

32 **Abstract**

33 **Introduction:** One of the key instruments used to assess attention-deficit/hyperactivity
34 disorder (ADHD) in children and adolescents is the ADHD Rating Scale-5. This study aimed
35 to test the psychometric characteristics of the ADHD Rating Scale-5 teacher version (ADHD-
36 T) in Dari among school-aged children in Kabul City.

37 **Methods:** Face and content validity, explanatory factor analysis (EFA), confirmatory factor
38 analysis (CFA) and reliability of the questionnaire were conducted. The structure, validity,
39 and reliability of the scales were evaluated using the translated versions of the ADHD-T
40 questionnaires for the assessment of ADHD in children. Teachers completed the ADHD-T-
41 Dari on behalf of three hundred and fifty-eight public primary school students.

42 **Results:** Face validity, content quality, and internal consistency of the ADHD-T-Dari were
43 excellent. Significant collinearity was found between the items of the inattention and/or
44 hyperactivity-impulsivity domains of the ADHD-T-Dari. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index was
45 0.913 and was satisfactory. The two-factor model of the scale showed a better fit with an
46 RMSEA of 0.065, a CMIN/*df* of 20.501, and a CFI of 905 compared to the one- and three-
47 factor models of ADHD-T-Dari. The Cronbach's alpha for the total ADHD-T-Dari scale with
48 18 items was 0.898, while it was 0.851 and 0.847 for the inattention and/or hyperactivity-
49 impulsivity subscales with 9 items each.

50 **Conclusion:** The exploratory and CFA showed that the psychometric qualities have strong
51 concept validity and very good psychometric properties with good reliability. Therefore, the
52 ADHD-T-Dari is valid, reliable, and suitable for the assessment of ADHD symptoms in
53 Afghan school children and adolescents.

54

55 **Introduction**

56 Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder
57 characterised by persistent symptoms of inattention and/or hyperactivity-impulsivity that do
58 not match the patient's neurological stage. Approximately 2 to 7% of children and
59 adolescents suffer from ADHD, making it one of the most common disorders in these age
60 groups [1,2]. ADHD is primarily characterised by inattention, hyperactivity, or impulsivity.
61 Therefore, a thorough assessment of symptoms should include a clinical interview with the
62 patient and their parents, as well as the collection of data on the impact of symptoms on the
63 patient's overall performance, both at home and at school [3]. Although both hereditary and
64 environmental factors are considered in the diagnosis, the exact origin of ADHD is still
65 unclear. In addition to neuropsychiatric and biological changes, social factors may also have
66 an impact on how severe the difficulties of the disorder are [4]. Children with ADHD have
67 great difficulty controlling their behaviour in response to environmental stresses. These
68 challenges typically lead to problems with behaviour regulation, academic performance, and
69 interactions with peers and family members [5]. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of
70 Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5), states that ADHD is characterised by two main
71 symptoms, namely inattention and hyperactivity/impulsivity [6].

72 A planned diagnostic interview with the child, parents, and teachers, completion of
73 ADHD rating scales by parents and teachers, and close observation of behaviour at school
74 and during clinical testing are all components of an evidence-based assessment of ADHD [7].
75 Teachers have access to pertinent information about a student's behaviour at school, including
76 details about how they interact with classmates and other students [8]. Clinicians need to use
77 reliable and validated instruments when assessing children and adolescents suspected of
78 having ADHD, taking into account the frequency, severity, and wide range of socio-
79 emotional and cognitive challenges associated with ADHD. Direct observation of behaviour

80 at school and clinical testing are as much a part of an evidence-based assessment of ADHD as
81 organised diagnostic interviews with the child, parents, and teachers [7]. The teacher's
82 assessment of the child's behaviour is crucial. ADHD rating scales completed by parents and
83 teachers are inexpensive, easy-to-use tools for diagnosing ADHD. Teachers have access to
84 vital information about a student's activities at school, including details about how he or she
85 interacts with peers and other students. Research has shown that a teacher's assessment is
86 more reliable than a parent's assessment while being more sensitive to hyperactive behaviour
87 [9]. The ADHD Rating Scale-5 is an instrument that, due to its simple structure and method
88 of administration, is well suited for intervention studies in which repeated administrations are
89 used to assess changes in behaviour. Following the established DSM-5 criteria, ADHD-5
90 offers clinicians the opportunity to collect information from both parents (ADHD-5 Home
91 version) and teachers (ADHD-5 School version) on the frequency of each of the defining
92 symptoms of ADHD [7].

93 There are no validated screening instruments in the Dari language that could help
94 teachers in Afghanistan to identify students with ADHD symptoms who may need further
95 screening for learning problems. Although several teacher-completed questionnaires have
96 been developed to assess ADHD symptoms and symptoms of other related mental health
97 conditions, the main challenge in evidence-based assessment, according to international
98 standards for the translation/adaptation of psychological testing instruments, is to validate the
99 adapted scale in the culture in which it was originally developed. When using a scale,
100 whether in research or clinical practice, it is crucial to demonstrate internal consistency. This
101 is defined as the psychometric quality of a test that demonstrates equivalence in the latent
102 variable under investigation [10,11]. The aim of this study was to validate the Dari-language
103 version of ADHD-T and to describe the prevalence of ADHD symptoms in public primary
104 school children in Kabul City, Afghanistan.

105

106 **Materials and methods**

107 **Sampling method**

108 Three hundred and fifty-eight public primary school students from Kabul City,
109 Afghanistan (174 males and 184 females), randomly selected from five schools and three
110 districts, served as the study's subjects. A printed version of the ADHD-5-Dari was used by
111 40 female teachers who had been teaching the students for at least six months to assess the
112 students. Fig 1 shows how the study participants were included and excluded from the study.
113 The study was conducted from March 2022 to August 2022. The students participated in the
114 study were between 6 and 9 years old, with a mean (M) age of 7.7 years, and a standard
115 deviation (SD) of 0.93. A total of 511 students (260 males and 251 females) were selected
116 from 5 schools using simple random sampling. Due to disputes between parents,
117 disagreements between children, and incomplete demographic information, 153 students (86
118 males and 67 females) were excluded.

119

120 **Fig 1. Sampling criteria for the selection of districts, schools, and students enrolled in**
121 **this study.**

122

123 **ADHD-T**

124 The ADHD-T Rating Scale-5 was developed and updated by DuPaul *et al.* (2016). It is
125 an 18-item scale for assessing children that reflects the symptoms of ADHD defined in the
126 DSM-5. The original questionnaire has very good psychometric properties [7]. For the
127 adaptation and validation of this questionnaire, written permission was obtained from the
128 developer of the questionnaire by email. The symptom scale contains two subscales: one for

129 inattention and one for hyperactivity-impulsivity. Each response is rated on a four-point
130 Likert scale, where 0 is "never or seldom", 1 is "occasionally", 2 is "frequently", and 3 is
131 "very often". The sums of all associated items are used to determine the total score for the
132 (sub)scales. Teachers can use this scale to assess a student's ADHD behaviour at school. This
133 questionnaire has a high level of content, construction, and reliability (internal consistency).
134 The validation of the 18 items of ADHD-T resulted in a two-dimensional validation. The
135 reliability and validity of the instrument were consistent in children aged 5 to 17 years [7].

136

137 **Translation of questionnaire**

138 In accordance with the standards established by Sousa & Rojjanasrirat [11], linguistic
139 and cultural adaptations were made, and the psychometric characteristics of the ADHD-T
140 Dari language versions were determined. The translation and validation process comprised
141 four stages.

142 In the first stage, the ADHD-T [7] was translated into English by two different
143 translators. The first translator was proficient in both the target language and the source
144 language of the questionnaire and was multilingual with Dari as his native language. The
145 translator had a good understanding of the colloquial language and everyday use of the target
146 language but was not familiar with the terminology used in the questionnaire. The second
147 translator was also multilingual and a native English speaker. He spoke both languages well
148 and was also bilingual, but unlike the other translator, he was familiar with the terms used in
149 the questionnaire. The translators' efforts resulted in the production of two ADHD-T versions
150 in Dari. In the second stage, the two translations served as the basis for the creation of one
151 version of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was created with the help of the study team,
152 the two translators, and a third translator. In the third stage, two independent translators with
153 the same characteristics as those in stage 1, back-translated the version of the accepted

154 questionnaire. None of the translators were familiar with the original ADHD-T text. As a
155 result of the translators' work, two back translations into English were produced. In the fourth
156 stage, a multidisciplinary panel of experts reviewed all five versions of the questionnaires to
157 determine the transcultural equivalence between the original ADHD-T and ADHD-T-Dari.
158 The expert panel consisted of the members of the research team and five translators who had
159 worked on the previous stages of the process. The members of the expert panel agreed and
160 produced the final ADHD-T-Dari version, which was available for validation.

161

162 **Content and face validity**

163 The item-level content validity index (I-CVI) and the scale-level content validity index
164 (S-CVI) for the ADHD-T-Dari were calculated. Eight professionals, one with a PhD and
165 seven with a master's degree (four from the Department of Counselling and four from the
166 Department of Psychology) from the Faculty of Psychological Science, Kabul University
167 were asked to rate each item on a four-point Likert scale (1 = not important, 2 = somewhat
168 relevant, 3 = fairly significant, and 4 = highly relevant) in the context of its relevance to
169 understanding ADHD.

170 For the face validation of the ADHD-T-Dari questionnaire, 40 highly qualified teachers
171 with at least a bachelor's degree and 10 years of experience were chosen. The paper-based
172 version of the questionnaire was distributed to the teachers. The questionnaire was self-
173 administered, and participants were asked to note the time taken to complete it, the
174 readability of the content, the language and terminology used, and the overall structure of the
175 questionnaire. Their perceptions of how well they understood the questions and their content
176 were rated and noted. This also included their comprehension of the language and overall
177 design. Based on their comments and recommendations, minor corrections and fine-tuning

178 were made to the questionnaire. It was then decided that a comprehensibility level of around
179 80% was considered acceptable [11].

180

181 **Data analysis**

182 Descriptive statistics were used to assess student demographic background and practise
183 data. Data were tested for normal distribution. Content validity (content validity index), face
184 validity (face validity index), item analysis (discrimination index), internal consistency
185 (Cronbach's alpha), and theoretical relevance (exploratory and confirmative factor analysis)
186 of the ADHD-T-Dari were assessed to evaluate psychometric characteristics.

187 For content validity, an I-CVI of 0.78 or more and an S-CVA/Ave of 0.90 or more were
188 considered indicative of content validity [11]. Standards were then rated as fair, good, or
189 excellent for each k value. The S-CVI/averages were determined by dividing the sum of the I-
190 CVI by the total number of items. The I-CVI of each item was calculated by dividing the
191 number of agreeing experts by the total number of experts. The probability of chance
192 occurrence (Pc) was estimated as $Pc = [N! / A! (N-A)!] \times 0.5N$, and the kappa was calculated
193 as $k = (I-CVI - Pc) / (1 - 1Pc)$.

194 For face validity, interobserver agreement was then measured using the kappa index.
195 Values between 0.61 and 0.80 were considered to indicate a respectable but acceptable level
196 of agreement, while values of 0.81 or more indicated an above average level of acceptable
197 agreement [11]. Finally, the item-level face validity index (I-FVI) and the scale-level face
198 validity index (S-FVI) were calculated using a formula similar to the S-CVI and I-CVI.

199 Item analysis was used to separate the values of the calculated indices (inter-item
200 correlations) for each item. Negative values were not allowed for the indices. The data
201 collected was also checked to see whether any floor or ceiling impacts had occurred. An
202 investigation of the internal consistency of the ADHD-T-Dari was performed. If Cronbach's

203 alpha exceeded 0.750, it was deemed that the criteria for internal consistency were met. The
204 main component analysis was used to establish the one-, two-, and three-dimensionality of
205 the ADHD-T-Dari.

206 To assess concept validity, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with Varimax rotation
207 was performed. It was determined whether the ADHD-T-Dari structure, which should
208 correspond to the structure of the original ADHD-T version, was one with a single item or
209 one with many items. Kaiser (own value) and Cattell (scree plot) were used as the two criteria
210 for separating the number of items.

211 When deciding which items to include in each factor, it was decided from the outset
212 that items that loaded more than 0.40 on a factor would be included. Ten respondents per
213 item is the recommended minimum sample size.

214 The accuracy of the adaptation of the obtained results to the imposed structure of
215 ADHD-T-Dari, resulting from the theoretical assumptions or another structure derived from
216 the EFA, was assessed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The proposed indices
217 should have the following values: goodness of fit index (GFI), comparative fit index (CFI)
218 and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) > 0.90 [12]; root mean squared error of approximation
219 (RMSEA) < 0.08 [13]; χ^2 divided by degrees of freedom (χ^2/df ratio) 3-5 [14]. Microsoft
220 Excel and IBM SPSS 28 were used for the calculation of all statistical tests. IBM AMOS
221 version 28 was used for the CFA calculations.

222

223 **Ethical considerations**

224 Parents reviewed the parental consent form, obtained their responses regarding the
225 study, and confirmed their consent. Baseline data was collected in individual interviews.
226 Baseline data included the socio-demographic information provided by the parents when

227 completing the parental consent form. The Ethics Committee of Kabul University (No. 25,
228 03/03/2020) granted the permission to conduct this study.

229

230

231 **Results**

232 **Socio-demographic characteristics**

233 A total of 358 public primary school students with a mean age of 7.7 years (5.67-9.83
234 years) (SD = 0.93), of whom 48.6% were male and 51.4% female, participated in the study.
235 The families of the students have a low (57%) or medium income (43%). 75.7% of mothers
236 and 56.4% of fathers were illiterate. 65.6% of the students were Tajik, followed by 43%
237 Pashtun, 4.5% Sadat, and 2.5% Hazara, while the remaining students did not specify their
238 ethnicity.

239

240 **Content and face validities**

241 The results for the I-CVI of ADHD-T-Dari ranged from 0.875 to 1. The S-CVI of
242 ADHD-T-Dari was at a satisfactory level. All 18 items of the ADHD-T-Dari were submitted
243 for validation as none of them were removed or modified. The I-FVI of ADHD-T-Dari was
244 0.975 to 1, indicating an excellent comprehension for all 18 items. Minor corrections and
245 fine-tuning of the questionnaire were made according to their comments and
246 recommendations. The results of CVI and FVI for inattention and hyperactivity-impulsivity
247 of ADHD-T-Dari are presented in S1, S2, S3 and S4 Tables.

248

249 **Construct validity**

250 The analysis of the raw data revealed the validity of the predictions of the exploratory
251 factor analysis (EFA). The correlation matrix's determinant for the ADHD-T-Dari items was
252 close to zero (0.001), indicating significant collinearity between the inattention and
253 hyperactivity-impulsivity domains of the items. According to the Bartlett's test of sphericity,
254 the matrix with the coefficients of correlation was a unit matrix ($\chi^2 = 2326.36$, $df = 153$, $p <$
255 0.001). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index, which gauges sampling adequacy, was 0.913,
256 indicating that the parameter satisfied the assumptions (> 0.5). The 18-item EFA test of
257 ADHD-T-Dari was divided into four components, which together accounted for 46.58% of
258 the overall variance. Nevertheless, the scree plot of this result showed a two-factor solution
259 that accounted for 46.58% of the total variance. The other factor had only 1.020 and 1.005
260 initial eigenvalues (5.968%), which were not included in the first component analysis (Fig 2).
261 The two factors (Inattention, hyperactivity-impulsivity) loading of ADHD-T-Dari were
262 higher than 0.4 (S5 Table).

263

264 **Fig 2. ADHD-T-Dari factor loading scree plot for Eigenvalue.**

265

266 **Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)**

267 CFA was used to compare the one-dimensional goodness-of-fit and the two- and three-
268 dimensional models of ADHD-T-Dari for the data collected. Compared to the two-
269 dimensional version, the findings for the one- and three-dimensional versions of ADHD-T
270 were less acceptable. The analysis revealed that the chi-square statistic on the degrees of
271 freedom (χ^2/df) of the two-dimensional model was 2.501 ($\chi^2 = 335.147$, $df = 134$). The
272 RMSEA was 0.065. The CFI score was 0.909 and the GFI was 0.905. The CFI and GFI
273 values indicate a good fit of the model. As a result, we consider our two-factor model to be

274 accepted. Table 1 lists the fit indices for all CFA models, and Figs 3,4 and 5 show the
 275 standardised factor loadings for the one-, two- and three-factor models of ADHD-T-Dari.

276

277

278

279

280 **Table 1. The result of CFA for one-, two- and three factors of ADHD-T-Dari.**

Fit indices	<i>p</i>	CMIN/ <i>df</i>	GFI	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Recommended	Insignificant	3-5	>0.90	>0.90	>0.90	<0.08
One factor	<0.001	4.25	0.809	0.802	0.776	0.095
Two factors	<0.001	2.501	0.905	0.909	0.896	0.065
Three factors	<0.001	2.525	0.907	0.909	0.895	0.065

281 Note. CMIN = Chi-Square, *df* = degree of freedom, GFI = goodness of the fit index, CFI =
 282 comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis's index, RMSEA = root mean square error of
 283 approximation.

284

285

286 **Fig 3. The CFA of the ADHD-T-Dari single-factor model with its loading.** The one-factor
 287 model is depicted in a CFA diagram (ADHD-T-5.es dimensions). Each rectangle (Hy =
 288 hyperactivity-impulsivity, InA = inattention) and oval circle (ADHD) denote a single item or
 289 dimension, respectively. Each circle is associated with items that define only one dimension,
 290 not with the items that define the other dimension (average item-subscale correlation).
 291 Arrows are used to depict correlations between dimensions and items.

292

293 **Fig 4. The CFA of the ADHD-T-Dari two-factors model with its loading.** The two-factor
 294 model and the correlations between the two subscales are depicted in a CFA diagram
 295 (ADHD-T-Dari dimensions). Each rectangle (Hy = hyperactivity-impulsivity, InA =

296 inattention) and each oval circle (IN = inattention, HI = hyperactivity-impulsivity) denote a
297 single item and dimension. Each circle is associated with the items that define only one
298 dimension, not with the items that define the other dimension (average item-subscale
299 correlation). Double arrows are used to depict correlations between dimensions and/or items
300 (correlation coefficient between item/inter-subcales).

301

302 **Fig 5. The CFA of the ADHD-T-Dari three-factors model with its loading.** The three-
303 factor model and the correlations between the three subscales are depicted in a CFA diagram
304 (ADHD-T-5.es dimensions). Each rectangle (Hy = hyperactivity-impulsivity, InA =
305 inattention) and each oval circle (inattention, hyperactivity-impulsivity) denote a single item
306 and dimension, respectively. Each circle is linked to the items that define only one
307 dimension, not to the items that define the other dimension (average item-subscale
308 correlation). Double arrows are used to depict correlations between dimensions and/or items
309 (correlation coefficient between items/inter-subcales).

310

311 **Reliability**

312 The overall Cronbach's alpha for the 18 items of the ADHD-T-Dari was 0.898, while
313 the components measuring inattention and hyperactivity-impulsivity were 0.851 and 0.847,
314 respectively. This indicates that the items form a scale with a reasonable degree of internal
315 consistency and reliability and are higher than the predicted 0.75 limits. In this study group,
316 the average score for the 18 ADHD-T-Dari items was 8.01 ($SD = 8.47$). These 18 items have
317 an adjusted item-total correlation of over 0.40, which is considered acceptable (Table 2).

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327 **Table 2. Cronbach's alpha and descriptive statistics for 18 ADHD-T-Dari if items**
328 **deleted.**

Items	Mean	SD	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
InA1	0.42	0.642	0.578	0.892
InA2	0.35	0.684	0.527	0.893
InA3	0.32	0.682	0.405	0.896
InA4	0.30	0.615	0.566	0.892
InA5	0.38	0.707	0.564	0.892
InA6	0.42	0.731	0.558	0.892
InA7	0.55	0.854	0.519	0.893
InA8	0.48	0.826	0.619	0.890
InA9	0.43	0.770	0.536	0.892
Hy1	0.57	0.898	0.581	0.891
Hy2	0.43	0.778	0.536	0.892
Hy3	0.38	0.760	0.531	0.893
Hy4	0.30	0.709	0.479	0.894
Hy5	0.46	0.831	0.546	0.892
Hy6	0.73	0.952	0.596	0.891

Hy7	0.70	0.939	0.583	0.891
Hy8	0.44	0.803	0.575	0.891
Hy9	0.35	0.728	0.477	0.894

329 Note. InA= inattention, Hy= hyperactivity-impulsivity

330

331

332

333 **Age and gender difference of ADHD**

334 The findings of the independent *t*-test using the ADHD-T-Dari scores as the dependent
 335 variables and the child's gender as the independent variable, are summarised in Table 3. The
 336 great impacts of gender were found to be statistically significant, with males being
 337 categorised as more inattentive, hyperactive and impulsive than girls. The effect sizes were
 338 often very large. Table 4 presents the results of the one-way ANOVA for age and
 339 respondents, for the inattention, hyperactivity-impulsivity and overall ADHD scales. In
 340 general, the effect sizes were small.

341

342

343 **Table 3. ADHD-T-Dari descriptive and independent tests for 174 male and 184 female**
 344 **students.**

Variables	Male		Female		<i>t</i> (356)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Inattention	10.23	6.69	5.12	5.84	7.713	<0.001	0.81
Hyperactivity	10.30	4.32	4.29	5.87	8.585	<0.001	1.16
ADHD	20.53	12.42	9.41	10.15	9.297	<0.001	0.98

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353 **Table 4. One-Way ANOVA of ADHD for age groups of students.**

Age (N)	5 (7)		6 (86)		7 (141)		8 (87)		9 (37)		F (4, 353)	η^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
InAt	12.7	7.16	7.32	7.21	6.76	6.03	9.35	7.00	6.38	6.82	3.42*	0.0
	1										*	4
Hyp	15.0	10.9	6.49	7.23	6.70	6.47	7.94	7.29	7.63	8.58	2.70*	0.0
	0	5										3
ADH	27.7	16.9	13.8	12.8	13.4	11.2	17.2	12.8	14.0	13.8	3.34*	0.0
D	1	6	1	1	6	6	9	4	2	4	*	4

354 Note. InAt = inattention, Hyp = hyperactivity, ADHD = attention defect hyperactivity.

355 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$.

356

357

358 Discussion

359 This study aimed to describe the prevalence of ADHD in public primary school students
 360 in Kabul City and to validate the Dari-language version of ADHD-T. However, to the best of
 361 our knowledge, this is the first study conducted in Afghanistan that adapts a questionnaire for
 362 teachers to utilise in determining whether their students have ADHD. The finalised validation

363 indicates strong psychometric characteristics of the ADHD-T-Dari, including validity and
364 reliability. However, in line with previous validation studies, no variations from the original
365 ADHD-T version were found. All items were validated, according to the judgement of the
366 expert panels.

367 The standard goodness-of-fit indices for ADHD demonstrated that the bi-factor models
368 provided better agreement, which is consistent with some studies [7]. However, several
369 studies on earlier forms of ADHD have shown a tendency towards high goodness-of-fit
370 indices for single-factor models [15]. The two and three ADHD components were evident in
371 the current study when one-, two-, and three- factorial analyses were used. The two-factor
372 was significant in the general population sample confirming previous findings [8]. The
373 original version of ADHD-T and ADHD-T-Dari were identical. The Kaiser criterion
374 indicated a two-item structure of the scale when examining the factor structure of the ADHD-
375 T-Dari's, and other research also claimed a two-component solution [3,8]. A two-factor
376 structure of the ADHD-T-Dari was found to be more effective for the CFA than a single- and
377 a three-factor structure.

378 The TLI for two-factor models in our study was somewhat (0.986) less than the
379 suggested value of > 0.90 but was still higher than for one- (0.776) and three-factor (0.895)
380 models. However, there are no "golden rules" for the TLI. When utilising the practical fit
381 indices to evaluate model fit in empirical studies, researchers should consider the number of
382 observed variables [16]. A relative decrease in misfit is measured by the TLI [17] per degree
383 of freedom. When the model was mis specified by fitting a single-factor model to two-factor
384 data or by removing cross-loadings, the population RMSEA tended to decrease as p
385 increased, and the population values for CFI and TLI tended to decrease. However, it was
386 found that the population values of CFI and TLI tended to increase when p increased [18].

387 Our findings indicate that the scale is sufficiently reliable (e.g. internal consistency).
388 The Cronbach's alpha for the inattention domain with 9 items of ADHD-T-Dari was = 0.851,
389 for hyperactivity-impulsivity with 9 items was 0.847 and for a total of 18 items was 0.898,
390 which was above the recommended value of 0.75 and showed a strong internal consistency.
391 These results are consistent with the source of the questionnaire [7] and the findings of
392 multinational studies [8,19] that have examined the validity of the teacher version of ADHD-
393 5. The findings of the psychometric investigation of the ADHD-T-Dari suggest that the scale
394 can be used by teachers in practice as an instrument for evaluating ADHD and academic
395 performance in school-aged children.

396 On average, ADHD affects between 2% and 7% of the world's population [1,2], and in
397 a meta-analysis, the pooled prevalence was reported to be between 1.1 and 16.7% in Italy
398 only [20]. In this study, the prevalence of ADHD was 21.5%, well above the global average.
399 However, there are no previous studies demonstrating the prevalence of ADHD in the Afghan
400 population. This increased prevalence of ADHD could be related to the younger age of the
401 study population and urbanisation. According to a meta-analysis, ADHD is more common in
402 both sexes up to the age of 9 years and decreases thereafter [21]. In terms of habitation,
403 ADHD is more common in urban areas [22]. According to studies, males are more likely to
404 have ADHD than females [23]. The current study confirms this trend, with boys being much
405 more likely to have ADHD than girls (23.6 vs. 19.6%).

406 This study has several limitations. Firstly, only teachers answered the questionnaire.
407 Our findings cannot be extrapolated to what the scale would say if it had been completed by
408 parents. Second, we only included a sample of students between the ages of 6 and 9, as the
409 original questionnaire was designed for children between the ages of 6 and 17. Third, due to
410 the larger number of classes and the teachers' lack of experience with psychometric
411 measurement methods in the present study, it was difficult for a single teacher to focus on

412 one student and complete the scale, even though the factor loadings are lower and the residual
413 variances are higher.

414

415 **Conclusion**

416 The results of the psychometric examination of the ADHD-T-Dari show that the
417 validity and reliability of the instruments are of high quality and can be used for the
418 assessment of ADHD in school-age children.

419

420

421 **Acknowledgements**

422 We would like to thank Dr. George J. DuPaul for giving permission to use the ADHD
423 rating Scale-5. We would like to acknowledge the academic staff from the Department of
424 Counselling and the Department of Psychology at the Faculty of Psychological Science,
425 Kabul University, for their assistance with content validity. We would also like to express our
426 gratitude to the Department of English Language at Kabul University, as well as Mariam
427 Momand, Bushra Wali, and Sheela Shneezai for their help in forward and backward
428 translation. Our appreciation goes to the teachers of Bibi Sara High School who assisted with
429 face validity and the students (Bibi Marwa Hashimi, Maryam Zarifi, Aryan Muqadas
430 Noorzad, Sahar Mhallygy, Umefarwa Haidari, Nastaran Haidari, Parivash Khanzadah, Shila
431 Joyan, Arshia Moddaa, Sadam Sherzai, Yad Mohammad Nazary, Sediqa Mirzad and Hela
432 Yaqub) from the Faculty of Pharmacy, Kabul University, who assisted in data collection. We
433 would like to thank all teachers, students, and parents who participated in the study and gave
434 their consent.

435

436 **References**

- 437 1. Mohammadi MR, Zarafshan H, Khaleghi A, Ahmadi N, Hooshyari Z, Mostafavi SA,
438 et al. Prevalence of ADHD and its comorbidities in a population-based sample. *J Atten*
439 *Disord.* 2021;25(8):1058–67. doi: 10.1177/1087054719886372
- 440 2. Polanczyk G, Rohde LA. Epidemiology of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder
441 across the lifespan. *Curr Opin Psychiatry.* 2007;20(4):386–92. doi:
442 10.1097/YCO.0b013e3281568d7a
- 443 3. Dobrean A, Păsărelu CR, Balazsi R, Predescu E. Measurement invariance of the
444 ADHD rating scale–IV home and school versions across age, gender, clinical status,
445 and informant. *Assessment.* 2021;28(1):86–99. doi: 10.1177/1073191119858421
- 446 4. Roigé-Castellví J, Morales-Hidalgo P, Voltas N, Hernández-Martínez C, van Ginkel
447 G, Canals J. Prenatal and perinatal factors associated with ADHD risk in
448 schoolchildren: EPINED epidemiological study. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.*
449 2021;30(3):347–58. doi: 10.1007/s00787-020-01519-2
- 450 5. McGoey KE, DuPaul GJ, Haley E, Shelton TL. Parent and teacher ratings of attention-
451 deficit/hyperactivity disorder in preschool: The ADHD rating scale-IV preschool
452 version. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess.* 2007;29(4):269–76. doi: 10.1007/s10862-007-
453 9048-y
- 454 6. Montagna A, Karolis V, Batale D, Counsell S, Rutherford M, Arulkumaran S, et al.
455 ADHD symptoms and their neurodevelopmental correlates in children born very
456 preterm. *PLoS ONE.* 2020;15(3):e0224343. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0224343
- 457 7. DuPaul GJ, Reid R, Anastopoulos AD, Lambert MC, Watkins MW, Power TJ. Parent
458 and teacher ratings of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder symptoms: Factor
459 structure and normative data. *Psychol Assess.* 2016;28(2):214–25. doi:
460 10.1037/pas0000166

- 461 8. Alhossein A, Abaoud AA, Becker D, Aldabas R, Bakhiet SF, Al Jaffal M, et al.
462 Psychometric properties of ADHD Rating Scale—5 for children and adolescents in
463 Sudan-school version. *Front Psychol.* 2022;13:883578. doi:
464 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.883578
- 465 9. Barkley RA. *Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: A Handbook for Dagnosis and*
466 *Treatment.* 4th ed. Barkley RA, editor. New York; 2015.
- 467 10. Vandenberg RJ, Lance CE. A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance
468 literature: suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research.
469 *Organ Res Methods.* 2000;3(1):4–70. doi: 10.1177/109442810031002
- 470 11. Sousa VD, Rojjanasrirat W. Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or
471 scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user-friendly
472 guideline. *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2011;17(2):268–74. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
473 2753.2010.01434.x
- 474 12. Bentler PM. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychol Bull.*
475 1990;22(4):541–62. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
- 476 13. Hu L, Bentler PM. Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to
477 underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychol Methods.* 1998;3(4):424–53. doi:
478 10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424
- 479 14. Whittaker TA, Schumacker RE. *A Beginner’s Guide to Structural Equation Modeling.*
480 *A Beginner’s Guide to Structural Equation Modeling.* 2022.
- 481 15. Arildskov TW, Virring A, Lambek R, Carlsen AH, Sonuga-Barke EJS, Østergaard SD,
482 et al. The factor structure of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in schoolchildren.
483 *Res Dev Disabil.* 2022;125:104220. doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2022.104220
- 484 16. Shi D, Lee T, Maydeu-Olivares A. Understanding the model size effect on SEM fit
485 indices. *Educ Psychol Meas.* 2019;79(2):310–34. doi: 10.1177/0013164418783530

- 486 17. Tucker LR, Lewis C. A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis.
487 *Psychometrika*. 1973;38(1):1–10. doi: 10.1007/BF02291170
- 488 18. Murray AL, Ushakova A, Wright H, Booth T, Lynn P. Structural equation modelling
489 with complex sampling designs and non-random attrition: A tutorial using lavaan and
490 Mplus. *Behav Res Methods*. 2021;51(1):409–28. doi: 10.31234/osf.io/jcz4d
- 491 19. Vallejo-Valdivielso M, Soutullo CA, de Castro-Manglano P, Marín-Méndez JJ, Díez-
492 Suárez A. Validation of a Spanish-language version of the ADHD Rating Scale IV in a
493 Spanish sample. *Neurologia*. 2019;34(9):563–72. doi: 10.1016/j.nrl.2017.05.010
- 494 20. Reale L, Bonati M. ADHD prevalence estimates in Italian children and adolescents: a
495 methodological issue. *Ital J Pediatr*. 2018;44(1):108. doi: 10.1186/s13052-018-0545-2
- 496 21. Erskine HE, Ferrari AJ, Nelson P, Polanczyk G V., Flaxman AD, Vos T, et al.
497 Research Review: Epidemiological modelling of attention-deficit/ hyperactivity
498 disorder and conduct disorder for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *J Child
499 Psychol Psychiatry Allied Discip*. 2013;54(12):1263–74. doi: 10.1111/jcpp.12144
- 500 22. Danielson ML, Bitsko RH, Ghandour RM, Holbrook JR, Kogan MD, Blumberg SJ.
501 Prevalence of parent-reported ADHD diagnosis and associated treatment among U.S.
502 Children and Adolescents, 2016. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*. 2018;47(2):199–212.
503 doi: 10.1080/15374416.2017.1417860
- 504 23. Sayal K, Prasad V, Daley D, Ford T, Coghill D. ADHD in children and young people:
505 prevalence, care pathways, and service provision. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2018;5(2):175–
506 86. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30167-0

507

508 **FUNDING**

509 This work was funded by the Ministry of Higher Education, Afghanistan, Higher Education
510 Development Program (HEDP).

511

512 **Supporting information**

513 **S1 Table. The scores of 8 experts on 9 items of the Inattention domain of ADHD-T-**

514 **Dari: CVI**

515

516 **S2 Table. The scores of 8 experts on 9 items of hyperactivity/Impulsivity domain of**

517 **ADHD-T-Dari: CVI**

518

519 **S3 Table. The scores of 40 teachers on 9 items of the Inattention domain of ADHD-T-**

520 **Dari: FVI**

521

522 **S4 Table. The scores of 40 teachers on 9 items of hyperactivity/Impulsivity domain of**


523 **ADHD-T-Dari: FVI**

524

525 **S5 Table. Principal Component Factor Analysis for ADHD using Varimax Rotation**

526 **Factor Loadings**

527




528

529 **Fig 1. Sampling criteria for the selection of districts, schools, and students enrolled in**

530 **this study.**


531



532

533 **Fig 2. ADHD-T-Dari factor loading scree plot for Eigenvalue.**


534



535

536 **Fig 3. The CFA of the ADHD-T-Dari single-factor model with its loading.** The one-factor
 537 model is depicted in a CFA diagram (ADHD-T-5.es dimensions). Each rectangle (Hy =
 538 hyperactivity-impulsivity, InA = inattention) and oval circle (ADHD) denote a single item or
 539 dimension, respectively. Each circle is associated with items that define only one dimension,
 540 not with the items that define the other dimension (average item-subscale correlation).
 541 Arrows are used to depict correlations between dimensions and items.


542



543

544 **Fig 4. The CFA of the ADHD-T-Dari two-factors model with its loading.** The two-factor
 545 model and the correlations between the two subscales are depicted in a CFA diagram
 546 (ADHD-T-Dari dimensions). Each rectangle (Hy = hyperactivity-impulsivity, InA =
 547 inattention) and each oval circle (IN = inattention, HI = hyperactivity-impulsivity) denote a
 548 single item and dimension. Each circle is associated with the items that define only one
 549 dimension, not with the items that define the other dimension (average item-subscale
 550 correlation). Double arrows are used to depict correlations between dimensions and/or items
 551 (correlation coefficient between item/inter-subscals).

552



553

554 **Fig 5. The CFA of the ADHD-T-Dari three-factors model with its loading.** The three-
 555 factor model and the correlations between the three subscales are depicted in a CFA diagram
 556 (ADHD-T-5.es dimensions). Each rectangle (Hy = hyperactivity-impulsivity, InA =
 557 inattention) and each oval circle (inattention, hyperactivity-impulsivity) denote a single item
 558 and dimension, respectively. Each circle is linked to the items that define only one
 559 dimension, not to the items that define the other dimension (average item-subscale
 560 correlation). Double arrows are used to depict correlations between dimensions and/or items
 561 (correlation coefficient between items/inter-subscals).

562

563 **S1 Table. The scores of 8 experts on 9 items of Inattention domain of ADHD-T-Dari:**

564 **CVI.**

Item	Experts								Experts in agreement	I-CVI	Pc	κ	Evaluation
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H					
Q01	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q02	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q03	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q04	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q05	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q06	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q07	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q08	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q09	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent

S-CVI/Ave = 0.944

565 Note. The item content validity index (I-CVI) is calculated as follows: positive agreements / total
566 experts. Scale content validity index (S-CVI/Ave) is the average of the CVIs divided by the total
567 number of instrument items. The binomial random variable was used to determine Pc (probability of a
568 chance occurrence): $Pc = [N! / A! (N-A)!] \times 0.5^N$. "N" stands for "number of experts" and "A" stands
569 for "number of experts on good relevance". Agreement on significance is indicated by the symbol
570 kappa: $kappa = (I-CVI - Pc) / (1 - Pc)$. Fair = $k = 0.40$ to 0.59 ; Good = $k = 0.60$ to 0.74 ; and Excellent = k
571 > 0.74 are the kappa evaluation standards.
572

573 **S2 Table. The scores of 8 experts on 9 items of hyperactivity/Impulsivity domain of**
 574 **ADHD-T-Dari: CVI.**

Item	Experts								Experts in agreement	I-CVI	Pc	κ	Evaluation
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H					
Q01	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q02	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q03	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q04	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q05	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	0.875	0.031	0.871	Excellent
Q06	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q07	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q08	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent
Q09	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1.0	0.004	1.0	Excellent

S-CVI/Ave = 0.958

575 Note. The item content validity index (I-CVI) is calculated as follows: positive agreements / total
 576 experts. Scale content validity index (S-CVI/Ave) is the average of the CVIs divided by the total
 577 number of instrument items. The binomial random variable was used to determine Pc (probability of a
 578 chance occurrence): $Pc = [N!/A! (N-A)!] \times 0.5^N$. "N" stands for "number of experts" and "A" stands
 579 for "number of experts on good relevance". $I-CVI - Pc / (1 - Pc) = k = \text{kappa}$ denoting agreement on
 580 importance. The following values for kappa are considered fair: 0.40 to 0.59; good: of 0.60 to 0.74;
 581 and excellent: > 0.74.
 582

583 **S3 Table. The scores of 40 teachers on 9 items of Inattention domain of ADHD-T-Dari:**

584 **FVI.**

Item	Number of teacher votes		I-FVI	Pc	κ	Comprehension
	Unclear	Clear				
Q01	1	39	0.975	3.63798E-11	0.975	excellent
Q02	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent
Q03	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent
Q04	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent
Q05	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent
Q06	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent
Q07	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent
Q08	1	39	0.975	3.63798E-11	0.975	excellent
Q09	0	40	1.0	9.09495E-13	1.0	excellent

S-FCVI/Ave = 0.994

585 Note. The I-FVI (item face validity index) is calculated as follows: clear votes / total experts. Average
 586 of FVIs / total number of instrument items is the S-FVI. The binomial random variable was used to
 587 determine Pc (probability of a chance occurrence): $Pc = \frac{N!}{A!(N-A)!} \times 0.5^N$. "N" stands for
 588 "number of experts", while "A" stands for "number of experts on good relevance". k stands for
 589 agreement on significance. $k = (I-FVI - Pc) / (Pc - 1)$. Kappa is measured using the following criteria:
 590 Fair = 80; Medium = 0.80-0.85; and Excellent = 0.85.

591

592 **S4 Table. The scores of 40 teachers on 9 items of hyperactivity/Impulsivity domain of**
 593 **ADHD-T-Dari: FVI.**

Item	Number of teacher votes		I-FVI	Pc	κ	Comprehension
	Unclear	Clear				
Q01	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q02	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q03	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q04	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q05	2	38	0.95	2.83762E-09	0.95	excellent
Q06	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q07	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q08	0	40	1	9.09495E-13	1	excellent
Q09	3	37	0.925	3.23489E-07	0.925	excellent

S-FCVI/Ave = 0.986

594 Note. The FVI is equal to the sum of expert votes. Average of FVIs / total number of instrument items
 595 is the S-FVI. The binomial random variable was used to determine Pc (probability of a chance
 596 occurrence): $Pc = [N! / A! (N-A)!] \times 0.5^N$. "N" stands for "number of experts", while "A" stands for
 597 "number of experts on good relevance". $I-FVI-Pc / (1-Pc) = \kappa$ kappa denoting agreement on
 598 importance. Kappa is measured using the following criteria: Fair = 80; Medium = 0.80 to 0.85; and
 599 Excellent = 0.85.
 600

601 **S5 Table. Principal Component Factor Analysis for ADHD using Varimax Rotation**

602 **Factor Loadings.**

Items	Factor loading		Communality
	1	2	
In-1		0.687	0.528
In-2		0.630	0.447
In-3		0.460	0.254
In-4		0.763	0.604
In-5		0.718	0.552
In-6		0.737	0.570
In-7		0.514	0.365
In-8		0.497	0.464
In-9		0.701	0.520
Hp-1	0.576		0.437
Hp-2	0.607		0.419
Hp-3	0.663		0.464
Hp-4	0.472		0.305
Hp-5	0.713		0.525
Hp-6	0.725		0.560
Hp-7	0.679		0.508
Hp-8	0.660		0.486
Hp-9	0.594		0.376
Eigenvalues	6.65	1.73	
% Of variance	36.96	9.61	

603 Note. In = inattention; Hp = hyperactivity.

Total number of districts = 22

Districts randomly selected = 3



Number of schools in 3 selected districts = 54

Number of schools randomly selected = 5



Number of students excluded, left the study, or provided incomplete information = 153




Total number of students in 5 schools = 1409
(male = 502, female = 907)


Number of students randomly selected = 511
(male = 260, female = 251)




Total of 358 students recruited
(male = 174, female = 184)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.09.24309985>; this version posted July 10, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).






medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.09.24309985>; this version posted July 10, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.09.24309985>; this version posted July 10, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.09.24309885>; this version posted July 10, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).