.08.008
- Fantoni F, Salvetti G, Manfredini D, Bosco M. Current concepts on the functional somatic syndromes and temporomandibular disorders. *Stomatologija*. 2007;9(1):3-9.
- Costa YM, Conti PC, de Faria FA, Bonjardim LR. Temporomandibular disorders and painful comorbidities: clinical association and underlying mechanisms. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol*. 2017;123(3):288-297. doi:10.1016/j.oooo.2016.12.005
- Dreher A, Hahn E, Diefenbacher A, et al. Cultural differences in symptom representation for depression and somatization measured by the PHQ between Vietnamese and German psychiatric outpatients. *J Psychosom Res*. 2017;102:71-77. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2017.09.010
- Choi E, Chentsova-Dutton Y, Parrott WG. The effectiveness of somatization in communicating distress in Korean and American cultural contexts. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:383. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00383
- Sun Y, Chen G, Wang L, et al. Perception of stigma and its associated factors among patients with major depressive disorder: a multicenter survey from an Asian population. *Front Psych*. 2019;10:321. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00321
- Panayiotou G, Kokkinos CM, Kapsou M. Indirect and direct associations between personality and psychological distress mediated by dispositional coping. *J Psychol*. 2014;148(5):549-567. doi:10.1080/00223980.2013.817375
- Rammstedt B, John OP. Measuring personality in one minute or less: a 10 item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *J Res Pers*. 2007;41(1):203-212. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.02.001
- Cooper C, Katona C, Livingston G. Validity and reliability of the Brief COPE in carers of people with dementia: the LASER-AD study. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2008;196(11):838-843. doi:10.1097/NMD.0b013e31818b504c
- Ferrando M, Andreu Y, Galdón MJ, Durá E, Poveda R, Bagán JV. Psychological variables and temporomandibular disorders: distress, coping, and personality. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2004;98(2):153-160. doi:10.1016/j.tripleo.2003.12.030
- Gębska M, Dalewski B, Palka Ł, Kołodziej Ł, Sobolewska E. The importance of type D personality in the development of temporomandibular disorders (TMDs) and depression in students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Brain Sci*. 2021;12(1):28. doi:10.3390/brainsci12010028
- Michelotti A, Martina R, Russo M, Romeo R. Personality characteristics of temporomandibular disorder patients using M.M.P.I. *Cranio*. 1998;16(2):119-125. doi:10.1080/08869634.1998.11746048
- Reissmann DR, John MT, Schierz O, Seedorf H, Doering S. Stress-related adaptive versus maladaptive coping and temporomandibular disorder pain. *J Orofac Pain*. 2012;26(3):181-190.
- Galdón MJ, Durá E, Andreu Y, Ferrando M, Poveda R, Bagán JV. Multidimensional approach to the differences between muscular and articular temporomandibular patients: coping, distress, and pain characteristics. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2006;102(1):40-46. doi:10.1016/j.tripleo.2005.02.067
- Yap AU, Tan SHX, Marpaung C. Temporomandibular disorder symptoms in young adults: three-dimensional impact on oral health-related quality of life. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2022;49(8):769-777. doi:10.1111/joor.13340
- Yap AU, Cao Y, Zhang MJ, Lei J, Fu KY. Age-related differences in diagnostic categories, psychological states and oral health-related quality of life of adult temporomandibular disorder patients. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2021;48(4):361-368. doi:10.1111/joor.13121
- Twenge JM, Cooper AB, Joiner TE, Duffy ME, Binau SG. Age, period, and cohort trends in mood disorder indicators and suicide-related outcomes in a nationally representative dataset, 2005-2017. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2019;128(3):185-199. doi:10.1037/abn0000410
- Serbic D, Friedrich C, Murray R. Psychological, social and academic functioning in university students with chronic pain: a systematic review. *J Am Coll Health*. 2021;1-15. [published online ahead of print]. doi:10.1080/07448481.2021.2006199
- Hilderink PH, Collard R, Rosmalen JG, Oude Voshaar RC. Prevalence of somatoform disorders and medically unexplained symptoms in old age populations in comparison with younger age groups: a systematic review. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2013;12(1):151-156. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2012.04.004
- Yap AU, Zhang MJ, Lei J, Fu KY. Diagnostic accuracy of the short-form Fonseca Anamnestic Index in relation to the diagnostic criteria for temporomandibular disorders. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2022;128(5):977-983. doi:10.1016/j.prosdent.2021.02.016

32. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-15: validity of a new measure for evaluating the severity of somatic symptoms. *Psychosom Med*. 2002;64(2):258-266. doi:10.1097/00006842-200203000-00008
33. Lovibond SH, Lovibond PF. *Manual for the Depression Anxiety & Stress Scales*. 2nd ed. Psychology Foundation; 1995.
34. Zagalaz-Anula N, Sánchez-Torrel CM, Acebal-Blanco F, et al. The short form of the Fonseca Anamnestic Index for the screening of temporomandibular disorders: validity and reliability in a Spanish-speaking population. *J Clin Med*. 2021;10(24):5858. doi:10.3390/jcm10245858
35. Pires PF, de Castro EM, Pelai EB, de Arruda ABC, Rodrigues-Bigaton D. Analysis of the accuracy and reliability of the short-form Fonseca Anamnestic Index in the diagnosis of myogenous temporomandibular disorder in women. *Braz J Phys Ther*. 2018;22(4):276-282. doi:10.1016/j.bjpt.2018.02.003
36. Zijlema WL, Stolk RP, Löwe B, et al. How to assess common somatic symptoms in large-scale studies: a systematic review of questionnaires. *J Psychosom Res*. 2013;74(6):459-468. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2013.03.093
37. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Löwe B. The patient health questionnaire somatic, anxiety, and depressive symptom scales: a systematic review. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2010;32(4):345-359. doi:10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2010.03.006
38. Kurlansk SL, Maffei MS. Somatic symptom disorder. *Am Fam Physician*. 2016;93(1):49-54.
39. Liao SC, Huang WL, Ma HM, et al. The relation between the patient health questionnaire-15 and DSM somatic diagnoses. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2016;16(1):351. doi:10.1186/s12888-016-1068-2
40. Ringwald WR, Manuck SB, Marsland AL, Wright AGC. Psychometric evaluation of a Big Five Personality State Scale for intensive longitudinal studies. *Assessment*. 2022;29(6):1301-1319. doi:10.1177/1073191211008254
41. García FE, Barraza-Peña CG, Włodarczyk A, Alvear-Carrasco M, Reyes-Reyes A. Psychometric properties of the Brief-COPE for the evaluation of coping strategies in the Chilean population. *Psicol Reflex Crit*. 2018;31(1):22. doi:10.1186/s41155-018-0102-3
42. Henry N, Kayser D, Egermann H. Music in mood regulation and coping orientations in response to COVID-19 lockdown measures within the United Kingdom. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12:647879. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.647879
43. Lee J, Lee EH, Moon SH. Systematic review of the measurement properties of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21 by applying updated COSMIN methodology. *Qual Life Res*. 2019;28(9):2325-2339. doi:10.1007/s11136-019-02177-
44. Dancey CP, Reidy J. *Statistics without Maths for Psychology*. 7th ed. Pearson; 2017.
45. Osborn TG, Li S, Saunders R, Fonagy P. University students' use of mental health services: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Ment Health Syst*. 2022;16(1):57. doi:10.1186/s13033-022-00569-0
46. Hiller W, Rief W, Brähler E. Somatization in the population: from mild bodily misperceptions to disabling symptoms. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2006;41(9):704-712. doi:10.1007/s00127-006-0082-y
47. Ran L, Wang W, Ai M, Kong Y, Chen J, Kuang L. Psychological resilience, depression, anxiety, and somatization symptoms in response to COVID-19: a study of the general population in China at the peak of its epidemic. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;262:113261. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113261
48. Nimmo SB. Medically unexplained symptoms. *Occup Med*. 2015;65(2):92-94. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqv004
49. Mirnics Z, Heincz O, Bagdy G, et al. The relationship between the big five personality dimensions and acute psychopathology: mediating and moderating effects of coping strategies. *Psychiatr Danub*. 2013;25(4):379-388.
50. Mostafaei S, Kabir K, Kazemnejad A, et al. Explanation of somatic symptoms by mental health and personality traits: application of Bayesian regularized quantile regression in a large population study. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2019;19(1):207. doi:10.1186/s12888-019-2189-1
51. Hyphantis T, Goulia P, Carvalho AF. Personality traits, defense mechanisms and hostility features associated with somatic symptom severity in both health and disease. *J Psychosom Res*. 2013;75(4):362-369. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2013.08.014
52. Perez DL, Barsky AJ, Vago DR, Baslet G, Silbersweig DA. A neural circuit framework for somatosensory amplification in somatoform disorders. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2015;27(1):e40-e50. doi:10.1176/appi.neuropsych.13070170
53. Yap AU, Lee DZR, Marpaung C. Negative affectivity and emotions in youths with temporomandibular disorders across cultures. *Crania*. 2022;1-9. [published online ahead of print]. doi:10.1080/08869634.2022.2107146
54. Bonjardim LR, Gavião MB, Pereira LJ, Castelo PM. Anxiety and depression in adolescents and their relationship with signs and symptoms of temporomandibular disorders. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2005;18(4):347-352.
55. Hanel G, Henningsen P, Herzog W, et al. Depression, anxiety, and somatoform disorders: vague or distinct categories in primary care? Results from a large cross-sectional study. *J Psychosom Res*. 2009;67(3):189-197. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2009.04.013
56. Carver CS, Scheier MF, Weintraub JK. Assessing coping strategies: a theoretically based approach. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1989;56(2):267-283. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.56.2.267
57. Hall NM, Kuzminskyte R, Pedersen AD, Ørnbøl E, Fink P. The relationship between cognitive functions, somatization and behavioural coping in patients with multiple functional somatic symptoms. *Nord J Psychiatry*. 2011;65(3):216-224. doi:10.3109/08039488.2010.528024
58. Kirmayer LJ, Robbins JM, Paris J. Somatoform disorders: personality and the social matrix of somatic distress. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 1994;103(1):125-136. doi:10.1037//0021-843x.103.1.125
59. Ode S, Robinson MD. Agreeableness and the self-regulation of negative affect: findings involving the neuroticism/somatic distress relationship. *Pers Individ Differ*. 2007;43(8):2137-2148. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.06.035
60. Smith WG. Does gender influence online survey participation? A record-linkage analysis of University Faculty online survey response behavior. Institute of Educational Sciences. Accessed January 15, 2023. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED501717>
61. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2016;9:211-217. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S104807

How to cite this article: Yap AU, Dewi NL, Marpaung C. Psychological characteristics of young adults with temporomandibular disorders, somatization and combined conditions: A multidimensional evaluation. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2023;50:1382-1392. doi:10.1111/joor.13570

Psychological characteristics of young adults with temporomandibular disorders, somatization and combined conditions: A multidimensional evaluation

ORIGINALITY REPORT

16%

SIMILARITY INDEX

14%

INTERNET SOURCES

11%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	0-bmcoralhealth-biomedcentral-com.brum.beds.ac.uk Internet Source	2%
2	discovery.researcher.life Internet Source	2%
3	pure.uva.nl Internet Source	1%
4	www.theseus.fi Internet Source	1%
5	Adrian Ujin Yap, Henry Chee Wai Ho, Ye Choung Lai. "Analysing the psychosocial construct of temporomandibular disorders: Implications for orthodontics", Seminars in Orthodontics, 2023 Publication	1%
6	Adrian Ujin Yap, Ye Cao, Min-Juan Zhang, Jie Lei, Kai-Yuan Fu. "Number and type of temporomandibular disorder symptoms: their	1%

associations with psychological distress and oral health-related quality of life", Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2021

Publication

7	www.quintessence-publishing.com Internet Source	1 %
8	pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov Internet Source	1 %
9	"Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020 Publication	1 %
10	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	1 %
11	www.cambridge.org Internet Source	<1 %
12	www.unboundmedicine.com Internet Source	<1 %
13	Adrian Ujin Yap, Darren Zong Ru Lee. "Dental fear and anxiety in Asian youths: response components and inducing stimuli", Clinical Oral Investigations, 2022 Publication	<1 %
14	Submitted to Murdoch University Student Paper	<1 %

15	Adrian Ujin Yap, Carolina Marpaung, Enrita Dian Rahmadini. "Psychological well-being and distress: Their associations with temporomandibular disorder symptoms and interrelationships", Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2021 Publication	<1 %
----	---	------

16	Submitted to Monash University Student Paper	<1 %
----	---	------

17	www.i-jmr.org Internet Source	<1 %
----	---	------

18	Adrian Ujin Yap, Ye Cao, May Chun Mei Wong, Kai-Yuan Fu. "Rasch validation of the oral health impact profile for temporomandibular disorders", Oral Diseases, 2021 Publication	<1 %
----	---	------

19	meridian.allenpress.com Internet Source	<1 %
----	---	------

20	ses.library.usyd.edu.au Internet Source	<1 %
----	---	------

21	worldwidescience.org Internet Source	<1 %
----	---	------

22	www.frontiersin.org Internet Source	<1 %
----	---	------

23 Adrian Ujin Yap, Jie Lei, Ji Woon Park, Chengge Liu, Seong Hae Kim, Byeong-Min Lee, Kai-Yuan Fu. "Age distribution of East Asian TMD patients and age-related differences in DC/TMD axis I findings", CRANIO®, 2024
Publication <1 %

24 Mohamed Baloul, Isam Eldin Elnour. "The Impact of Health Insurance on Access to Health Care in Sudan", University of Malaya (Malaysia), 2023
Publication <1 %

25 epub.uni-regensburg.de
Internet Source <1 %

26 mdpi-res.com
Internet Source <1 %

27 www.researchgate.net
Internet Source <1 %

28 link.springer.com
Internet Source <1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches

< 15 words

Exclude bibliography On

Psychological characteristics of young adults with temporomandibular disorders, somatization and combined conditions: A multidimensional evaluation

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

GENERAL COMMENTS

/0

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11