

**Comparative study between Conners
parent scale and Conners third edition
self-report scale in children with
Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder**

Thesis

*Submitted for partial fulfillment of Master Degree
in Neuropsychiatry*

By

Eman Mohamed Sultan

M.B.B.Ch.

Under Supervision of

Professor. Nahla El-Sayed Nagy

Professor of Neuropsychiatry

Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University

Professor. Heba El Shahawi

Professor of Neuropsychiatry

Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University


Assistant Professor. Eman Shorub

Assistant Professor of Neuropsychiatry

Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University**

2016



Acknowledgement

Thanks first and last to ALLAH for his great care, support and guidance in every step in our life.

*I am greatly honored to express my deepest gratitude to Professor **Nahla El Sayed Nagy**, professor of psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for her meticulous revision of this work, constructive criticism sincere supervision and support.*

*I am profoundly grateful to Professor **Heba El Shahawi**, professor of psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University. She was the person who put the idea and plan of this work, without her this work would not come to the light.*

*No words can describe my deep appreciation to Assistant Professor **Eman Shorub**, Assistant Professor of psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for her sincere advice and kind cooperation in all steps of this work.*

I also wish to thank all my professors and colleagues for their encouragement and cooperation and the psychologists for their help.

I would also like to thank all the children and their parents who enrolled in the study for their participation, cooperation and trust in us.

Furthermore, I am so grateful to my uncle Usama Soltan, Associate professor of Arabic, Middlebury College, USA for the professional translation of the scale from English to Arabic language.

Last but not least, I have to thank my family, my father, my mother, my sister and brother for their continuous support and encouragement. I dedicate this work to them; I wish to make them proud of me.

Eman Sultan

List of contents

Content	Page n.
Introduction and Aim of the Work	1-5
Review of Literature:	
Chapter one: Epidemiology and Diagnosis of ADHD	6
Chapter two: Psychological assessment of ADHD	42
Subjects and Methods	100
Results	109
Discussion	149
Summary	182
Conclusions	187
Limitations of the Study	188
Recommendations	189
References	190
Arabic Summary	-

List of Tables

Table n.	Content	Page n.
1	Summary of epidemiological studies on attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in Arab countries.	15
2	Rates of ADHD for different countries.	17
3	Selected candidate genes implicated in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).	24
4	DSM-IV-TR Diagnostic Criteria for ADHD	30
5	DSM-5 Diagnostic Criteria for ADHD	31
6	ICD-10 Diagnostic Criteria for hyperkinetic disorder	35
7	Understanding T-score	76
8	Content Goals for Conners 3	79
9	The difference between CRS-R and Conners 3 rating scale	86
10	Published Conners Assessments over the years	88
11	Psychometric properties of ADHD rating scales.	89
12	The socioeconomic standard of the study group.	113
13	Description of the sociodemographic data	114
14	The IQ of the children of the study group	115
15	The Conners rating scores of the study group	117
16	The Conners 3 self-report rating scores of the children of the study group	118
17	The interrater reliability of the Conners 3 SR subscales	119

18	The correlation between different subscale of the CPRS and the Conners 3 SR	120
19	The correlation between the oppositional content of the two scales	121
20	The correlation between the oppositional subscale of the CPRS and the defiance/ aggression subscale of the SR	123
21	The correlation between the hyperactivity subscale in the CPRS and hyperactivity/ impulsivity subscale of the SR	125
22	The correlation between cognitive subscale of the CPRS and the learning disability subscale of the SR	127
23	The correlation between the cognitive subscale of the CPRS and the inattention subscale of the SR	129
24	The correlation between the emotional lability subscale of the CPRS and the anxiety screener items of the SR	131
25	The correlation between the emotional lability subscale of the CPRS and the depression screener items of the SR	132
26	The correlation between the anxious/shy subscale of the CPRS and the anxiety screening items of the SR	134
27	The correlation between the social problem subscale of the CPRS and the family relation subscale of the SR	136
28	The correlation between the social problem subscale of the CPRS and the aggression subscale of the SR	138
29	The correlation between the DSM inattention subscales of the CPRS and the SR	140

30	The correlation between the DSM hyperactivity /impulsivity subscales of the CPRS and the SR	142
31	The correlation between the ADHD indices of the two scales.	144
32	The correlation between the CPRS and the SR as regard the ADHD types	145
33	The significant correlations in the study	146
34	The correlation between the social class and the inattention subscale of the SR	147
35	The correlation between the social classes and the hyperactivity/impulsivity subscale of the SR	147
36	The correlation between the social classes and the ADHD index of the SR	148

List of Figures

Figure n.	Content	Page n.
1	ADHD prevalence estimates over time	10
2	Prevalence of ADHD over time.	11
3	Risk Factors of ADHD	27
4	History of the Conners Assessments	80
5	The key development goals of Conners 3	85
6	Transition from CRS-R to Conners 3 and Conners CBRS content scales	87
7	The number of children and adolescent in each age group in the study group	110
8	The age distribution of the study group	111
9	The gender distribution in the study	112
10	The socioeconomic standard of the study group.	114
11	The IQ of the study group	116
12	The agreement/disagreement percentage of the oppositional subscales	122
13	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the oppositional subscale of the CPRS and the defiance/ aggression subscale of the SR	124
14	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the hyperactivity subscale in the CPRS and hyperactivity/impulsivity subscale of the SR	126
15	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the cognitive subscale of the CPRS and the learning disability subscale of the SR	128
16	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the cognitive subscale of the CPRS and the inattention subscale of the SR	130

17	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the emotional lability subscale of the CPRS and the anxiety screener items of the SR	132
18	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the emotional lability subscale of the CPRS and the depression screener items of the SR	133
19	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the anxious/shy subscale of the CPRS and the anxiety screening items of the SR	135
20	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the social problem subscale of the CPRS and the family relation subscale of the SR	137
21	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the social problem subscale of the CPRS and the aggression subscale of the SR	139
22	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the DSM inattention subscales of the CPRS and the SR	141
23	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the DSM hyperactivity /impulsivity subscales of the CPRS and the SR	143
24	The agreement/disagreement percentage between the CPRS and the SR as regard the ADHD types	145

List of abbreviations

ADHD	Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder
Conners 3–SR	Conners 3rd edition–Self-Report
CBCL	The Child behavioral checklist
CBRS	Conners Comprehensive Behavior Rating Scales
CD	Conduct Disorder
Conners EC	Conners Early Childhood
CGI	Conners’ Global Index
CRS	Conners’ rating Scales
CPRS	Conners’ Parent Rating Scale
CPRS-R:L	The Conners Rating Scale–Revised: Long version
CPRS-R:S	The Conners Rating Scale–Revised: Short version
CASS	the Conners-Wells’ Adolescent Self-Report Scale
DSM	Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders
ICD	The International Classification of Diseases
KSAD	The Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorder and Schizophrenia for School Age Children
ODD	Oppositional Defiant Disorder
VARs	The Vanderbilt ADHD Rating Scales
VADPRS	The Vanderbilt ADHD Parent Rating Scale
VADTRS	The Vanderbilt ADHD Teacher Rating Scale

ABSTRACT

Background: Diagnostic criteria for identifying ADHD are based on behavioral symptoms, because of the lack of reliable biological markers for diagnosing ADHD. Behavior rating scales are the most common ADHD assessment tools because of their uncomplicated administration and high time- and cost-efficiency. While multiple informant reports are useful in providing information observed by different informants in different settings, disagreement appeared between them.

Objective: To study the difference between symptoms reported by the parents and their children and develop and test the Arabic version of the Conners 3 self-scale.

Method: Cross sectional comparative study through correlations between the answers of the children on the Conners 3 self-report after translation of the scale to Arabic language and the answers of their parents on the Conners revised long version parent form.

Results: The only significant correlations we found are between the cognitive subscale of the CPRS and the inattention and learning problems subscale of the SR, the emotional lability subscale and the depression screening items and the social problem subscale of the CPRS and the defiance/aggression subscale of the SR. Low or no agreement between the children and adolescents and their parents as regard different symptoms and subtypes of ADHD.

Conclusions: We found no significant correlation between different subscales of the CPRT and the Conners 3 SR, and

when found it is week. The Arabic version of the Conners 3 self-report has a highly significant interretar reliability which makes it suitable for use in the Arab region with different clinicians and assessors.

Key Words: rating scales, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, informant agreement, Reliability.

Introduction

Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a developmental -behavioral disorder mostly diagnosed in childhood. Its prominent features are attention deficit, hyperactivity, and impulsiveness, which can cause poor occupational, academic, and social performance in the future (*Kalbag and Levin, 2005*).

However, this diagnosis has been controversial because of its high prevalence and the popular conception that it is over diagnosed (*Sciutto and Eisenberg, 2007*).

The recognition and treatment of ADHD date from the second half of the 20th century (*Swanson et al., 1998*). Since then, significant advances have been made towards understanding the disorder, resulting in the dissemination of knowledge across societies and in increasing recognition and treatment of affected individuals (*Timimi and Taylor, 2004*).

The DSM-IV defined 3 nominal subtypes of ADHD, based on differential elevations on 2 dimensions of inattention symptoms and hyperactivity-impulsivity symptoms. The predominantly inattentive type (ADHD-I) describes individuals with maladaptive levels of inattention, but not hyperactivity impulsivity; the predominantly hyperactive-impulsive type (ADHD-H) is characterized by

maladaptive levels of hyperactivity-impulsivity, but not inattention; and the combined type (ADHD-C) describes individuals who exhibit significant symptoms of both inattention and hyperactivity-impulsivity. Additional DSM-IV criteria required onset of ADHD symptoms prior to age 7 and required that current ADHD symptoms lead to significant impairment in multiple settings. Finally, a diagnosis of ADHD was precluded if the individual met the criteria for a pervasive developmental disorder or psychotic disorder (*Willcutt, 2012*).

ADHD remains a clinical diagnosis. There is no frog test for ADHD. The diagnosis is made by taking a history and performing an examination and ruling out alternative disorders. The DSM criteria and parent/teacher rating scales are essential elements. The “gold standard” for ADHD diagnosis includes a comprehensive clinical history and examination, rating scales, direct behavioral observations, neuropsychological testing, and objective, comparative analysis of different drug effects. Such an approach is very costly and has economic burden, so that we mostly rely on history/examination and rating scales in diagnosis of ADHD.

ADHD rating scales have been used for almost 50 years. In fact, there is no reason not to use rating scales to

evaluate ADHD symptoms in children. Rating scales are good for delineating symptoms and their perceived severity. Ideally, several informants should fill out a rating scale, including parents, teachers, patient, and spouse. Rating scales are systematic and quantitative, but not objective. They are a necessary component of the diagnostic process, but not sufficient. Many rating scales are used like Vanderbilt rating scale, child behavior checklist, behavior assessment system for children (BASC), Conners parents ,teacher and self rating scale and the Wender Utah Rating Scale, which captures childhood symptoms of ADHD in patients who present as adults(*Thomas, Gualtieri and Johnson, 2005*)

ADHD frequently persists into adulthood (*Biederman and Faraone, 2005*). The societal economic impact of ADHD is large, with significant costs located both in the health care sector and elsewhere, for example, in education, social services, and productivity losses associated with family members (*Le et al., 2014*).

Rationale of the study

We depend on rating of ADHD symptoms and subtype in Arab region on parent only because no available valid and reliable tool for children.

Hypothesis

No difference in rating ADHD symptoms and subtypes rated by children and their parents.