

## FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH CHILDREN'S ADHERENCE TO STIMULANT MEDICATION

Phillip Firestone, Ph.D.

School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ontario

---

*Hyperactive children and their families were studied to assess adherence to a regimen of stimulant medication. Of those agreeing to participate for one year, 20% had discontinued medication by the fourth month and 44% by the tenth month. Findings are discussed in relation to child and parent characteristics, the unique nature of using medication to treat behavior problems in children, and the difficulty of carrying out such long-term investigations with children.*

---

Since hyperactivity is evident in eight to ten percent of school age children,<sup>2, 5, 29</sup> and there is ample evidence that many of their problems persist into adolescence and early adulthood,<sup>36</sup> it is not surprising that there is considerable interest in the development of effective treatment programs for this population. Presently, stimulant medication is the most widely used treatment for hyperactive children.<sup>27</sup> In fact, the effects of stimulant medication on hyperactivity is the most thoroughly researched treatment in child psychiatry.<sup>16</sup> However, several puzzling aspects concerning its effectiveness remain.

Several excellent reviews have doc-

umented the beneficial short-term effects of stimulant medication on the classroom and social behavior of hyperactive children.<sup>1, 2, 8, 38</sup> However, long-term investigations have not supported these positive findings.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, there is little evidence, to date, that the academic progress of these children is aided by medication.<sup>2, 3, 25</sup>

Several suggestions have been made concerning the seeming paradox of enhanced attentional abilities and improved classroom behavior and the lack of accelerated academic gain. It is possible that placing a child on medication does improve attention and behavior but does not compensate for the lack of

---

*Submitted to the Journal in September 1980. Research was supported by grants DM-304 and DM-425 from the Ontario Ministry of Health.*

skills and other variables that predispose a child to academic achievement.<sup>2</sup> Another suggestion is that the demonstrated lack of academic achievement while taking medication may be due to the insensitivity of the tests or to the relatively brief intervention periods utilized in this research.<sup>2, 34</sup>

A rarely mentioned but nonetheless glaring deficit in the utilization of medication for hyperactivity is that of adherence. A survey by Solomons<sup>32</sup> found that 43% of the children on stimulant medication were not being adequately monitored by a physician. Furthermore, there are virtually no data indicating the percentage of hyperactive children who do not take their prescribed medication appropriately. Briant<sup>6</sup> suggested that the failure of patients to take medication as prescribed has probably accounted for more variability or lack of consistency in outcome data than any other factor in drug intervention. Investigations with other populations support this claim. It is currently estimated that 50% of adult patients do not take medication as prescribed. Children may fare even worse. Bergman and Werner<sup>5</sup> studied the compliance rate of children diagnosed as suffering from streptococcal pharyngitis, acute otitis media, and skin infections thought to be caused by streptococci. The prescribed treatment consisted of orally ingested penicillin for a ten-day period. It was discovered that 56% had stopped taking the medication by the third day, 71% by the sixth, and 82% by the ninth day. Similar results were obtained by Mattar, Markello and Yaffe,<sup>24</sup> who found that only 7.3% of 300 pediatric outpatients completed their course of antibiotics for otitis media.

Another serious deficit in the lit-

erature on the treatment of hyperactive children is that of subject selection.<sup>15</sup> There is rarely any mention of the solicitation procedures used or the number of children and families meeting criteria, who for one reason or another reject the offer of treatment. This type of selection bias has been shown to affect the results and limit the generalization of research with schizophrenic adults.<sup>33</sup> As Loney and Halmi<sup>22</sup> cogently argued, research that does not take exclusion variables into account does not provide much information with which to specify predictors of treatment response. Neither does this type of research allow for a matching of patient variables with the various treatment modalities available.

In order better to understand the problems inherent in the pharmacological treatment of children in general, and hyperactive children in particular, this paper will examine the demographic and psychological factors associated with attrition and adherence.

The issue of adherence to drug regimens has been addressed in several recent works.<sup>12, 28</sup> These reviews pinpointed the strengths and weaknesses of several of the popular methods of assessing adherence such as clinician ratings, pill counts, blood or urine sampling, record keeping, and outcome. In the end it is quite clear that one should use a combination of approaches to assess compliance because any single method has serious limitations.

The primary goal of the present project was not to increase compliance rates. Rather, it was to ascertain what the normal drug usage patterns in an outpatient child population might be. Since it was felt that the implementation of intrusive monitoring practices might,

in fact, change these patterns, adherence was gauged largely through verbal reports from the parents.

#### METHOD

##### *Subjects*

Seventy-six children (68 boys and 8 girls) between five and nine years of age, referred to the psychology department of the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, were participants in the investigation. The hospital is the pediatric center of the region, with a catchment of 600,000 children. The children had as their prime difficulties, overactivity, short attention span, impulsivity, inability to delay gratification, and aggressiveness, tantrums, or oppositional behavior (attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity<sup>11</sup>). They were required to have a score of 15 or higher on the Hyperactivity Index (HI) of Conners's behavior rating scale for teachers (TRS).<sup>17</sup> Peabody Picture Vocabulary IQs were at least 80, and the children were living at home with at least one parent. The hyperactivity had to be in evidence prior to 2½ years of age and be present at home and at school. Excluded from the sample were children who showed definite signs of brain damage, epilepsy, or psychosis. Families in which either parent was psychotic, or in which the marital discord was so great that the parents openly admitted intervention would be impossible, were excluded.

##### *Procedure*

All children were referred by physicians. Parents and children were then interviewed by the author and each parent was asked independently to fill out Conners's rating scale for parents,<sup>10</sup> a

marital satisfaction questionnaire,<sup>21</sup> and to supply demographic data. The identified patient's teacher was then contacted and asked to complete the TRS. If the family met the criteria, they were randomly assigned to a medication-only condition (methylphenidate hydrochloride) or to a group in which parents received instruction in behavior modification techniques while their children received medication. (A description of the parent training is available elsewhere.<sup>14</sup>) Parents were told their child would be assessed prior to treatment, after about four months; immediately after the parent training, then approximately every six months after that for three years. If parents agreed to participate, their MMPI and IQ data were collected and arrangements for testing the hyperactive child were made. If they rejected treatment, the reasons for this were explored and they were also asked to complete the above measures and tests.

##### *Medication*

Medication was provided free of charge for approximately the first four months of the study. After that, patients were required to purchase medication through regular procedures. Parents were instructed to give their children 5 mg. of the medication morning and noon every day including weekends, until a correct dosage was established. Medication was raised or lowered in 5 mg. gradations, based upon parental and teacher telephone reports, over a three to four week period. Dosages were determined either by a reported significant decrease in problematic behavior or indications of negative side effects (*e.g.*, headaches, stomachaches, irritability,

insomnia). Once the appropriate dosage was established, children generally received medication only on school days. The same person (the author) was responsible for the titration procedure and for maintaining contact with the parents. All medication changes were carried out in consultation with the referring physicians. The average number of contacts per family by a project person during the first four months was 16 in the parent training condition and 13 in the medication only group. The average dosage of methylphenidate was 22 mg. per day with a minimum of 10 mg. and a maximum of 40 mg.

Project personnel attempted at all times to be supportive of the parents' wishes concerning medication use: The parents were informed of medication effects and their child's progress on medication. If, however, parents wanted to take their child off medication they were not subjected to any coercion. Rather, they were informed that the project would still like to follow the child's progress in order to advise the parents concerning academic planning and emotional development.

The duration of the investigation was 12 months. Therefore, since most children were kept off medication during the summer vacation, full compliance entailed taking medication for ten months. Families rejecting pharmacological intervention or terminating its use prior to the end of the fourth month were classified as nonadherents ( $N=32$ ). Adherents were those families who complied with the intervention for nine months or more ( $N=26$ ). Seven subjects who took medication from five to eight months were excluded to ensure independence of the groups.

#### *Rating Scales and Tests*

*Conners's rating scales.* Conners developed a widely used rating scale for teachers.<sup>9</sup> The TRS, a scale of 39 items has been factor-analyzed to produce five factors. Only the HI<sup>17</sup> was analyzed in this experiment and the score is based on the total score within the factor (a four-point scale, 0-3, is used). This factor has been utilized extensively to assess the effectiveness of psychotropic medication with hyperactive children and has been repeatedly shown to be sensitive to drug effects.<sup>13, 35</sup> Conners also developed a rating scale for parents (PRS)<sup>10</sup> that discriminates among hyperactive, neurotic, and normal control children. This 93-item scale has been factor-analyzed to produce eight factors but only the HI was used. The HI is scored in the same manner as is the TRS.

*Assessment of emotional adjustment.* Weiss *et al*<sup>37</sup> developed this scale to assess the emotional adjustment of hyperactive children in a long-term follow-up of children on methylphenidate or chlorpromazine. This is a three-point scale based upon an interview with the parents by a senior psychologist (1, normal; 2, slightly disturbed; 3, severely disturbed). The score is based on a total of seven factors—peer relations, mood, sexual adjustments, relationship with adults, adjustment to authority, number of nervous symptoms, and rate of delinquency.

*Locke-Wallace marital adjustment test.* Locke and Wallace<sup>21</sup> devised a questionnaire to measure marital adjustment which reliably discriminated between good and poor marriages. The mean adjustment score for the well-adjusted group was 135.9 and for the

maladjusted group, 71.1. Only 17% of the maladjusted group received scores of 100 or higher, whereas 96% of the well-adjusted group achieved scores of at least 100. This scale has been used extensively in research.<sup>19, 23, 26</sup>

*Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.* The MMPI is the most widely used objective test of personality. It allows for a symptomatic self-assessment covering a wide range of complaints and fears; in addition, it taps a number of areas of distress and allows for an actuarial classification of acknowledged concerns. The test is self-administered, with the subject answering true or false to a large number of short, structured narrative statements. It is the most widely used personality inventory in research.<sup>7</sup>

*Shipley Institute of Living Scale.* This instrument, introduced as a measure of intellectual performance,<sup>30, 31</sup> consists of a vocabulary test and an abstract reasoning test; it is administered in 20 minutes. The scale has been found to correlate highly with other tests of intellectual functioning.

**RESULTS**

Seventy-six families met the inclusion criteria and were offered treatment. Of these, three children improved so dramatically during the pretests that they no longer required treatment; nine families rejected any form of treatment; eleven families declined the offer of treatment if it included stimulant medication, but accepted parent training as an alternative; ten children responded adversely to methylphenidate and were switched to dextroamphetamine, and eight of these responded adversely to dextroamphetamine and were dropped

from the study, while the other two children remained on this medication.

FIGURE 1 depicts the compliance rates of the families in the two treatment groups. By the fourth month, 80% of the children were still taking medication. A chi-square analysis did not reveal a differential drop-out rate in the two treatment groups,  $\chi^2(1)=.21, p>.10$ , at the end of the fourth month. By the tenth month, 44% of the children were no longer on medication. Once again, a chi square analysis did not reveal a differential drop-out between groups,  $\chi^2(1)=.38, p>.10$ .

Although there were some minimal side effects in both the adhering and nonadhering groups (lack of appetite at lunch, some difficulty falling asleep), the nonadherents did not report these factors as very important in their decision to stop administering medication. The major reasons given were that par-

Figure 1

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN ADHERING TO PRESCRIBED MEDICATION




Table 1

## MOTHERS' AND TEACHERS' HYPERACTIVITY RATINGS FOR THE NONADHERENTS AND ADHERENTS PRE AND POST MEDICATION

NONADHERENTS	PRE	POST	t	df	p<
Teachers	20.94±4.22 (17)	14.18±1.77 (17)	3.51	16	.003
Mothers	18.88±4.78	14.00±7.48	1.98	16	.066
ADHERENTS					
Teachers	17.83±4.52	7.08±3.31	10.19	23	.001
Mothers	22.46±5.52	13.00±5.24	7.18	23	.001

ents were not comfortable with the idea of medicating their children or that the children were reluctant to take their medication. With a few patients in both groups there was some pressure from teachers to take children off medication, despite its seeming to help them. It should be noted that all but three families stopped giving their children medication prior to consulting the project or their physician.

In order to assess whether symptomatic improvement may have led to the high drop-out rate, the HI scores as rated by mothers and teachers, taken as soon as possible after the cessation of medication, were compared to children's premedication scores. Generally, the off-medication ratings were collected within two months of terminating pharmacotherapy. As TABLE 1 indicates, teachers did, in fact, rate the children as significantly improved compared to when they entered the study. There was

a similar trend report by the mothers. However, it is also clear that the children were still quite problematic at the time of assessment while off medication. The adherents' most recent scores while still on medication also showed that they improved significantly as rated by both mothers and teachers.

TABLE 2 reveals that the adherents were rated by teachers as significantly more improved while on medication than the nonadherents' off medication. However, the mothers in the two groups did not differ in their ratings of the children. The characteristics of the children just prior to treatment, in the two compliance groups, are presented in TABLE 3. There was a trend suggesting that nonadherents were younger and scored significantly lower on the intelligence test. No other differences were evident between the groups. A significant chi-square of the sex distribution within the groups was revealed (TABLE 4). It ap-

Table 2

## MOTHERS' AND TEACHERS' HYPERACTIVITY RATINGS FOR THE ADHERENTS AND NONADHERENTS

GROUP	ADHERENTS	NONADHERENTS	t	df	p<
Teachers HI	7.08±3.81	14.18±1.77	3.73	22	.001
Mothers HI	13.00±5.24	14.00±7.48	.48	26	NS

Table 3  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHILDREN

FACTOR	NONADHERENTS	ADHERENTS	t	df	p<
Age	7.05± 1.54 (30)	7.67± 1.22 (26)	1.07	54	.10
IQ	109.00± 15.78 (26)	116.35± 13.58 (26)	1.80	49	.04
Mothers' HI	19.82± 5.34 (26)	10.84± 6.83 (26)	.01	47	—
Teachers HI	19.41± 4.57 (27)	18.77± 4.38 (26)	.52	51	—
Emotional Adjustment	12.63± 3.48 (16)	12.09± 2.76 (23)	.52	27	—

pears that families were more likely to prematurely discontinue medication if the child was female.

TABLE 5 presents the characteristics of the families in the compliance groups. Since the literature concerning drop-out in adult psychotherapy indicates that premature terminators tend to have lower IQs and fewer completed years of schooling,<sup>4</sup> and since similar findings were evident in a study comparing the families of hyperactive children who stayed in parent training programs with those discontinuing prematurely,<sup>15</sup> one-tailed *t* tests were conducted on these data. Mothers and fathers in the nonadherent group were significantly younger than those who complied with the medication regimen. There was also a trend indicating that these parents scored more poorly on intelligence

tests. There were no other significant differences between the groups. Nor were there any significant differences between groups on any of the subscales of the MMPI.

DISCUSSION

The most clear-cut finding in the present study is that a large number of parents cannot or will not use the stimulant medication prescribed for their children. Approximately 26% of the total group refused treatment altogether. Of those agreeing to have their children placed on medication (excluding children who responded with adverse side effects sufficient to preclude continuation on medication), 20% stopped using it by the end of the fourth month. By the end of the tenth month only 55% of the children were still taking their prescribed medication. It is important to note that less than 10% of the families sought consultation prior to terminating pharmacological intervention. Nonadherence was generally discovered when project personnel routinely contacted the families. It is quite likely that less diligent supervision of these families would have led to inflated estimates of compliance rates.

Table 4  
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN NONADHERENT AND ADHERENT GROUPS BY SEX

SEX	NONADHERENTS	ADHERENTS
Males	24	25
Females	6	1

$\chi^2(1)=3.50$   $p<.05$ .

Table 5  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FAMILIES

MOTHERS	NONADHERENTS	ADHERENTS	t	df	p
Age	31.52± 3.59 (29)	35.39± 6.55 (26)	2.68	38	.01
IQ	106.46± 9.68 (26)	110.16± 9.7 (25)	1.36	49	.09*
Education	12.61± 2.41 (28)	12.87± 2.48 (26)	.30	51	—
Marital Satisfaction	104.27±24.13 (22)	108.56±28.61 (25)	.56	45	—
<b>FATHERS</b>					
Age	33.93± 3.78 (27)	38.31± 7.71 (26)	2.61	36	.01
IQ	104.35±11.39 (23)	110.04±13.05 (25)	1.61	46	.06*
Education	12.37± 3.08 (27)	13.12± 3.53 (36)	.82	50	—
Marital Satisfaction	98.64±28.79 (22)	108.67±26.57 (24)	1.22	43	—
Income	23,778±11,171 (27)	26,692±13,102 (26)	.87	49	—
No. of Sibs	1.21± 1.32 (29)	1.17± .70 (40)	.14		—

\* One-tailed t tests.

The reasons for termination of medication use are not clear. It does not seem that undesirable side effects or symptom remission were major factors. Although there was a significant reduction in problematic behavior in children off medication, as perceived by both mothers and teachers, their behavior was still seen as quite troublesome. As reported in numerous other studies, the mothers in the adherent and nonadherent groups found their children equally hyperactive. This is not unexpected since the short-lived nature of stimulant medication results in the children being relatively drug-free after school and on weekends.

A significant differential attrition rate by treatment group (parent training plus medication vs. medication-only) was not found. However, visual inspection

of the data does indicate that parents in the parent training groups may have been slightly more inclined to take their children off medication. It is possible that the larger number of contacts with this group simply revealed nonadherence more accurately. An alternate explanation, based upon parental comments, is that these parents gained a great deal of confidence in their ability to deal with children and hence felt they could deal with their child without the use of "drugs."

The findings that younger children, males, children with lower IQs, and younger parents who tend to have lower IQs are less likely to adhere to medication prescriptions parallels previous work in this area, comparing those who drop out of parent training groups with those who remain.<sup>15</sup> However, unlike



this previous work, the personality characteristics of the parents did not predict compliance. Several reviews concerned with adherence of adults to medication regimens support the lack of a personality profile characteristic of nonadherents.<sup>12, 20, 28</sup>

The reasons for and use of stimulant medication with children differ considerably from the manner in which long-term medications are normally administered to adults, and may increase nonadherence. Hyperactive children rarely seek assistance for the problems they are experiencing at home or at school. More often than not parents bring a child to a physician for consultation because of the difficulty the child is experiencing at school. However, this difficulty is defined by the school rather than expressed by the child. Therefore, adults act as the intermediary complainants between the home or school and the physician. In fact, the most frequently used diagnostic aids are not the subjective reports of the child but behavior rating scales filled out by parents and teachers in addition to a developmental history. Neither is the hyperactive child responsible for taking the medication, and the child is only a consultant when it comes to the titration process. Unless the child is suffering from undue side effects, dosages of stimulant medication are raised or lowered based upon adults' reports of the child's behavior. The child is not seen as a reliable reporter of his or her own behavior. Research into medication usage with adults suggests that such factors all lead to lowered compliance rates.<sup>12, 20, 28</sup>

The behavior of hyperactive children, unlike that of adults, changes over time due to maturation, sometimes con-

founding the changes brought about by medication. Early research with hyperactive children reported that they "outgrow" their problems by the time they reach adolescence. Considerable research now exists indicating that although the most evident aspects of the problem, such as overactivity, may decrease with age, the primary deficits, such as attention and impulse control, remain.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, this change in the topography of the problematic behavior may lead to decreased adherence rates.

Several findings in the present study are quite clear and are of primary importance in relation to research with hyperactive children. The families of a large number of diagnosed hyperactive children do not accept the pharmacological treatment of their children. This group is rarely mentioned in the research literature. It is not inconceivable that the sometimes contradictory findings concerning the efficacy of stimulant medication are at least partially caused by differential subject selection. Research that does not clearly define exclusion criteria and describe attrition variables and subjects who have dropped out can be as misleading as the inadequate description of the populations that complete drug trials. In addition, it seems clear that hyperactive children are inclined to stop using their prescribed medication. It appears that adherence is inversely related to the time elapsed from the prescription date, and that the parents do not normally report the nonadherence of their hyperactive children to professionals. It is suggested that the seeming paradox of improved abilities due to stimulant medication being found in short-term studies but not in long-term outcome studies may be

partially due to nonadherence to the prescribed medication.

#### REFERENCES

1. BARKLEY, R. 1977. A review of stimulant drug research with hyperactive children. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiat.* 18:137-165.
2. BARKLEY, R. 1979. Using stimulant drugs in the classroom. *Sch. Soc. Dig.* 8:412-425.
3. BARKLEY, R. AND GUNNINGHAM, C. 1978. Do stimulant drugs improve the academic performance of hyperkinetic children? A review of outcome studies. *Clin. Pediat.* 17(1):85-92.
4. BERGIN, A. AND LAMBERT, M. 1978. The evaluation of therapeutic outcomes. *In Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change, Second Ed.*, S. Garfield and A. Bergin, eds. John Wiley, New York.
5. BERGMAN, A. AND WERNER, R. 1963. Failure of children to receive penicillin by mouth. *New Eng. J. Med.* 268:1334-1338.
6. BRIANT, R. 1978. An introduction to clinical pharmacology. *In Pediatric Psychopharmacology*, J. Werry, ed. Brunner/Mazel, New York.
7. BUTCHER, J. AND TELLEGEN, A. 1978. Common methodological problems in M.M.P.I. research. *J. Clin. Consult. Psychol.* 46(4):620-628.
8. CANTWELL, D. AND CARLSON, G. 1979. Stimulants. *In Pediatric Psychopharmacology*, J. Werry, ed. Brunner/Mazel, New York.
9. CONNERS, C. 1970. A teacher rating scale for use in drug studies with children. *Amer. J. Psychiat.* 126:884-888.
10. CONNERS, C. 1970. Symptom patterns in hyperkinetic, neurotic and normal children. *Child Devlop.* 41:667.
11. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition. 1980. American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
12. DUNBAR, J. AND STUNKARD, A. 1979. Adherence to diet and drug regimen. *In Nutrition, Lipids and Coronary Heart Disease*. R. Levy, B. Rifkind, and N. Ernst, eds. Raven Press, New York.
13. FIRESTONE, P. ET AL. 1978. The effects of caffeine and methylphenidate on hyperactive children. *J. Amer. Acad. Child Psychiat.* 18:445-456.
14. FIRESTONE, P. ET AL. 1981. The differential effects of parent training and stimulant medication with hyperactives: a progress report. *J. Amer. Acad. Child Psychiat.* 20:135-147.
15. FIRESTONE, P. AND WITT, J. 1981. Characteristics of families completing and prematurely discontinuing a behavioral parent training program. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ottawa.
16. GITTLEMAN-KLEIN, R. ET AL. 1976. Relative efficacy of methylphenidate and behavior modification in hyperkinetic children: an interim report. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 4(4):361-378.
17. GOYETTE, C., CONNERS, C. AND ULRICH, R. 1978. Normative data on revised Conners' parent and teacher rating scales. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 6(2):221-236.
18. HOY, B. ET AL. 1978. The hyperactive child at adolescence: cognitive, emotional, and social functioning. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 6(3):311-324.
19. JOHNSON, S. AND LOBITZ, G. 1974. The personal and marital adjustment of parents as related to observed child deviance and parenting behaviors. *Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 2:193-207.
20. KASL, S. 1975. Issues in patient adherence to health care regimens. *J. Hum. Stress* 1:5-17.
21. LOCKE, H. AND WALLACE, K. 1959. Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: their reliability and validity. *J. Marr. Fam. Liv.* 21:251-255.
22. LONEY, J. AND HALMI, K. 1980. Clinical treatment research: Its design, execution, analysis, and interpretation, or, how I stopped worrying and learned to love regressing. *Biol. Psychiat.* 15(1):147-156.
23. MARGOLIN, G. 1978. Relationship among marital assessment procedures: a correlational study. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 46:1556-1558.
24. MATAR, M., MARKELLO, J. AND YAFFE, S. 1975. Inadequacies in pharmacologic management of ambulatory children. *J. Pediat.* 87:137-141.
25. O'LEARY, K. 1980. Pills or skills for hyperactive children. *J. Appl. Behav. Anal.* 13:191-204.
26. OLTMANN, T., BRODERICK, J. AND O'LEARY, K. 1977. Marital adjustment and the efficacy of behavior therapy with children. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 4:724-729.
27. ROSS, D. AND ROSS, S. 1976. *Hyperactivity*. John Wiley, New York.
28. SACKETT, D. AND HAYNES, R. 1976. *Compliance with therapeutic regimens*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
29. SAFER, D. AND ALLEN, R. 1976. *Hyperactive Children: Diagnosis and Management*. University Park Press, Baltimore.
30. SHIPLEY, W. 1940. A self-administering scale for measuring intellectual impairment and deterioration. *J. Psychol.* 9:371-377.
31. SHIPLEY, W. 1940. *ShIPLEY Institute of Living Scale for Measuring Intellectual Impairment: Manual for Directions and Scoring Key*.

- Neuropsychiatric Institute of the Hartford Retreat, Hartford, Conn.
32. SOLOMONS, G. 1973. Drug therapy: initiation and follow-up. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 205:335-344.
  33. SPOHN, H. AND FITZPATRICK, T. 1980. Informed consent and bias in samples of schizophrenic subjects at risk for drug withdrawal. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* 89(1):79-92.
  34. SPRAGUE, R. AND BERGER, B. 1980. Drug effects on learning performance: relevance of animal research to pediatric psychopharmacology. *In Rehabilitation, Treatment, and Management of Learning Disorders*, R. Knights and D. Bakker, eds. University Park Press, University Park, Md.
  35. SPRAGUE, R., CHRISTENSEN, D. AND WERRY, J. 1974. Experimental psychology and stimulant drugs. *In Symposium on the Clinical Use of Stimulant Drugs in Children*, C. Conners, ed. Excerpta Medica, Amsterdam.
  36. WEISS, G., HECHTMAN, L. AND PERLMAN, T. 1978. Hyperactives as young adults: school, employer and self-rating scales obtained during ten year follow-up evaluation. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.* 48:439-445.
  37. WEISS, G. ET AL. 1975. Effect of long term treatment of hyperactive children with methylphenidate. *Canad. Med. Assoc. J.* 112:156-165.
  38. WHALEN, C. AND HENKER, B. 1980. *Hyperactive Children: The Social Ecology of Identification and Treatment*. Academic Press, New York.