

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

How Substance Users With ADHD Perceive the Relationship Between Substance Use and Emotional Functioning.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7f37f2x5>

Journal

Journal of attention disorders, 22(9_suppl)

ISSN

1087-0547

Authors

Mitchell, John T
Weisner, Thomas S
Jensen, Peter S
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2018-07-01

DOI

10.1177/1087054716685842

Peer reviewed



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

J Atten Disord. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 July 01.

Published in final edited form as:

J Atten Disord. 2018 July ; 22(9 Suppl): 49S–60S. doi:10.1177/1087054716685842.

How Substance Users with ADHD Perceive the Relationship between Substance Use and Emotional Functioning

Dr. John T. Mitchell, Ph.D.,

Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

Dr. Thomas S. Weisner, Ph.D.,

Departments of Psychiatry & Anthropology, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Dr. Peter S. Jensen, M.D.,

Department of Psychiatry, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR, USA and the Reach Institute, New York, NY, USA

Dr. Desiree W. Murray, Ph.D.,

Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

Dr. Brooke S.G. Molina, Ph.D.,

Departments of Psychiatry and Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Dr. L. Eugene Arnold, M.D.,

Department of Psychiatry, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

Dr. Lily Hechtman, M.D.,

Division of Child Psychiatry, McGill University, Montreal Children's Hospital, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Dr. James M. Swanson, Ph.D.,

School of Medicine, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

Dr. Stephen P. Hinshaw, Ph.D.,

*Contact Information: John T. Mitchell, Ph.D.; Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences; Duke University Medical Center; 2608 Erwin Road; Pavilion East; Suite 300; Durham, NC, 27705; Phone 919-681-0012; FAX 919-681-0016; john.mitchell@duke.edu. Dr. Murray is currently with the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.

Declaration of Interests

In the past 2 years: Dr. Mitchell has received royalties from New Harbinger Press. Dr. Jensen receives royalties from several publishing companies: Random House, Oxford, and APPI, Inc. He also is a part owner of a consulting company, CATCH Services, LLC. He is the CEO/President of a non-profit organization, the REACH Institute, but receives no compensation. The REACH Institute has received an unrestricted gift from Shire, Inc. Dr. Arnold has received research funding from Curemark, Forest, Lilly, Neuropharm, Novartis, Noven, Shire, Supernus, and YoungLiving (as well as NIH and Autism Speaks) and has consulted with or been on advisory boards for Arbor, Gowlings, Neuropharm, Novartis, Noven, Organon, Otsuka, Pfizer, Roche, Seaside Therapeutics, Sigma Tau, Shire, Tris Pharma, and Waypoint; Dr. Hechtman has received research funding, served on the advisory boards and has been speaker for Ely Lilly, GlaxoSmithKline, Ortho Janssen, Purdue, and Shire; Dr. Wells receives royalty income from Multi-Health Systems; Dr. Kollins has received research support and/or consulting fees from the following: Akili Interactive, Alcobra, Arbor, Atentiv, CogCubed, Kempfarm, Intelligent Automation, Ironshore, Neos, NIH, Purdue Canada, Rhodes, Shire, Sunovion, Tris, and SK Life Sciences; Dr. Belendiuk has stock/equity in Shire and Roche. None of the other authors have any additional declarations.

Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA and the University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

Ms. Elizabeth C. Victor, M.A.,

Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

Dr. Scott H. Kollins, Ph.D.,

Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

Dr. Karen C. Wells, Ph.D.,

Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

Dr. Katherine A. Belendiuk, Ph.D.,

Institute of Human Development, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Mr. Andrew Blonde, M.A.,

Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA

Dr. Celeste Nguyen, Ph.D.,

School of Medicine, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

Ms. Lizeth Ambriz, B.A., and

Departments of Psychiatry & Anthropology, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Ms. Jenny L. Nguyen, B.A.

School of Medicine, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

Abstract

Objective—Although substance use (SU) is elevated in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and both are associated with disrupted emotional functioning, little is known about how emotions and SU interact in ADHD. We used a mixed qualitative-quantitative approach to explore this relationship.

Method—Narrative comments were coded for 67 persistent (50 ADHD, 17 local normative comparison group [LNCG]) and 25 desistent (20 ADHD, 5 LNCG) substance users from the Multimodal Treatment Study of Children with ADHD (MTA) adult follow-up (21.7–26.7 years-old).

Results—SU persisters perceived SU positively affects emotional states and positive emotional effects outweigh negative effects. No ADHD group effects emerged. Qualitative analysis identified perceptions that cannabis enhanced positive mood for ADHD and LNCG SU persisters, and improved negative mood and ADHD for ADHD SU persisters.

Conclusion—Perceptions about SU broadly and mood do not differentiate ADHD and non-ADHD SU persisters. However, perceptions that cannabis is therapeutic may inform ADHD-related risk for cannabis use.

Keywords

Substance use; qualitative research; MTA study; ADHD

Introduction

Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a childhood-onset condition that often persists with many adverse outcomes (Barkley, Murphy, & Fischer, 2008), including substance use (SU) and substance use disorders (SUDs) (Dunne, Hearn, Rose, & Latimer, 2014; Kessler et al., 2006; Molina & Pelham, 2014; van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen et al., 2012). In a meta-analysis of studies that prospectively followed children with and without ADHD into adolescence or adulthood, childhood ADHD predicted nicotine, alcohol, cannabis, and cocaine SUDs (Lee, Humphreys, Flory, Liu, & Glass, 2011). Assessing malleable behavioral mechanisms underlying this association may inform treatment and prevention efforts. Here we examine the role of emotional functioning in the context of SU and childhood ADHD by adopting a mixed qualitative-quantitative approach to identify novel directions for future research and intervention.

Disrupted emotional functioning is associated with both ADHD and SU. In ADHD, emotion dysregulation is argued to be either a core (Barkley, 2010) or associated component (Martel, 2009). Features of emotion dysregulation (e.g., quickness to anger) are predictive of negative functional outcomes over and above core ADHD symptoms (Barkley & Fischer, 2010; Barkley & Murphy, 2010) and are not fully accounted for by psychiatric comorbidity (Surman et al., 2011). Regarding SU, negative reinforcement models propose that a primary motive among regular users is to escape or avoid negative affect that occurs during periods of non-use (Baker, Piper, McCarthy, Majeskie, & Fiore, 2004; Kassel, Stroud, & Paronis, 2003). This model has received some support in substance users with ADHD—e.g., cigarette smoking abstinence elicits higher levels of negative affect in ADHD smokers than non-ADHD smokers (McClernon et al., 2008; McClernon et al., 2011). Moreover, negative affect improves immediately after smoking among individuals with ADHD (Mitchell et al., 2014). Such studies examining emotional functioning in ADHD samples are cross-sectional and restricted to one type of substance, although different forms of SU commonly co-occur and interact with emotional functioning over development. Therefore, studies of longitudinally-assessed substance users with a history of ADHD are needed.

Perceptions also play an important role in SU (Del Boca, Darkes, Goldman, & Smith, 2002; Goldman, 2002). For example, in a longitudinal study of students in grades 7–11, expected liking of a substance was predictive of SU initiation and escalation (Fulton, Krank, & Stewart, 2012). In another prospective study of young adults with alcohol-dependent fathers, alcohol expectations mediated the relation between externalizing symptoms and alcohol use (Schuckit & Smith, 2006), indicating that SU perceptions are an important factor in maladaptive use in at-risk samples. However, despite being at-risk for various SU outcomes, individuals with ADHD endorse lower levels of expectancies about the effects of different forms of SU (Harty, Pederson, Gnagy, Pelham, & Molina, in press; Pedersen, Harty, Pelham, Gnagy, & Molina, 2014), suggesting that ADHD may be associated with decreased

awareness of subjective effects of SU using traditional rating scales (Harty et al., in press). To best capture such complex perceptions of SU and emotions in those with ADHD, qualitative methodology may have utility. Quantitative scales typically have a narrow, pre-determined focus, whereas a qualitative approach may provide a more inclusive examination of emotional experience using participants' own explanations, experiences, and terminology.

In short, little is known about perceptions regarding emotional functioning and SU in youth with ADHD, and exploratory work may have important implications. We therefore examine young adults' narrative comments using mixed quantitative-qualitative analyses in a subsample of persistent and desistent substance users from the Multimodal Treatment Study of Children with ADHD (MTA) (MTA Cooperative Group, 1999) to descriptively examine an understudied topic and generate hypotheses for future research. The MTA began as a 14-month randomized controlled trial of treatments for children with ADHD and continued as a prospective naturalistic follow-up study with regular assessments for 16 years. The MTA features a large multi-site sample ascertained via a gold-standard assessment; it also includes a local normative comparison group (LNCG) of classmates group-matched for age and sex (MTA Cooperative Group, 1999). Given that this is a well-characterized sample with and without ADHD who have been assessed for SU over time and were recruited across multiple sites, the MTA is a particularly rich sample to address the overarching goal of this study: to better understand the perceived role of emotional functioning in the context of SU in youth with a history of ADHD. To allow for variation in SU experience, we examined both SU persistence and desistence. In this exploratory investigation, we first assessed group differences (i.e., childhood ADHD/nonADHD and SU persistence/desistence) regarding emotional functioning and SU via group comparisons of coded excerpts from qualitative interviews. Second, we performed substance-specific qualitative analyses to determine whether specific classes of substances yielded unique perceived emotion-substance relations.

Methods

Participants

Participants were drawn from the 183 young adults who participated in the qualitative interview sub-study of the MTA (detailed in Weisner et al., of this special section). In brief, recruitment aimed to oversample participants with an ADHD history as well as participants with persistent substance use into early adulthood from four of the original seven MTA sites. For the current study, 92 young adults ($n = 70$ ADHD, $n = 22$ LNCG) were selected based on qualitatively-confirmed persistent and desistent SU (see Jensen et al. of this special section). ADHD and LNCG groups did not significantly differ in age, sex, race, SU persistence, mood or anxiety disorders in the past year according to a semi-structured diagnostic interview conducted with young adults (Shaffer, Fisher, Lucas, Dulcan, & Schwab-Stone, 2000), or site source (Table 1). Young adults in the ADHD group originally received a diagnosis of ADHD, Combined Type at study entry when they were 7.0–9.9 years old using procedures detailed by the MTA Cooperative Group (1999). Diagnostic and recruitment information on later assessments is available in Molina et al. (Molina et al., 2013).

Procedures

Qualitative study recruitment—Subject recruitment and interviews occurred closest in time to MTA participants' regularly scheduled 14 or 16 year follow-up assessments, with the intention of oversampling participants with an ADHD history and participants with persistent SU through adolescence into early adulthood.

Qualitative interviews—A qualitative interviewing approach identified as the Eco-Cultural Family Interview and described in detail by Weisner et al. was conducted. This format features an approximately 2-hour guided conversation with interviewer prompts to discuss certain topics. Examples of interviewer prompts (if the information did not spontaneously emerge) included:

What are current stressors affecting you these days?

What makes you similar or different emotionally from other young adults?

When you first tried (insert substance), how did you feel?

What substance do/did you like the best?

What are some of the negative aspects of (insert substance)?

Did your emotions affect your substance use?

Did your substance use affect you emotionally?

Qualitative interview coding and reliability—As described in Weisner et al., interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed, and entered into a web-based research and analysis database system that allows integration of qualitative and quantitative data (Dedoose.com) (Lieber & Weisner, 2010)). The following topics were identified by raters of the interview transcripts:

Topic 1: Emotional states precipitate SU

Topic 2: SU positively affects emotional states

Topic 3: SU negatively affects emotional states

When a topic was identified, it was coded on a 0 to 8 ordinal scale reflecting the degree of perceived association between emotion and SU for that particular topic: none (0), mild (1–2), moderate (3–5), substantial (6–8). Raters were blind to the scores of other raters and to the sites from which the excerpts were drawn. Kappa coefficients were $>.70$ between raters when determining whether a topic should be coded. Intra-class correlations indicated excellent consistency (ICC = .90) between raters when applying scores on the 0 to 8 scale.

The distribution of scores are reported by topic for descriptive purposes in Figure 1. The following percent of individual mean scores were in the moderate or substantial range (i.e., mean scores ≥ 3.0) for SU persisters and desisters, respectively: 88% and 67% (Topic 1), 76% and 21% (Topic 2), and 54% and 50% (Topic 3). An additional variable, a difference score of two topics, assessed the relative balance of positive and negative perceptions of SU

and was created by subtracting the average score on a scale of 0–8 for each young adult for Topic 2 from Topic 3.

Data Analysis

Two-way between-groups analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted across all four variables to evaluate main effects for ADHD/LNCG group and SU persister/desister group, and their interaction. Given the small sample size of some subgroups (i.e., $n = 5$ for those in the LNCG/SU desister group¹), interactions were underpowered and effect sizes (Cohen's d) are emphasized (Cohen, 1988), consistent with our exploratory aims. We then examined substance-specific themes. The prevalence of endorsements of these themes was calculated across groups and subjected to chi-square analysis.

Results

Quantitative Analysis of Emotion and Substance Use Topics

Across the four variable (three topics, one difference score), two main effects for SU persister/desister status emerged (Table 2) such that SU persisters scored higher than SU desisters on Topic 2 (the perception that SU positively affects emotional status; $p < .001$) and the difference score (the relative balance of positive from negative perceptions of SU; $p = .04$). Examination of effect sizes for both variables revealed large effects for ADHD/SU persisters in comparison to SU desisters with or without ADHD (d 's = 0.85–2.83). Effect sizes for LNCG/SU persisters in comparison to both SU desister groups were also large for Topic 2 (d 's = 0.97–1.68). Main effects and interactions were not significant for any other variable.

Qualitative Analysis of Emotion and Substance Use Topics

Because the most robust difference between SU persisters and desisters emerged for Topic 2, we conducted an exploratory qualitative analysis of participant narratives for this topic at a substance-specific level. The majority of interview excerpts for that topic ($n = 423$ across participants) involved cannabis (49%), alcohol (29%), or cigarettes (14%). Overall, 82% of excerpts involved at least one of these substances for Topic 2. We limited qualitative analyses to these three substances. Two themes emerged.

Qualitative Theme 1: There is a perceived positive impact of cannabis on emotional functioning in persistent substance users via improvement in positive mood or reduction in negative mood—reduction in negative mood appears to be most apparent in ADHD persistent substance users—The frequency of endorsements indicating that cannabis was perceived to enhance positive mood was not equivalent across all four groups ($\chi^2 = 8.10$, $p = .044$; Table 3). Pairwise comparisons were conducted and excluded the LNCG/SU desister subgroup given its small sample size for this and all other comparisons. These analyses indicated that significantly more ADHD/SU persisters (63%) and LNCG/SU persisters (60%) endorsed this qualitative

¹Sample sizes varied across topics because not all participants received a rating (on a scale of 0 to 8) for each topic. Data analysis was repeated with 0 entered for any participants who did not receive a rating for a particular topic—this supplemental analysis, available from the first author, did not result in any change in statistical significance or interpretation.

theme than ADHD/SU desisters (24%; $\chi^2 = 7.77, p = .005$ and $\chi^2 = 4.39, p = .036$, respectively). ADHD and LNCG SU persisters did not differ. Types of positive mood identified by participants included descriptors such as feeling “good” or “relaxed.” To exemplify these narratives,² when one ADHD/SU persister participant was asked about the effects of smoking cannabis, he stated:

“(I) just relax for a minute, take a break or I don’t know ... Just the good feeling. (Smoking cannabis) just gives you a good feeling. I don’t know ... Gives you a nice good ‘I can do it’ feeling.”

The frequency of endorsements via reduction in negative mood was also significant ($\chi^2 = 8.27, p = .041$). Pairwise comparisons indicated a different trend in which significantly more ADHD/SU persisters (57%) endorsed this theme than did ADHD/SU desisters (18%; $\chi^2 = 7.55, p = .006$; Table 3). LNCG/SU persisters did not significantly differ from ADHD/SU persisters or ADHD/SU desisters, although comparison with the latter group approached significance ($p = .077$). Types of negative mood identified by participants included descriptors such as feeling “irritated” and “frustrated.” This perceived regulatory function to manage negative mood was described by one ADHD/SU persister as:

“I’m a little more on the edge maybe. Like I get a little more edgy, I get more irritated easy, that’s another reason why I like smoking pot, it mellows me down that way I won’t get irritated...”

A similar pattern did not emerge for alcohol or cigarette smoking.

Qualitative Theme 2: There is a perceived positive impact of cannabis use on ADHD in ADHD persistent substance users—The frequency of endorsements for this qualitative theme was not equivalent across all four groups ($\chi^2 = 14.09, p = .003$; Table 3). Pairwise comparisons indicated that significantly more ADHD/SU persisters (50%) endorsed this theme than LNCG/SU persisters (13%) and ADHD/SU Desisters (12%; $\chi^2 = 6.29, p = .012$ and $\chi^2 = 7.58, p = .006$, respectively). As an example of endorsements for this theme, some ADHD/SU persisters stated that cannabis helped attentional aspects of their ADHD.

“But over the years, now that I’ve got older it helps me focus ... I would rather smoke before I go to class than not cause I pay attention better in class. I will take better notes ... and ... ask the teacher more questions if I smoke before I go to class.”

Some ADHD/SU persisters reported that cannabis improved their ADHD, but then qualified this with a statement about the emotional impact of cannabis. For example, one participant indicated that smoking cannabis was therapeutic for her ADHD symptoms, but then stated:

“It’s like a teddy bear. It’s something that makes me feel better. I’m sure that’s what addicts say all the time. It does. It makes me feel like I’m like, okay, it’s a

²Examples that typified endorsements are reported. Vague use of pronouns (e.g., “it”) were replaced with specific terms used elsewhere in the post (e.g., “smoking cannabis”) and denoted by use of parentheses. Also, use of “...” within quotes indicates a natural pause in speech or excerpt portions removed to allow for brevity while maintaining the overall context of the quote.

winder down ... I'll go home and have a half of a blunt and probably pass out and watch some TV. ... it's a relaxation device for me."

Other ADHD/SU persisters referenced improvement in mood as a function of cannabis use and described positive effects on mood that appeared to calm hyperactive-impulsive ADHD symptoms:

"I feel like (cannabis) calms me down. Like I said, I do – I do like my personality, I'm not gonna complain about the ADHD. I'm not gonna complain about being on the go all the time. But, like I said, you got to have some downtime."

Moreover, some ADHD participants perceived their ADHD and mood as intermingled: if smoking cannabis improved their ADHD, then it also had a positive impact on their mood (and vice versa). For example, when one participant was asked about his ADHD and then about cannabis use, he stated:

"I mean, at times (ADHD) makes me really angry and stuff like that. People are supposed to be on the same wavelength as me or something ... When, they're not. And, I just get really enraged and I get pissed off ... Yeah, 'What the fuck? Are you doing this shit to fuck with me?' And, they're not, you know? But, it's just that's just my personality, that's just who I am (To manage this), smoking weed, really, really, really helps like – I can fucking go ape shit and I'll go fucking smoke a blunt or I'll smoke a bowl, or I'll smoke a joint or something, and I'll just – I'll chill out."

A similar pattern did not emerge for alcohol or cigarette use.

Discussion

Prospective studies of children diagnosed with ADHD, including the MTA, have demonstrated a relationship with SU and SUDs (Howard et al., 2015; Molina et al., 2007; Molina et al., 2013). The current study utilized a mixed qualitative-quantitative approach that extended such findings by examining the role of emotional functioning in SU in a subsample of persistent and desistent substance users. We first performed a quantitative analysis of topics coded from interviews with young adults that yielded main effects for SU persistence on two of four topics. SU persisters perceived that (a) SU had a positive impact on their emotional functioning and (b) the positive benefits of SU on emotional functioning outweighed the negative impact of use in comparison to SU desisters. Consistent with these findings, other studies assessing the narratives of SU persisters and desisters indicate that the experience of SU differentiates these two groups. For example, Liebrechts et al. (Liebrechts et al., 2015) reported that desistent cannabis users exhibit differences in agency, goal setting strategies, and ability to envision another self when attempting to quit in comparison to persistent cannabis users. Findings from the current study add to the evidence for such group differences and indicate that perceptions about the role of emotional functioning in SU are important as well. In terms of treatment implications, one key barrier to SU treatment is the belief that treatment is not needed (Gates, Copeland, Swift, & Martin, 2012). Findings from this study would add that persistent substance users may be dissuaded from seeking treatment because their SU is perceived to be adaptive (i.e., SU has a positive impact on

emotional functioning, which outweighs the negative emotional impact). Perceptions about the role of emotion in SU did not differentiate ADHD and LNCG persistent substance users in this study; therefore, treatment development efforts targeting perceptions about the role of emotion may not be specific to those with a history of ADHD—at least in regards to SU in general.

In-depth exploratory analysis of the personal reflections regarding this positive emotional outcome of SU allowed greater specification by different substances. Two themes emerged. First, there was a perceived positive impact of cannabis on emotional functioning in persistent substance users (both ADHD and LNCG groups) via improvement in positive mood or reduction in negative mood (the latter was particularly applicable to the ADHD group). Such perceptions are consistent with research on the subjective effects of cannabis use (Green, Kavanagh, & Young, 2003). The perceived mitigating effect of cannabis on negative mood for ADHD SU persisters is consistent with models of SU in ADHD patients. For example, Molina and Pelham (Molina & Pelham, 2014) propose that negative mood may maintain patterns of use, and expectancies about use (e.g., beliefs that negative mood will improve following SU episodes) may be substance-specific in individuals with ADHD. In accordance with our findings, this may be particularly applicable to cannabis users with childhood ADHD. One clinical implication of this is that treatments should target how cannabis users with a history of ADHD cope with their negative emotional states. Mindfulness and acceptance-based interventions may be particularly promising treatments to address this mechanism given their effects on negative mood as a mediator of treatment outcome (Brewer, Elwafi, & Davis, 2013; Brown et al., 2008; Witkiewitz et al., 2014).

The second theme that emerged from our exploratory analysis was that 50% of ADHD/SU persisters perceived that cannabis improved ADHD. Endorsement rates for other subgroups ranged from 0% to 13%. To our knowledge, only one other study (Harty et al., in press) has considered perceptions about cannabis use in a sample with ADHD in childhood, and no study has identified a perception that cannabis is therapeutic for ADHD in an ADHD sample. Such perceptions are common online (Mitchell et al., 2016) and have been advocated in case study findings (Strohbeck-Kuehner, Skopp, & Mattern, 2008), but are in stark contrast with laboratory-based studies in non-ADHD cannabis-using samples on neurocognition (McDonald, Schleifer, Richards, & de Wit, 2003; Ramaekers, Kauert, Theunissen, Toennes, & Moeller, 2009; Ramaekers et al., 2006). Findings from this study suggest that these perceptions need to be compared against the acute and chronic effects of cannabis use in a controlled laboratory setting. Future studies should also differentiate between perceptions that cannabis improves mood versus improving ADHD symptoms—some in our sample appeared to conflate the effects on ADHD with effects on mood.

At a broad level, there is a need to understand the deleterious effects of cannabis use (Volkow, Baler, Compton, & Weiss, 2014; Volkow et al., 2016), particularly in vulnerable populations such as those with ADHD, as legalized recreational use among adults could significantly increase access to cannabis among youth and is a growing concern for pediatric health in the US (Saloner, McGinty, & Barry, 2015). This exploratory analysis also demonstrates the utility of a qualitative approach to identify perceptions that are not captured using traditional quantitative methods (Harty et al., in press; Pedersen et al., 2014).

Contrary to past studies that have demonstrated nicotine (Conners et al., 1996; Levin et al., 1996; Potter & Newhouse, 2004, 2008) and *ad libitum* cigarette smoking (Mitchell et al., 2014) improve attention in adults with ADHD, participants with ADHD histories did not perceive improvement in such functioning when asked to reflect on their smoking in the current study. This may be another disjunction between fact and perception among individuals with ADHD.

Limitations & Future Directions

Small sample size limited power to detect group differences for subgroup analyses, particularly for analysis of specific substances (i.e., alcohol, tobacco, cannabis). Further, while the aim of this study was to examine childhood ADHD, we did not examine persistence of ADHD into adulthood. In addition, although the purpose of the current study was to examine perceptions about SU in general given that this is an understudied topic in substance users with ADHD, future studies should explore aspects of emotional functioning over the course of substance use (e.g., initiation, maintenance, and cessation). Finally, despite that internalizing disorders may be characterized by poor emotion regulation, they were infrequent in the current sample: rates between ADHD and LNCG samples were low (i.e., <10%) and did not differ between groups. Other aspects of emotional dysregulation, such as anger, may be just as, if not more, relevant to SU in ADHD than depression or anxiety (Molina & Pelham, 2014).

Conclusions

These findings are the first, to our knowledge, to incorporate qualitative methodology to examine the relation between emotions and SU in a longitudinal sample of childhood-diagnosed with ADHD. Young adults' narratives revealed that those who are persistent substance users perceive a link between their emotions and SU in comparison to SU desisters, particularly the perception about the positive impact of SU on emotional states and the relative balance of positive and negative effects of use. Secondary exploratory analyses revealed cannabis-specific effects themes associated with childhood ADHD: cannabis is perceived to have a therapeutic effect on negative mood and ADHD symptoms. The current study is the first to identify such perceptions about the effects of cannabis in an ADHD sample, which can generate testable novel hypotheses about cannabis use and perceived effects on mood and ADHD in the laboratory setting and natural environment. Clarifying the role of these potentially malleable perceptions may inform development of treatment and prevention efforts.

Acknowledgments

Funding

The work reported was supported by cooperative agreement grants and contracts from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) to the following: University of California–Berkeley: U01MH50461, N01MH12009, N01DA-8-5550; Duke University: U01MH50477, N01MH12012, N01DA-8-5554; University of California, Irvine: U01MH50440, N01MH12011, N01DA-8-5551; University of Pittsburgh: U01 MH50467, N01MH 12010, N01DA-8-5553; McGill University N01MH12008, N01DA-8-5548. Additional funding support provided by NIDA (K23DA032577 to J.T.M., K24DA023464 to S.H.K., R01DA039881 to B.S.G.M.). The opinions and assertions contained in this report are the private views of

the authors and are not to be construed as official or as reflecting the views of the Department of Health and Human Services, NIMH, or NIDA.

The Multimodal Treatment Study of Children with ADHD (MTA) was a National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) cooperative agreement randomized clinical trial, continued under an NIMH contract as a follow-up study and finally under a National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) contract. Collaborators from NIMH: Benedetto Vitiello, M.D. (Child & Adolescent Treatment and Preventive Interventions Research Branch), Joanne B. Severe, M.S. (Clinical Trials Operations and Biostatistics Unit, Division of Services and Intervention Research), Peter S. Jensen, M.D. (currently at REACH Institute and Mayo Clinic), L. Eugene Arnold, M.D., M.Ed. (currently at Ohio State University), Kimberly Hoagwood, Ph.D. (currently at Columbia); previous contributors from NIMH to the early phases: John Richters, Ph.D. (currently at National Institute of Nursing Research); Donald Vereen, M.D. (currently at NIDA). Principal investigators and co-investigators from the sites are: University of California, Berkeley/San Francisco: Stephen P. Hinshaw, Ph.D. (Berkeley), Glen R. Elliott, Ph.D., M.D. (San Francisco); Duke University: Karen C. Wells, Ph.D., Jeffery N. Epstein, Ph.D. (currently at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center), Desiree Murray, Ph.D.; previous Duke contributors to early phases: C. Keith Conners, Ph.D. (former PI); John March, M.D., M.P.H.; University of California, Irvine: James Swanson, Ph.D., Timothy Wigal, Ph.D.; previous contributor from UCLA to the early phases: Dennis P. Cantwell, M.D. (deceased); New York University: Howard B. Abikoff, Ph.D.; Montreal Children's Hospital/McGill University: Lily Hechtman, M.D.; New York State Psychiatric Institute/Columbia University/Mount Sinai Medical Center: Laurence L. Greenhill, M.D. (Columbia), Jeffrey H. Newcorn, M.D. (Mount Sinai School of Medicine). University of Pittsburgh: Brooke Molina, Ph.D., Betsy Hoza, Ph.D. (currently at University of Vermont), William E. Pelham, Ph.D. (PI for early phases, currently at Florida International University). Follow-up phase statistical collaborators: Robert D. Gibbons, Ph.D. (University of Illinois, Chicago); Sue Marcus, Ph.D. (Mt. Sinai College of Medicine); Kwan Hur, Ph.D. (University of Illinois, Chicago). Original study statistical and design consultant: Helena C. Kraemer, Ph.D. (Stanford University). Collaborator from the Office of Special Education Programs/US Department of Education: Thomas Hanley, Ed.D. Collaborator from Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention/Department of Justice: Karen Stern, Ph.D. Additional investigators involved in Qualitative Interview Substudy: Thomas S. Weisner, Ph.D., & Jeffrey Good, Ph.D. UCLA.

References

- Baker TB, Piper ME, McCarthy DE, Majeskie MR, Fiore MC. Addiction motivation reformulated: An affective processing model of negative reinforcement. *Psychological Review*. 2004; 111(1):33–51. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.111.1.33 [PubMed: 14756584]
- Barkley RA. Deficient emotional self-regulation is a core component of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of ADHD & Related Disorders*. 2010; 1(2):5–37.
- Barkley RA, Fischer M. The unique contribution of emotional impulsiveness to impairment in major life activities in hyperactive children as adults. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2010; 49(5):503–513. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaac.2010.01.019 [PubMed: 20431470]
- Barkley RA, Murphy KR. Deficient emotional self-regulation in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): The relative contributions of emotional impulsiveness and ADHD symptoms to adaptive impairments in major life activities. *Journal of ADHD & Related Disorders*. 2010; 1(4):5–28.
- Barkley, RA., Murphy, KR., Fischer, M. ADHD in adults: What the science says. New York, NY: The Guilford Press; 2008.
- Brewer JA, Elwafi HM, Davis JH. Craving to quit: psychological models and neurobiological mechanisms of mindfulness training as treatment for addictions. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2013; 27(2):366–379. DOI: 10.1037/a0028490 [PubMed: 22642859]
- Brown RA, Palm KM, Strong DR, Lejuez CW, Kahler CW, Zvolensky MJ, ... Gifford EV. Distress tolerance treatment for early-lapse smokers: Rationale, program description, and preliminary findings. *Behavior Modification*. 2008; 32(3):302–332. DOI: 10.1177/0145445507309024 [PubMed: 18391050]
- Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press; 1988.
- Conners CK, Levin ED, Sparrow E, Hinton SC, Erhardt D, Meck WH, ... March J. Nicotine and attention in adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Psychopharmacology Bulletin*. 1996; 32(1):67–73. [PubMed: 8927677]

- Del Boca FK, Darkes J, Goldman MS, Smith GT. Advancing the expectancy concept via the interplay between theory and research. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2002; 26(6):926–935.
- Dunne EM, Hearn LE, Rose JJ, Latimer WW. ADHD as a risk factor for early onset and heightened adult problem severity of illicit substance use: an accelerated gateway model. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2014; 39(12):1755–1758. DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.07.009 [PubMed: 25123341]
- Fulton HG, Krank MD, Stewart SH. Outcome expectancy liking: a self-generated, self-coded measure predicts adolescent substance use trajectories. *Psychol Addictive Behaviors*. 2012; 26(4):870–879. DOI: 10.1037/a0030354
- Gates P, Copeland J, Swift W, Martin G. Barriers and facilitators to cannabis treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Review*. 2012; 31(3):311–319. DOI: 10.1111/j.1465-3362.2011.00313.x [PubMed: 21521384]
- Goldman MS. Expectancy and risk for alcoholism: The unfortunate exploitation of a fundamental characteristic of neurobehavioral adaptation. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2002; 26(5):737–746.
- Green B, Kavanagh D, Young R. Being stoned: a review of self-reported cannabis effects. *Drug and Alcohol Review*. 2003; 22(4):453–460. DOI: 10.1080/09595230310001613976 [PubMed: 14660135]
- Harty SC, Pederson SL, Gnagy EM, Pelham WE Jr, Molina BSG. ADHD and marijuana use expectancies in young adulthood. *Substance Use and Misuse*. (in press).
- Howard AL, Molina BS, Swanson JM, Hinshaw SP, Belendiuk KA, Harty SC, ... Wigal T. Developmental progression to early adult binge drinking and marijuana use from worsening versus stable trajectories of adolescent attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder and delinquency. *Addiction*. 2015; 110(5):784–795. DOI: 10.1111/add.12880 [PubMed: 25664657]
- Jensen PS, Yuki K, Murray DW, Mitchell JT, Weisner TS, Hinshaw SP, Molina BSG, Swanson JM, Arnold LE, Hechtman L, Wells KC. Turning points in the lives of youth with and without ADHD: Are they linked to changes in substance use? *Journal of Attention Disorders*. (in press).
- Kassel JD, Stroud LR, Paronis CA. Smoking, stress, and negative affect: correlation, causation, and context across stages of smoking. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2003; 129(2):270–304. [PubMed: 12696841]
- Kessler RC, Adler L, Barkley R, Biederman J, Conners CK, Demler O, ... Zaslavsky AM. The prevalence and correlates of adult ADHD in the United States: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2006; 163(4):716–723. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.163.4.716 [PubMed: 16585449]
- Lee SS, Humphreys KL, Flory K, Liu R, Glass K. Prospective association of childhood attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and substance use and abuse/dependence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2011; 31(3):328–341. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2011.01.006 [PubMed: 21382538]
- Levin ED, Conners CK, Sparrow E, Hinton SC, Erhardt D, Meck WH, ... March J. Nicotine effects on adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1996; 123(1):55–63. DOI: 10.1007/BF02246281 [PubMed: 8741955]
- Lieber, E., Weisner, TS. Meeting the practical challenges of mixed methods research. In: Tashakkori, A., Teddlie, C., editors. *Handbook of Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2010. p. 559-579.
- Liebrechts N, van der Pol P, de Graaf R, van Laar M, van den Brink W, Korf DJ. Persistence and desistance in heavy cannabis use: the role of identity, agency, and life events. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 2015; 18(5):617–633. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2014.992320
- Martel MM. Research review: A new perspective on attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Emotion dysregulation and trait models. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2009; 50(9):1042–1051. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02105.x [PubMed: 19508495]
- McClermon FJ, Kollins SH, Lutz AM, Fitzgerald DP, Murray DW, Redman C, Rose JE. Effects of smoking abstinence on adult smokers with and without attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Results of a preliminary study. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2008; 197(1):95–105. DOI: 10.1007/s00213-007-1009-3 [PubMed: 18038223]

- McClernon FJ, Van Voorhees EE, English J, Hallyburton M, Holdaway A, Kollins SH. Smoking withdrawal symptoms are more severe among smokers with ADHD and independent of ADHD symptom change: Results from a 12-day contingency-managed abstinence trial. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2011; 13(9):784–792. DOI: 10.1093/ntr/ntr073 [PubMed: 21571687]
- McDonald J, Schleifer L, Richards JB, de Wit H. Effects of THC on behavioral measures of impulsivity in humans. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2003; 28(7):1356–1365. DOI: 10.1038/sj.npp.1300176 [PubMed: 12784123]
- Mitchell JT, Dennis MF, English JS, Dennis PA, Brightwood A, Beckham JC, Kollins SH. Ecological momentary assessment of antecedents and consequences of smoking in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Substance Use and Misuse*. 2014; 49(11):1446–1456. DOI: 10.3109/10826084.2014.912229 [PubMed: 24827866]
- Mitchell JT, Sweitzer M, Tunno A, Hagmann C, Kollins SH, McClernon FJ. “I use weed for my ADHD”: A qualitative analysis of online forum discussions on cannabis and ADHD. *PLoS One*. 2016; doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0156614
- Molina BS, Flory K, Hinshaw SP, Greiner AR, Arnold LE, Swanson JM, ... Wigal T. Delinquent behavior and emerging substance use in the MTA at 36 months: prevalence, course, and treatment effects. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2007; 46(8):1028–1040. DOI: 10.1097/chi.0b013e3180686d96 [PubMed: 17667481]
- Molina BS, Hinshaw SP, Eugene Arnold L, Swanson JM, Pelham WE, Hechtman L, ... Marcus S. Adolescent substance use in the multimodal treatment study of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (MTA) as a function of childhood ADHD, random assignment to childhood treatments, and subsequent medication. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2013; 52(3):250–263. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaac.2012.12.014 [PubMed: 23452682]
- Molina BS, Pelham WE Jr. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and risk of substance use disorder: developmental considerations, potential pathways, and opportunities for research. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2014; 10:607–639. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153722
- MTA Cooperative Group. A 14-month randomized clinical trial of treatment strategies for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. The MTA Cooperative Group. Multimodal Treatment Study of Children with ADHD. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 1999; 56(12):1073–1086. [PubMed: 10591283]
- Pedersen SL, Harty SC, Pelham WE, Gnagy EM, Molina BS. Differential associations between alcohol expectancies and adolescent alcohol use as a function of childhood ADHD. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2014; 75(1):145–152. [PubMed: 24411806]
- Potter AS, Newhouse PA. Effects of acute nicotine administration on behavioral inhibition in adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2004; 176(2):182–194. DOI: 10.1007/s00213-004-1874-y [PubMed: 15083253]
- Potter AS, Newhouse PA. Acute nicotine improves cognitive deficits in young adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*. 2008; 88(4):407–417. DOI: 10.1016/j.pbb.2007.09.014
- Ramaekers JG, Kauert G, Theunissen EL, Toennes SW, Moeller MR. Neurocognitive performance during acute THC intoxication in heavy and occasional cannabis users. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*. 2009; 23(3):266–277. DOI: 10.1177/0269881108092393 [PubMed: 18719045]
- Ramaekers JG, Kauert G, van Ruitenbeek P, Theunissen EL, Schneider E, Moeller MR. High-potency marijuana impairs executive function and inhibitory motor control. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2006; 31(10):2296–2303. DOI: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301068 [PubMed: 16572123]
- Saloner B, McGinty EE, Barry CL. Policy strategies to reduce youth recreational marijuana use. *Pediatrics*. 2015; 135(6):955–957. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2015-0436 [PubMed: 25941304]
- Schuckit MA, Smith TL. An evaluation of the level of response to alcohol, externalizing symptoms, and depressive symptoms as predictors of alcoholism. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2006; 67(2):215–227.
- Shaffer D, Fisher P, Lucas CP, Dulcan MK, Schwab-Stone ME. NIMH Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Version IV (NIMH DISC-IV): description, differences from previous versions, and reliability of some common diagnoses. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2000; 39(1):28–38. DOI: 10.1097/00004583-200001000-00014 [PubMed: 10638065]

- Strohbeck-Kuehner P, Skopp G, Mattern R. Cannabis improves symptoms of ADHD. *Cannabinoids*. 2008; 3(1):1–3.
- Surman CB, Biederman J, Spencer T, Yorks D, Miller CA, Petty CR, Faraone SV. Deficient emotional self-regulation and adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: a family risk analysis. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2011; 168(6):617–623. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2010.10081172 [PubMed: 21498464]
- van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen K, van de Glind G, van den Brink W, Smit F, Crunelle CL, Swets M, Schoevers RA. Prevalence of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in substance use disorder patients: a meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2012; 122(1–2):11–19. DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.12.007 [PubMed: 22209385]
- Volkow ND, Baler RD, Compton WM, Weiss SR. Adverse health effects of marijuana use. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2014; 370(23):2219–2227. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1402309 [PubMed: 24897085]
- Volkow ND, Swanson JM, Evins AE, DeLisi LE, Meier MH, Gonzalez R, ... Baler R. Effects of Cannabis Use on Human Behavior, Including Cognition, Motivation, and Psychosis: A Review. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2016; doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.3278
- Weisner TS, Murray DW, Jensen PS, Mitchell JT, Swanson JM, Hinshaw SP, Wells KC, Hechtman L, Molina BSG, Arnold LE, Sorensen P, Stehli A. Follow-up of young adults in the MTA: Design and methods for qualitative interviews. (under review).
- Witkiewitz K, Bowen S, Harrop EN, Douglas H, Enkema M, Sedgwick C. Mindfulness-based treatment to prevent addictive behavior relapse: theoretical models and hypothesized mechanisms of change. *Substance Use and Misuse*. 2014; 49(5):513–524. DOI: 10.3109/10826084.2014.891845 [PubMed: 24611847]




Figure 1. Percent of participants endorsing a moderate/substantial perceived relationship for each topic. Each topic was scored on a scale from 0 to 8 where 0–2 corresponds to no/mild perceived relationship and 3–8 corresponds to moderate/substantial perceived relationship. Sample sizes varied because not all participants received a rating for each topic ($n = 41\text{--}47$ ADHD/SU Persisters, $n = 15\text{--}16$ LNCG/SU Persisters, $n = 17\text{--}20$ ADHD/SU Desisters, $n = 4$ LNCG/SU Desisters).

Table 1

Participant demographics

	ADHD (<i>n</i> = 70)	LNCG (<i>n</i> = 22)	Test statistic	<i>p</i>
Age (<i>SD</i>)	24.37 (1.78)	23.88 (1.04)	$t(90) = 1.75$.08
Sex (%)				
Male	52 (74%)	18 (82%)	$\chi^2(1) = 0.52$.47
Female	18 (26%)	4 (18%)		
Race (%)				
White	54 (77%)	18 (82%)	$\chi^2(4) = 4.44$.35
Black	7 (10%)	1 (5%)		
Non-Black/Hispanic	0 (0%)	1 (5%)		
Mixed	7 (10%)	2 (9%)		
Other	2 (3%)	0 (0%)		
SU Group (%)				
Persistent	50 (71%)	17 (77%)	$\chi^2(1) = 0.29$.59
Desistent	20 (29%)	5 (23%)		
Internalizing Disorders (past year)				
Mood	3 (4.3%)	2 (9.1%)	$\chi^2(1) = 0.75$.39
Anxiety	6 (8.6%)	2 (9.1%)	$\chi^2(1) = 0.01$.94
Site (%)				
Berkeley	20 (29%)	5 (23%)	$\chi^2(3) = 0.62$.89
Duke	22 (31%)	7 (32%)		
Irvine	17 (24%)	7 (32%)		
Montreal	11 (16%)	3 (14%)		

Note. SU = Substance use.

Table 2

Means (*SD*) from emotion and substance use topics as a function of ADHD/LNCG group and substance use persistence/desistence group

Variables	SU Persisters			SU Desisters			ADHD x SU Group Status	F values			Cohen's <i>d</i>					
	ADHD (<i>n</i> = 39-47)	LNCG (<i>n</i> = 15-16)	ADHD (<i>n</i> = 17-20)	LNCG (<i>n</i> = 4)	ADHD Group Status	SU Group Status		ADHD x SU Group Status	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	SU Persisters v. SU Desisters	
Topic 1. Emotional states precipitate SU	4.40 (1.45)	4.36 (1.48)	3.85 (1.79)	3.54 (1.40)	0.13	1.99	0.08	.03	.34	.60	.31	.57	.19			
Topic 2. SU positively affects emotional states	3.96 (1.30)	3.36 (1.72)	1.76 (1.59)	1.28 (0.33)	1.46	23.26**	0.02	.39	1.52	2.83	.97	1.68	.41			
Topic 3. SU negatively affects emotional states	3.05 (1.71)	3.30 (1.80)	2.76 (2.07)	2.14 (1.59)	0.75	0.21	0.45	-.14	.15	.55	.28	.68	.34			
Difference of positive from negative perception scores	1.02 (2.05)	-0.06 (1.88)	-1.00 (2.68)	-0.86 (1.52)	0.48	4.26*	0.79	.55	.85	1.04	.41	.47	-.06			

Notes. SU = Substance Use. Sample sizes varied because not all participants received a rating for each topic. Topics are focused on emotions as an antecedent to SU (i.e., Topic 1) and consequence of SU (i.e., Topics 2 and 3). Topics 1-3 were scored on a scale of 0 to 8. The difference score variable is the within participant average of Topic 2 minus the within participant average of Topic 3, which was then averaged across participants. The values listed here do not equal the difference of Topic 2 from Topic 3 for some groups (e.g., for the MTA/SU persister group, 3.96 - 3.05 = 1.02) since some participants did not have scores for both Topics 2 and 3. Those participants who had values for only Topic 2 or 3 were excluded in the calculation of the difference score variable.

* $p < .05$,

** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Frequency endorsements (%) for each qualitative theme

	SU Persisters				SU Desisters				χ^2	<i>p</i>	Pairwise Contrasts
	(1) ADHD ^a (<i>n</i> = 25–46)	(2) LNCG ^b (<i>n</i> = 4–15)	(3) ADHD ^c (<i>n</i> = 7–17)	(4) LNCG ^d (<i>n</i> = 2–4)	(1) ADHD ^a (<i>n</i> = 25–46)	(2) LNCG ^b (<i>n</i> = 4–15)	(3) ADHD ^c (<i>n</i> = 7–17)	(4) LNCG ^d (<i>n</i> = 2–4)			
<u>Qualitative Theme 1</u>											
Cannabis perceived to enhance positive mood	29 (63%)	9 (60%)	4 (24%)	2 (50%)	29 (63%)	9 (60%)	4 (24%)	2 (50%)	8.10	.044	1,2 > 3
Cannabis perceived to reduce negative mood	26 (57%)	7 (47%)	3 (18%)	1 (25%)	26 (57%)	7 (47%)	3 (18%)	1 (25%)	8.27	.041	1 > 3
Alcohol perceived to enhance positive mood	18 (60%)	3 (38%)	10 (53%)	3 (100%)	18 (60%)	3 (38%)	10 (53%)	3 (100%)	3.75	.289	
Alcohol perceived to reduce negative mood	9 (30%)	1 (13%)	5 (26%)	1 (33%)	9 (30%)	1 (13%)	5 (26%)	1 (33%)	1.06	.787	
Cigarettes perceived to enhance positive mood	8 (32%)	1 (25%)	1 (14%)	1 (50%)	8 (32%)	1 (25%)	1 (14%)	1 (50%)	1.31	.728	
Cigarettes perceived to reduce negative mood	17 (68%)	2 (50%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	17 (68%)	2 (50%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	3.87	.276	
<u>Qualitative Theme 2</u>											
Cannabis perceived to improve ADHD/ADHD symptoms	23 (50%)	2 (13%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	23 (50%)	2 (13%)	2 (12%)	0 (0%)	14.09	.003	1 > 2,3
Alcohol perceived to improve ADHD/ADHD symptoms	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0.60	.897	
Cigarettes perceived to improve ADHD/ADHD symptoms	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0.91	.824	

Notes. SU = Substance Use; LNCG SU Desisters were excluded from pairwise contrasts due to small sample size.

^a ADHD SU Persisters *n* = 46, 30, and 25 for analysis of cannabis, alcohol, and cigarettes, respectively (i.e., among ADHD SU Persisters, these were the number of participants who commented on each respective substance);

^b LNCG SU Persisters *n* = 15, 8, and 4 for analysis of cannabis, alcohol, and cigarettes, respectively (i.e., among LNCG SU Persisters, these were the number of participants who commented on each respective substance);

^c ADHD SU Desisters *n* = 17, 19, and 7 for analysis of cannabis, alcohol, and cigarettes, respectively (i.e., among ADHD SU Desisters, these were the number of participants who commented on each respective substance);

^d LNCG SU Desisters *n* = 4, 3, and 2 for analysis of cannabis, alcohol, and cigarettes, respectively (i.e., among LNCG SU Desisters, these were the number of participants who commented on each respective substance).