

Study a Correlative between CPRS and Self Constructed ABP T/P RS along with Standardization

Shyny T. Y

Ph.D. (Psychology) Bharathiar University – Coimbatore Tamilnadu state, India

Abstract: --- The purpose of this study was to provide an adolescent behaviour problem rating scale for teachers and parents to identify their behavioural problems and can provide proper intervention for both adolescents and parents whenever necessary. This rating scale is also important in clinical and research settings with children suffering from neuro developmental disorders, and particularly with children with Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). This scale provides an interesting qualitative and quantitative picture of the emotional and behavioural conduct problem, learning problem, anxiety, impulsive/hyperactive behaviour, behavioural addictions like alcoholism, drug addiction, internet addiction etc.

Key Words:- Adolescent behaviour problem, Personal behaviour problem, Inter personal behaviour problem, Behavioural addiction

I. INTRODUCTION

There have been significant increases in risk taking behaviours of adolescents. Recent research has begun to take a closer look at risk factors of adolescence due to the rates of substance abuse, depression, suicide and other deleterious behaviours that plague this age group. The rates of these detrimental behaviours have far reaching effects on adolescents and their long-term health and can have severe effects on their social environment. It is necessary that the fields of psychology, education, and counselling continue to research and implement new information in prevention and intervention with children and their environments. The leading causes of premature death in adults and children are due to addiction, substance abuse, and unsafe sex. These behaviours can lead to cardiovascular disease, violence, and unintended injuries that can lead to death. Adolescent behaviours that are destructive to their health lead to significant health problems as adults. According to National Health Statistics (2000), over 80% of adults who now use tobacco, started using it as an adolescent; half of high school students reported using alcohol within the last thirty days; nearly half of high school students used marijuana in their lifetime; and 25% of accidental pregnancies occur in adolescents. In 1999, 17% of students reported bringing a weapon to school; 28.3 % of high school students have felt sad or hopeless; and 20% of high school students had seriously considered or had a previous suicide attempt. Drug offense cases are the most common violations in the juvenile court system and 10% percent of perpetrators of homicide are under the age of 18. Children are now more likely to have experienced the separation and/or divorce of

their parents which can also leave children without needed parental monitoring and supervision. Research has indicated that with divorce, children's risk taking behaviours increase. Now days more conflicts exists between the parents' relationship and in the parent-child relationship. There may be an increased drive for the adolescent to seek acceptance by peers. A decrease in supervision and monitoring due to parent employment or divorce leaves adolescents more vulnerable to risk behaviours such as sex, drugs and crime. There is an ebb and flow in the rates of these behaviours over time. More specific instruments and research are needed to indicate areas of parent-child relationships that can be used for intervention and prevention of adolescent risk-taking behaviour. This study addresses the increase of conduct problems in adolescence and the need for assessment tools that can measure areas of the parent-adolescent relationship that having an impact on adolescent behaviour. The fields of social sciences, education, and counselling continue to adapt to social changes in order to better serve families, parents and children. More specific instruments and research are needed to indicate areas of parent- adolescent and teacher- adolescent relationships that can be used to indicate needs for intervention and prevention of adolescent risk-taking behaviour. A specific instrument is needed to measure adolescent behaviour problems in three levels like personal, interpersonal and behavioural addiction. CPRS can only measure adolescents Personal and Interpersonal problems while ABP T/P RS can measure personal, interpersonal as well as Behavioural addictions.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Conners Parent Rating Scale-48 items (CPRS) is one of the most used behavioural scales in clinical and research settings with children suffering from neuro developmental disorders, and particularly with children with Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). This scale provides an interesting qualitative and quantitative picture of the emotional and behavioural children's attitude by including five subscales assessing conduct problem, learning problem, anxiety, impulsive/hyperactive behaviour and psychosomatic feelings (e.g., Goyette, Conners, & Ulrich, 1978). Previous versions of this scale were developed to contribute to the identification of hyperkinetic children and evaluate treatment efficiency. The Revised Conners' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS-R): Factor Structure, Reliability, and Criterion Validity C. Keith Conners, 1,4 Gill Sitarenios,2 James D. A. Parker,3 and Jeffery N. Epstein1 Received June 19, 1997; accepted September 8, 1997. The Conners' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS) is a popular research and clinical tool for obtaining parental reports of childhood behaviour problems. No study has existed for rating adolescent's behaviour problems by parents as well as teachers to give them remedial measures. In this context, the principal aims of this study were to find out problems of adolescence by constructing an adolescent rating scale. Exploratory and confirmatory factor-analytic results revealed a seven-factor model including the following factors: Cognitive Problems, Oppositional, Hyperactivity-Impulsivity, Anxious-Shy, Perfectionism, Social Problems, and Psychosomatic. The psychometric properties of the revised scale appear adequate as demonstrated by good internal reliability coefficients, high test-retest reliability, and effective discriminatory power. Advantages of the CPRS-R include a corresponding factor structure with the Conners' Teacher Rating Scale—Revised and comprehensive symptom coverage for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and related disorders. The initial Conners' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS) was developed as a comprehensive checklist for acquiring parental reports of the basic presenting problems for children referred to an outpatient psychiatric setting (Conners, 1970). This scale was used to form the basis for a detailed parental interview about the child's problems. In its original form, the CPRS contained items grouped in terms of problems with sleep, problems eating, problems with temper, problems with keeping friends, problems in school, etc. Later, an "additional" problems category was added that included items covering the cardinal symptoms of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): hyperactivity, impulsivity, and inattention Using the 93 CPRS items as the unit of analysis, eight factors were identified: Conduct Disorder,

Anxious-Shy, Restless-Disorganized, Learning Problems, Psychosomatic, Obsessive-Compulsive, Antisocial, and Hyperactive-Immature. The factor structure and norms from this sample have been used for scoring the 93- item CPRS (Conners, 1989). With time, the CPRS has developed into a popular instrument for screening and assessing behaviour problems and has become a useful and effective parent rating scale for assessing psychosocial (e.g., Horn, alongo, Popovich, & Peradotto, 1987).

Several versions of the CPRS are currently in use including a 48-item questionnaire resulting from a re standardization of a subset from the original scale (Goyette, Conners, & Ulrich, 1978). A 10-item abbreviated questionnaire was also constructed from the items with the best factor loadings (Conners, 1994). Some factor analytic research with the CPRS and its related scales on clinical samples have suggested slightly differing CPRS factor structures (Cohen, DuRant, & Cook, 1988; O'Connor, Foch, Sherry, & Plomin, 1980) than was reported originally. For example, Cohen (Cohen et al., 1988) found that Learning Problems did not form a separate factor in his clinic sample but instead loaded on the Impulsive-Hyperactive factor, thereby forming an overall ADHD factor. Cohen argued that this factor structure was consistent with some investigators contentions that attention (Learning Problems) and hyperactivity (Impulsivity-Hyperactivity) tend to present as a single disorder in clinical populations (Cohen & Hynd, 1986; Werry, Sprague, & Cohen, 1975). Despite some differences in factor structure across studies, the psychometric properties of the CPRS have made this scale an attractive research and clinical tool. Good reliability of the CPRS as assessed by test-retest (Glow, Glow, & Rump, 1982) and inter rater reliability (Conners, 1973) has been established. In addition, the CPRS's concurrent validity is well established by high correlations with similar factors on other parent rating scales, such as the Child Behaviour Checklist (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983; Mash & Johnston, 1983) and Behaviour Problem Checklist (Arnold, Barnebey, & Smeltzer, 1981; Campbell & Steinert, 1978). Further evidence of its validity comes from research demonstrating the discriminatory power of the CPRS in differentiating behaviourally disordered children from normal children (Prior & Wood, 1983; Ross & Ross, 1976, 1982) and between differing types of behavioural disorders (Conners, 1970; Kuehne, Kehle, & McMahan, 1987; Leon, Kendall, & Garber, 1980).

For over 30 years, the Conners' Teacher Rating Scale (CTRS) has been used by clinicians and researchers to assess teachers' perceptions of children's behaviour in the classroom. This scale was first introduced in a series of research reports demonstrate rating the efficacy of psycho stimulant medication as an intervention

for behaviorally disordered children (Conners& Eisenberg, 1963; Conners, Eisenberg, & Barcai) since the introduction of the original 39-item CTRS (CTRS-39), abbreviated versions of this scale have been offered. These include the 28-item CTRS (Goyette, Conners, & Ulrich, 1978), Abbreviated Symptom Questionnaire (Sprague & Sleator, 1973), and IOWA Conners (Pelham, Milich) The major purpose of the CTRS is to provide information at a screening level to assist clinician and researchers in understanding several important domains of child behaviour. Such information is necessary part of the process of assessment, diagnosis, and treatment monitoring . No questionnaire or rating scale is existed to measure behavioural addiction, personal and inter personal behavioural problems of adolescents simultaneously. Conners parent rating scale and teachers rating scale is meant to measure only personal and interpersonal behavioural problems of children not really helpful to identify adolescent behavioural addictions. But ABP T/P RS can measure personal, interpersonal as well as Behavioural addictions.

II. METHOD

64 Participants in this study were of the parents of the adolescents between the age group of 12 to 18. Mean age of participants was 15. The gender of the participant was unequal. ABP Parent/teacher rating scale with 45 items were employed here. Reliability for ABP P/T Rating scale is completed. Split half reliability and item analysis is find out by using participants of this study. Validity was examined through a comparison with the Conners' Parent Rating scale .Three behaviour problems are embedded here in a random order. They are Personal, Inter personal and Behavioural addiction. Item number 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17 are included under Personal behaviour problems. Item number 3,7,11,15,19,21 and 23 are included under Inter Personal behaviour problems. Item number 2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20 and 22 are included under Behavioural Addiction .Developing the Adolescent Behaviour Problem Teacher/Parent Rating Scale (ABPT/P Rating Scale) The intent of the study is to provide an alternative measure to the Conners' parent rating scale developed by C.Keith Conners with 28 items .The assumption behind the need for a new measure was based on the fact that much of the research employed by this rating scale is only based on adolescent's Personal and Interpersonal behavioural problems . The major use of Conners' rating scale is to identify problems like problems with sleep, problems eating, problems with temper, problems with keeping friends, problems in school etc.. But it couldn't explain about behavioural additions like alcohol addiction, internet

addiction, drug addiction etc.. ABP T/P RS is not only different in the concept of behavioural problems but also includes a measure of consistency of behaviour problems over developmental ages of adolescents from 12 to 18 . The chief study includes different behavioural problems of adolescents in each of the three behavioural problems like Personal, Interpersonal and Behavioural Addiction. Three ages were looked at; age 12, age 15 and age 18, the different stages of adolescents. ABP T/P RS is chiefly constructed to measure the behaviour problems between the age group 12 to 18 .No large pools of items were developed, instead only 23 items were developed for parents and teachers to measure three groups of behavioural problems like Personal, Inter Personal, Behavioural Addiction. It was developed by referring several sources in the literature on adolescent behaviour problems. The respondent was asked to answer on a four point Likert scale from "Not true at all" to "Very much true" .The final test consist 23 items . Participants were asked to read each of the items and answer according to how they felt their adolescence. For the response "Not true at all" '0' is the score while for " Very much true" '3' is the score.

Research hypothesis

1. There will be consistent Behaviour problem across ages as reported by Parent subjects of adolescents with age group twelve, fifteen & eighteen.
2. There will be relatively high positive correlation between Personal and Inter personal behaviour problems of ABP T/P RS and CONNER'S Parent Rating Scale.
3. The Item analysis of Reliability Coefficient will be greater than .70 for the ABP P/T RS.

III. RESULTS

TABLE-1
Reliability of ABP and CPRS

<i>Reliability-</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
ABP	0.979	23
CPRS	0.980	27

Internal consistency is estimated by using Cronbach's alpha. An alpha value of 0.70 or above is considered to be criterion for demonstrating strong internal consistency, alpha value of 0.60 or above is considered to be significant. Here reliability is .98 for the ABP T/P R S as well as CPRS. So we can say

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 2, Issue 9, September 2017

this newly constructed ABP T/P RS has very strong internal consistency

TABLE 2

CPRS	Age	N	Mean	Stand ard Deviation	F	P value
Personal	12 years	22	27.95	19.37	0.408	0.6 67
	15 years	22	23.68	20.54		
	18 years	20	22.85	19.63		
Interpersonal	12 years	22	14.86	8.35	0.115	0.8 91
	15 years	22	13.82	8.57		
	18 years	20	14.85	7.69		
ABP	Age	N	Mean	Stand ard Deviation	F	P value
	12 years	22	6.41	5.17	0.085	0.9 18
	15 years	22	6.18	4.86		
18 years	20	6.80	4.58			
Interpersonal	12 years	22	8.18	6.96	0.034	0.9 67
	15 years	22	8.00	7.24		
	18 years	20	8.55	6.64		
Behavioural addiction	12 years	22	15.36	12.82	0.423	0.6 57
	15 years	22	12.09	12.54		
	18 years	20	12.60	12.59		

A one sample analysis of variance is used to test hypotheses about means when there are three or more groups of one independent variable. In this case, age group was considered to be the independent variable, which included three age groups as (a) 12 years; (b) 15 years; and (c) 18 year. So ANOVA was used to compare the mean intention scores of different age groups. The results of the ANOVA test depicted in Table 2 reveals that statistical value is greater than 0.05 for all the variables. So we conclude that the mean score of different variables does not differ with age.

Table-3

Correlation Total Between Two Rating Scales As Total, Age And Subtype

Correlation T otal	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	P
ABP-CPRS	0.956	0.949	0.963	25.659	<0.001
Age- 12	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
ABP-CPRS	0.960	0.949	0.971	15.333	<0.001
Age- 15	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
ABP-CPRS	0.932	0.913	0.951	11.499	<0.001
AGE-18	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
ABP-CPRS	0.983	0.978	0.988	22.715	<0.001
CPRS and ABP total data	Correlation coefficient	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Personal- CPRS and Personal- ABP	0.857*	0.835	0.879	13.095	<0.001
Interpersonal- CPRS and Interpersonal- ABP	0.858*	0.836	0.880	13.153	<0.001

Correlation was seen as appropriate to analyze the relationship between the two variables which were interval-scaled and ratio-scaled. Furthermore, correlation coefficients reveal magnitude and direction of relationships which are suitable for hypothesis testing. Pearson Correlation is used to identify the relationship between old and new questionnaires and the result is exhibited in. A positive correlation exist for the variables Personal and Interpersonal for new and old scales as in these case the correlation coefficient has value greater than 0.5 and p value less than 0.05.

TABLE-4

Correlation between CPRS and ABP age groups

Age-12	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Personal- CPRS and Personal- ABP	0.836	0.793*	0.879	6.813	<0.001
Interpersonal- CPRS and Interpersonal- ABP	0.816	0.768*	0.864	6.313	<0.001
Age-15	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Personal- CPRS and Personal- ABP	0.887	0.856*	0.918	8.590	<0.001
Interpersonal- CPRS and Interpersonal- ABP	0.857	0.819*	0.895	7.437	<0.001
AGE-18	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Personal- CPRS and Personal- ABP	0.882	0.849*	0.915	7.941	<0.001
Interpersonal- CPRS and Interpersonal- ABP	0.915	0.890*	0.940	9.622	<0.001

Pearson Correlation is used to identify the relationship between old and new questionnaires and the result is exhibited in. We can conclude that correlation is significant. Here Table 4 point out this significant correlation

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 2, Issue 9, September 2017

Table 5
ABP T/P RS Item analysis and Validity

Variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	P value
Q_1	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-23.000	<0.001
	High	16	2.88	0.50		
Q_2	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_3	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-16.959	<0.001
	High	16	2.63	0.62		
Q_4	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_5	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-16.959	<0.001
	High	16	2.63	0.62		
Q_6	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_7	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-20.684	<0.001
	High	16	2.81	0.54		
Q_8	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-15.811	<0.001
	High	16	2.50	0.63		
Q_9	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_10	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_11	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-19.053	<0.001
	High	16	2.75	0.58		
Q_12	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_13	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-19.053	<0.001
	High	16	2.75	0.58		
Q_14	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_15	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-19.053	<0.001
	High	16	2.75	0.58		
Q_16	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_17	Low	16	0.50	0.82	-12.247	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_18	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-47.000	<0.001
	High	16	2.94	0.25		
Q_19	Low	16	0.56	0.81	-11.979	<0.001
	High	16	3.00	0.00		
Q_20	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		

Q_21	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-17.855	<0.001
	High	16	2.69	0.60		
Q_22	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-33.669	<0.001
	High	16	2.88	0.34		
Q_23	Low	16	0.00	0.00		
	High	16	3.00	0.00		

Table 5 result revealed there is a strong validity for each items. P value is less than .05 ie; correlation is Significant at .001 level

IV. DISCUSSION

The objective of this study is to design and construct a new measure Adolescent Behaviour Problem Teacher/Parent rating scale (ABP T/P RS) and correlate it with CPRS. Review of literature point out the use of the two behaviour problems instead of three. They are personal and interpersonal behaviour problems. ABP is constructed to measure personal, interpersonal and behavioral addiction. Item analysis, reliability and validity were found to be adequate with these participants. The reliability cronbach's alpha for the ABP is 0.98 which is very strong. Some insight gained from this analysis relate to the correlation between three age groups and three sub types of behaviour problems. There is positive correlation between CPRS and ABP /P RS. This questionnaire is mainly made for the parents and teachers to identify behaviour problems of their adolescents between 12 to 18 and at a particular age group of 2, 15, and 18. The three sub scales of the ABP show high reliability and validity. The usual limitation of this study was small sampling of 64 makes this pilot study. Some other problem was difference in geographical areas like urban and rural. Another limitation was the Gender difference of the population.

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to provide an adolescent behaviour problem rating scale for teachers and parents to identify their behavioural problems and can provide proper intervention for both adolescents and parents whenever necessary. This rating scale is also important in clinical and research settings with children suffering from neuro developmental disorders, and particularly with children with Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). This scale provides an interesting qualitative and quantitative picture of the emotional and behavioural adolescents attitude by including three subscales assessing conduct problem, learning problem, anxiety, impulsive/hyperactive behaviour, behavioural addictions like alcoholism, drug addiction, internet addiction etc. ABP categorize adolescents into three categories. This research examine how these behaviour problems relate to

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 2, Issue 9, September 2017

adolescents of different age group 12,15 and 18. Anova test reveals that statistical value is greater than 0.05 for all the variable. Mean score of different variable does not differ with age. A positive correlation exists for the variables personal and Interpersonal for ABP and CPRS. Here correlation value is greater than .5 and P value is less than .05 which reveals significant correlation.

REFERENCES

1. Achenbach, T. M., Howell, C. T., Quay, H. C., & Conners, C. K. (1991). National survey of problems and competencies among four- to sixteen-year-olds: Parents' reports for normative and clinical samples. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 56 (3), 1-131.
2. American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
3. American Psychological Association. (1985). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
4. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1984). The effect of sampling error on convergence, improper solutions, and goodness-of-fit indices for maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 49, 155-173.
5. Barkley, R. A. (1990). *Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: A hand book for diagnosis and treatment*. New York: Guilford Press.
6. Barkley, R. A., Fischer, M., Edelbrock, C. S., & Smallish, L. (1990). The adolescent outcome of hyperactive children diagnosed by research criteria: I. An 8-year prospective follow-up study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 29, 546-557.
7. Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
8. Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
9. Brito, G. N. (1987). The Conners Abbreviated Teacher Rating Scale: Development of norms in Brazil. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 15, 511-518.
10. Brown, R. T. (1985). The validity of teacher ratings in differentiating between two subgroups of attention deficit disorder children with or without hyperactivity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 45, 661-669.
11. Camp, B. W., & Zimet, S. G. (1974). The relationship of teacher rating scales to behaviour observations and reading achievement of first-grade children. *Journal of Special Education*, 8, 353-359.
12. Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioural and life sciences*. New York: Plenum Press.
13. Cole, D. A. (1987). Utility of confirmatory factor analysis in test validation research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 584-594.
14. Conners, C. K. (1989). *Manual for Conner's Rating Scales*. N. Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
15. Conners, C. K. (1994). The Conners Rating Scales: Use in clinical assessment, treatment planning and research. In M. Maruish (Ed.), *Use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcome assessment* (pp. 550-578). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
16. Conners, C. K. (1997). *Conners' Rating Scales—Revised; technical manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
17. Conners, C. K., & Eisenberg, L. (1963). The effects of methyl phenidate on symptomatology and learning in disturbed children. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 120, 458-464.
18. Conners, C. K., Eisenberg, L., & Barcai, A. (1967). Effect of dextroamphetamine on children. Studies on subjects with learning disabilities and school behaviour problems. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 17, 478-85.
19. Conners, C. K., & March, J. S. (1994). A developmental history form for ADHD and related

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 2, Issue 9, September 2017

- disorders. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
20. Conners, C. K., Parker, J. D. A., & Sitarenios, O. (1997). Parent and teacher ratings of DSM-IV ADHD symptoms: A test of the subtype model. Manuscript submitted for publication.
 21. Curry, J., & Murphy, L. (1995). Comorbidity of anxiety disorders. In J. March (Ed.), *Anxiety disorders in children and adolescents* (pp. 301-317). New York: Guilford Press.
 22. Edelbrock, C., Greenbaum, R., & Conover, N. C. (1985). Reliability and concurrent relations between the teacher version of the Child Behaviour Profile and the Conners Revised Teacher Rating Scale. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 13, 295-303.
 23. Epstein, J. N., March, J. S., Conners, C. K., & Jackson, D. (1998). Racial differences on the Conners Teacher Rating Scale. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 26, 109-118.
 24. Epstein, M. H., & Nieminen, G. S. (1983). Reliability of the Conners Abbreviated Teacher Rating Scale across raters and across time: Use with learning disabled students. *School Psychology Review*, 12, 337-339.
 25. Everett, J. E. (1983). Factor comparability as a means of determining the number of factors and their rotation. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 18, 197-218.
 26. Fischer, M., & Newby, R. F. (1991). Assessment of stimulant response in ADHD children using a refined multi method clinical protocol [Special issue: Child psychopharmacology]. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 20, 232-244.
 27. Goyette, C. H., Conners, C. K., & Ulrich, R. F. (1978). Normative data on revised Conners Parent and Teacher Rating Scales. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 6, 221-236.
 28. Gualtieri, C. T., Keenan, P. A., & Chandler, M. (1991). Clinical neuropsychological effects of desipramine in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 11, 155-159.
 29. Hinshaw, S. P. (1991). Externalizing behaviour problems and academic underachievement in childhood and adolescence: Causal relationships and underlying mechanisms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 1-29.
 30. Horn, W. F., Jalongo, N., Popovich, S., & Peradotto, D. (1987). Behavioural parent training and cognitive-behavioural self-control therapy with ADD-H children: Comparative and combined effects. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 16, 57-68.
 31. Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1986). LISREL VI: Analysis of linear structural relationships by maximum likelihood, instrumental variables, and least squares methods. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software.
 32. Kendall, P. C., & Braswell, L. (1982). Cognitive-behavioural selfcontrol therapy for children: A components analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50, 672-689.
 33. Kendall, P. C., & Brophy, C. (1981). Activity and attentional correlates of teacher ratings of hyperactivity. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 6, 451-458.
 34. Kessel, J. B., & Zimmerman, M. (1993). Reporting errors in studies of the diagnostic performance of self-administered questionnaires: Extent of the problem, recommendations for standardized presentation of results, and implications for the peer review process. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 395-399.
 35. Klee, S. H., & Garfinkel, B. D. (1983). The computerized continuous performance task: A new measure of inattention. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 11, 487-496.
 36. Lahey, B. B., Green, K. D., & Forehand, R. (1980). On the independence of ratings of hyperactivity, conduct problems, and attention deficits in children: A multiple regression analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 48, 566-574.
 37. Leung, P. W., Luk, S. L., & Lee, P. L. (1989). Problem behaviour among special school children in Hong Kong: A factor-analytical study with

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)
Vol 2, Issue 9, September 2017

- Conners' Teacher Rating Scale. *Psychologia An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient*, 32, 120-128.
38. Luk, S. L., & Leung, P. W. (1989). Conners' Teacher's Rating Scale: A validity study in Hong Kong. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 30, 785-793.
39. Luk, S. L., Leung, P. W., & Lee, P. L. (1988). Conner's Teacher Rating Scale in Chinese children in Hong Kong. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 29, 165-174.
40. March, J. S., Leonard, H. L., & Swedo, S. E. (1995). Neuro psychiatry of pediatric obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Comprehensive Therapy*, 21, 507-512.
41. Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness of-fit indexes in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 391-410.
42. Milich, R., & Landau, S. (1982). Socialization and peer relations in hyperactive children. In K. D. G. I. Bialer (Ed.), *Advances in learning and behavioural disabilities* (Vol. 1, pp. 283-339). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
43. Milich, R., Roberts, M. A., Loney, J., & Caputo, J. (1980). Differentiating practice effects and statistical regression on the Conners Hyperkinesis Index. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 8, 549-552.
44. Munir, K., Biederman, J., & Knee, D. (1987). Psychiatric comorbidity in patients with attention deficit disorder: A controlled study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 26, 844-848.
45. O'Leary, K. D., Vivian, D., & Nisi, A. (1985). Hyperactivity in Italy. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 13, 485-500.
46. Parker, J. D. A., Sitarenios, G., & Conners, C. K. (1996). Abbreviated Conner's Rating Scales revisited: A confirmatory factoranalytic study. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 1, 55-62.
47. Pelham, W. E., Milich, R., Murphy, D. A., & Murphy, H. A. (1989). Normative data on the IOWA Conners Teacher Rating Scale. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 18, 259-262.
48. Rapport, M. D., DuPaul, G. J., Stoner, G., & Jones, J. T. (1986). Comparing classroom and clinic measures of attention deficit disorder: Differential, idiosyncratic, and dose-response effects of methylphenidate. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 334-341.
49. Reid, R. (1995). Assessment of ADHD with culturally different groups: The use of behavioural rating scales. *School Psychology Review*, 24, 537-560.
50. Roberts, M. A., Milich, R., Loney, J., & Caputo, J. (1981). A multi trait -multi method analysis of variance of teachers' ratings of aggression, hyperactivity, and inattention. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 9, 371-380.
51. Satin, M. S., Winsberg, B. G., Monetti, C. H., Sverd, J., & Foss, D. A. (1985). A general population screen for attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 24, 756-764.

Adolescent Behaviour Problem Teacher/Parent Rating Scale (ABP T/P RS)**By SHYNY T. Y Ph.D (Psychology) Bharathiar University – Coimbatore**

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)

Vol 2, Issue 9, September 2017

Name of Student:	Age:	Sex:
M/F		
Name of Teacher/Parent:	Age:	Sex: M/F

Instructions: Below are a number of problems that adolescent have. Please put "tick" mark against each item according to your response.

Sl No	Statements	Not true at all	Just a little true	Often true	Very much true
1	Easily frustrated.				
2	Tobacco Consumption.				
3	Defiant with others.				
4	Telling lies unnecessarily.				
5	Difficulty in completing a work.				
6	Internet addiction.				
7	Restless and disturbs others.				
8	Stealing money or other things.				
9	Inattentive and easily distracted.				
10	Dirty talk & risky sexual activities.				
11	Argues with adults.				
12	Alcohol consumption.				
13	Short attention span.				
14	Suicidal attempts.				
15	Climbing into inappropriate situations like others conversations.				
16	Drug addiction.				
17	Disorganized at school or home & poor academic achievement.				
18	Running away from home or school.				
19	Does not follow through on instructions of authority.				
20	Criminal tendency.				
21	Disobedience to authority.				
22	Absent in the school without any reason.				
23	Depression and isolation from others				

Adolescent Behaviour Problem Teacher/Parent Rating Scale (ABP T/P RS)

Answer Sheet

Score	0	1	2	3	Score	0	1	2	3	Score	0	1	2	3
Q	Not true at all	Just a little true	Often true	Very much true	Q	Not true at all	Just a little true	Often true	Very much true	Q	Not true at all	Just a little true	Often true	Very much true
1					3					2				
5					7					4				
9					11					6				
13					15					8				
17					19					10				
					21					12				
					23					14				
										16				
										18				
										20				
										22				

P=.....	I.P=.....	B.A=.....
---------	-----------	-----------

(P=Personal, I.P=Interpersonal, B.A=Behavioural addiction)

Have you responded to all of the statements Yes/No

Have you entered your responses in the correct boxes Yes/No

Have you responded accurately and honestly Yes/No

Name of Student:	Age:	Sex: M/F
Name of Teacher/Parent:	Age:	Sex: