

In order to help people with a mental illness, it is important to be able to understand and measure the severity of the experiences that they find distressing and disabling and which can affect their behaviour. SCAN is a set of instruments that provide a detailed and accurate picture of 'mental state'. The central method is an interview, the Present State Examination, which has been developed over 25 years; the current edition is the 10th. Patients find it appropriate and acceptable. A computerised form is available, which allows the organisation of algorithms that analyse the data and provide diagnoses according to the two internationally agreed systems, ICD-10 and DSM-IV. This reference manual describes the rationale and development of the SCAN system, its results, training methods and uses.



## **Diagnosis and clinical measurement in psychiatry**



# **Diagnosis and clinical measurement in psychiatry**

A reference manual for  
**SCAN**

---

Edited by

**J. K. Wing,**

**N. Sartorius**

and

**T. B. Üstün**



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 1011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© World Health Organization 1998

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1998

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Times New Roman 10/13pt, in QuarkXpress™ [SE]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Diagnosis and clinical measurement in psychiatry: a reference manual  
for SCAN/PSE-10 / edited by J. K. Wing, N. Sartorius, and T. B. Üstün.  
p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0 521 43477 7 (hardback)

1. Mental status examination. 2. Psychodiagnostics.

3. Psychological tests. I. Wing, J. K. (John Kenneth), 1923– .

II. Sartorius, N. III. Üstün, T. B.

[DNLM: 1. Mental disorders – classification. 2. Mental disorders – diag-  
nosis. 3. Psychiatric status rating scales. 4. Psychological  
tests. 5. Interview, psychiatric. WM 15 D5355 1998]

RC386.6.M44D53 1997

616.89'075 – dc20

DNLM/DLC

for Library of Congress 96-26653 CIP

ISBN 0 521 43477 7 hardback

# Contents

<i>List of authors and SCAN Advisory Committee</i>	viii
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
1 Measurement and classification in psychiatry <i>J. K. Wing, N. Sartorius and T. B. Üstün</i>	1
2 The PSE tradition and its continuation in SCAN <i>J. K. Wing</i>	12
3 Aims and structure of SCAN <i>J. K. Wing</i>	25
4 The SCAN Glossary and principles of the interview <i>J. K. Wing</i>	36
5 SCAN translation <i>N. Sartorius</i>	44
6 Technical procedures <i>T. B. Üstün and W. M. Compton III</i>	58
7 Training in the use of SCAN <i>T. B. Üstün, G. L. Harrison and S. Chatterji</i>	68
8 International field trials: SCAN-0 <i>J. K. Wing, N. Sartorius and G. Der</i>	86
9 SCAN-1: Algorithms and CAPSE-1 <i>G. Der, G. Glover, T. S. Brugha and J. K. Wing</i>	110
10 Development of SCAN-2.1 <i>T. S. Brugha</i>	116
11 Computerisation of SCAN-2.1: CAPSE-2 <i>A. Y. Tien, S. Chatterji, and T. B. Üstün</i>	128
12 Clinical, educational and scientific uses <i>J. K. Wing, N. Sartorius and T. B. Üstün</i>	139
<i>Subject index</i>	147

## **Authors and members of WHO SCAN Advisory Committee, 1996–1998**

Professor P. Bebbington, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, Archway Wing, Whittington Hospital, Highgate Hill, London N19 5NF, UK.

Dr A. Bertelsen, Institute of Psychiatric Demography, Århus Psychiatric Hospital, DK-8240 Risskov, Denmark.

Professor J. L. Vázquez-Barquero, Hospital Universitario 'Marques de Valdecilla', Facultad de Medicina, 39000 Santander, Spain.

Dr. T. S. Brugha, Section of Social and Epidemiological Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Leicester General Hospital, Leicester LE5 4PW, UK.

Dr. S. Chatterji, National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences, Department of Psychiatry, Post Bag No. 2979, Bangalore 560029, India.

Dr W. M. Compton III, Department of Psychiatry, Washington University School of Medicine, 4940 Children's Place, St Louis, Missouri 63110, USA.

Mr G. Der, MRC Medical Sociology Unit, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8RZ, UK.

Dr Gyles Glover, Charing Cross and Westminster Medical School, London W6, UK.

Dr. A. Göğüş, Department of Psychiatry, Hacettepe University Medical School, 06100 Ankara, Turkey.

Professor G. L. Harrison, Professorial Unit, Mapperley Hospital, Porchester Road, Nottingham NG3 6AA, UK.

Dr V. Mavreas, Department of Psychiatry, University of Athens, Eginition Hospital, 74 Vas. Sophias Avenue, 11528 Athens, Greece.

Dr F. J. Nienhuis, Department of Social Psychiatry, PO BOX 30.001, 9700RB Groningen, The Netherlands. [www.psy.med.rug.nl/0018](http://www.psy.med.rug.nl/0018)

Professor C. Pull, Centre Hospitalier de Luxembourg, Service de Neuropsychiatrie, 4 rue Barblé, Luxembourg.

Dr A. Romanowski, The Johns Hopkins University, Department of



Psychiatry, Meyer Building, Room 4–181, 600 North Wolfe Street, Baltimore 21287, USA.

Professor N. Sartorius, Department of Psychiatry, University Hospitals, 16–18 Boulevard de St Georges, 1205, Geneva, Switzerland.

Dr A. Y. Tien, The Johns Hopkins University, School of Hygiene and Public Health Department of Mental Hygiene, 624 North Broadway, Baltimore, Maryland 21205, USA.

Professor J. K. Wing, College Research Unit, Royal College of Psychiatrists, 11 Grosvenor Crescent, London SW1X 7EE, UK.

Professor Y. Nakane, Nagasaki University School of Medicine, Department of Neuropsychiatry, 7–1, Sakamoto-machi, Nagasaki 852, Japan

### **World Health Organization**

T. B. Üstün and J. Orley, Division of Mental Health and Prevention of Substance Abuse, WHO, Geneva 27, CH1211 Switzerland.

#### **Up to date information concerning SCAN**

Information concerning SCAN and its components – including the PSE-10 Interview Manual, Item Group Checklist, Clinical History Schedule, Glossary, Training Manual and software applications – is available on the WHO web site for SCAN ([www.who.ch/msa/scan](http://www.who.ch/msa/scan)) with instructions on how to obtain them. If convenient, contact a SCAN Training and Reference Centre. A list of addresses is at page viii and is also included in the SCAN interview manual.

Alternatively, write to Doctor T. Bedirhan Üstün, Chief, Epidemiology, Classification and Assessment Unit, Division of Mental Health and Prevention of Substance Abuse, Room L3.19, WHO, CH-1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland.

Tel: +41.22.791.3609

Fax: +41.22.791.4885

E-mail: [USTANT@WHO.CH](mailto:USTANT@WHO.CH)



## Preface

The reference manual for the ninth edition of the Present State Examination (PSE-9), together with an algorithm for deriving diagnoses according to the eighth edition of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-8), was the first edition of the PSE to be published in full (1974). It was based on 15 or more years of development and experience, culminating in the use of the seventh and eighth editions in two large international research projects – the US–UK Diagnostic Project and the WHO International Pilot Study of Schizophrenia. Because PSE-9 is brief compared with its predecessors, and a 40-item version of it can be used by trained but non-clinical interviewers for screening purposes in two-stage population surveys, it has proved very popular. A voluminous scientific literature resulted and is still accumulating. However, the advent of consensus diagnostic algorithms, in DSM-III and its successors, and the provision of an international standard in ICD-10, meant that a compatible tenth edition of the PSE must be provided. This is now implemented as the main part of the SCAN.

The points made in the preface to the reference manual for PSE-9 remain relevant for SCAN/PSE-10. In particular, the principle of top-down application of diagnostic algorithms (at that time created from the prose descriptions in ICD-8; DSM-III was still 6 years away) to a database of ratings of clinical phenomena each differentially described in a Glossary, remains fundamental. Creating each database is a joint project between interviewer and respondent, and should be independent of preconceptions about classification. The independent diagnostic rules are then applied electronically. Both processes are being immensely simplified by the use of the computer-assisted PSE (CAPSE), the results from which can also be used to inform the respondent. CAPSE provides options for the analysis and presentation of symptomatic or diagnostic profiles based on one or a series of clinical interviews with one respondent, and also for analy-

sis of data from groups of respondents. This ease of use and choice of outputs could not have been contemplated 23 years ago.

The final sentences of the original preface will serve to end this one also. 'The system can be improved by dropping some of the symptoms, adding others, polishing the definitions of others and, in general, coming closer to the truth. There will certainly be a need for a further edition eventually.'

J. K. Wing  
College Research Unit  
11 Grosvenor Crescent  
London SW1X 7EE, UK

N. Sartorius  
Department of Psychiatry  
University Hospitals  
16–18 Boulevard de St Georges  
1205 Geneva, Switzerland

T. B. Üstün  
Division of Mental Health and Prevention  
of Substance Abuse,  
World Health Organization,  
Geneva 27, CH1211, Switzerland

# Acknowledgements

The SCAN system has been developed in the framework of the World Health Organization (WHO) and National Institutes of Health (NIH) *Joint Project on Diagnosis and Classification of Mental Disorders, Alcohol and Drug Related Problems* (Principal Investigator, N. Sartorius, WHO). The development of SCAN was funded by WHO, NIH and Institutes employing collaborators who took part in the project.

SCAN had its origin in an existing instrument, the ninth revision of the Present State Examination (PSE). Its development is described in Chapter 2.

It is impossible to acknowledge the work of everyone who has participated during the past 16 years. No such enterprise can succeed without the advice, support and collaboration of many researchers, centres and agencies. Some, at least, are listed below.

## **Task force on diagnostic instruments:**

J. K. Wing (Chair), M. von Cranach, C. Pull, L. Robins, H.-U. Wittchen, investigators from Field Trial Centres, staff of WHO and NIH

## **SCAN-1 1982–1992**

WHO: N. Sartorius, A. Jablensky, T. B. Üstün, M. Grant

NIH: J. Blaine (NIDA), J. Burke (NIMH), B. Grant (NIAAA),  
R. Hirschfeld (NIMH), D. Regier (NIMH), L. Towle (NIAAA)

## **Field Trial Centres, principal investigators:**

SCAN Field Trial Centres are listed on pages xv–xvi with centres that have been approved subsequently.

**Contributions to the design and trial of particular parts of SCAN-1:**

Alcohol and drug	T. Babor, A. Bertelsen, A. Göğüş, B. Grant, V. Nikolov, J. Strang, T. Tomov, J. L. Vázquez-Barquero
Cognitive symptoms	V. Mavreas, M. Roth, J. L. Vázquez-Barquero
Computer assisted interview	G. Glover
Computer design and programs	G. Der, N. Contractor, S. Gauthier, E. Glover
Consultants	H. Pfister, D. Rae
General editing	P. Bebbington, A. Bertelsen, T. Brugha, J. Cooper, J. Escobar, A. Farmer, V. Gentil, R. Giel, A. S. Henderson, A. Jablensky, T. B. Üstün
Glossary	T. Babor, P. Bebbington, R. Campbell, T. Üstün
Obsessional symptoms	G. Andrews
Print and graphic design	M. Locker, J. Stevenson, G. Der, J. Wing
Social impairment	L. Wing
Somatoform symptoms	P. Morosini, T. B. Üstün
General development of the SCAN-1 system and relevant training, co-ordination, data management and analysis: MRC Social Psychiatry Unit, Institute of Psychiatry, London.	
Chief Editor: J. K. Wing.	

**SCAN-2.0 1992–1994**

An editorial committee supervised changes necessary to incorporate the final revision of ICD-10 DCR: J. K. Wing (Chair), T. Babor, J. L. Vázquez-Barquero, P. Bebbington, A. Bertelsen, T. S. Brugha, S. Chatterji, W. M. Compton III, G. Harrison, V. Mavreas, A. Romanoski, N. Sartorius, A. Y. Tien and, at WHO, T. Üstün, A. Janca.

Textual changes were edited by A. Bertelsen, T. Brugha, S. Chatterji, W. M. Compton III, R. Y. Mehta, A. J. Romanoski and A. Y. Tien.

Development of computer programs for data entry, CAPSE, and ICD-10 and DSM diagnostic algorithms, was initiated by S. Chatterji,

G. Der, A. Y. Tien and T. B. Üstün. Inventa, Inc. of Bangalore, India (Principal programmers R. Ashok, C. P. Hari, and others) undertook the programming. S. Channabasavanna, R. Murthy and M. K. Isaac at the National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences in Bangalore provided support for editorial and programming work.

Administrative and secretarial assistance: R. Barrelet, J. Head (London), G. Covino, J. Wilson (Geneva), M. Brugha, I. Chenery (Leicester), D. Tien, M. Tseng (Baltimore).

### *SCAN-2.1 1994–1997*

The WHO SCAN Advisory Committee supervised changes from SCAN version 2.0 to version 2.1: A. Bertelsen (Chair from July 1995), J. L. Vázquez-Barquero, T. S. Brugha, S. Chatterji, W. M. Compton III, F. J. Nienhuis, A. Göğüs, G. Harrison, V. Mavreas, A. Y. Tien, J. K. Wing and, at WHO, T. B. Üstün and J. Orley.

Errata lists were contributed by T. S. Brugha, J. L. Vázquez-Barquero, A. Bertelsen, C. G. Lyketsos, F. J. Nienhuis and A. Göğüs. Textual changes were edited by A. Bertelsen, T. S. Brugha, S. Chatterji and A. Y. Tien. The SCAN Advisory Committee (computer subcommittee) directed the further development of computer programs: A. Y. Tien (Chair), S. Chatterji, G. Der and T. Üstün. ICD-10 diagnostic algorithms were produced by S. Chatterji. DSM-IV algorithms were produced by S. Chatterji. DSM-IV algorithms were produced by G. Cai, W. Eaton, J. Lawler, A. Romanoski and A. Y. Tien. All algorithms were corrected by A. Bertelsen, T. S. Brugha, S. Chatterji, G. Der, W. M. Compton III, A. Romanoski and A. Y. Tien.

Administrative and secretarial help: D. Eggertsen (Århus), G. Covino, M. Brugha, I. Chenery (Leicester).

### **SCAN Training and reference centres (\*field trial centres):**

Details of the phone, fax, email and postal addresses and numbers of all SCAN centres are printed in the SCAN interview manual and Glossary, and can be updated on request to the Division of Mental Health and Prevention of Substance Abuse, WHO, Avenue Appia, Geneva, Switzerland.

Ankara, Turkey*	A. Göğüs
Århus, Denmark	A. Bertelsen
Athens, Greece*	V Mavreas

---

Baltimore, USA	A. Y. Tien
Bangalore, India*	M. K. Isaac
Beijing, China*	Shu Liang
Canberra, Australia*	B. Hughson
Cardiff, UK	A. Farmer
Farmington, USA*	J. Escobar, T. Babor
Geneva, Switzerland*	L. Barrelet
Groningen, Netherlands*	F. J. Nienhuis
Leicester, UK*	T. S. Brugha
London, UK*	P. E. Bebbington
Lübeck, Germany*	H. Freyberger
Luxembourg	C. Pull
Manchester, UK	L. Appleby
Mannheim, Germany*	K. Maurer
Nagasaki, Japan	Y. Nakane
Nottingham, UK*	G. Harrison
Perth, Australia	A. Jablensky
Santander, Spain*	J. L. Vázquez-Barquero
Sao Paolo, Brazil*	L. Andrade
Sofia, Bulgaria*	V. Nikolov
St Louis, USA	W. M. Compton
Verona, Italy*	M. Tansella

## Chapter 9

Eric Glover (Biometrics, Institute of Psychiatry) made an important contribution to the ICD-10 programming, and Simon Shanks (Research Unit, Royal College of Psychiatrists) prepared the DSM-III-R program. We are also indebted to Robert Thomas (Advanced Systems Group, Warwick Research Institute) for designing the expert system.

## Chapter 10

The need for revision of SCAN Version 1 was recognised by the WHO SCAN editorial committee in mid-1992. A small group consisting of T. S. Brugha (Leicester, UK), W. M. Compton (St Louis, USA) and A. Bertelsen (Århus, Denmark) was asked to take initial responsibility, with T. B. Üstün co-ordinating for WHO.

A preliminary draft was received and discussed by the SCAN



---

Editorial Group in February 1994, in London, and further modifications were introduced. *SCAN* version 2.0 was delivered to the publishers (APPI) in May 1994, and published and presented at the meeting of the Association of European Psychiatrists in Copenhagen in September that year. Some further changes and corrections were agreed by the *SCAN* Advisory Committee meetings in Århus in July 1995, London in July 1996 and Luxemburg in November 1997, and were incorporated as *SCAN*-2.1.



# 1 Measurement and classification in psychiatry

J. K. Wing, N. Sartorius and T. B. Üstün

## Why measure and classify

The formulation and development of medical disease concepts requires an interaction between two essential components. One is reliable recognition and labelling of a cluster of physical and/or psychological characteristics, regarded as undesirable because of the distress or disability that accompanies them. Sometimes a single characteristic is enough. The other is the testing of hypotheses concerning the relationship of these characteristics to damage and dysfunction in underlying biological systems (pathology) and to their causes (aetiology).

The terminology of symptoms, syndromes and disorders implies a hierarchical link to biological causes which, even if currently unknown, will eventually be empirically demonstrated. This assumption has often proved unwarranted. Probably more such clusters have proved useless or misleading than have successfully survived the process of scientific testing.

The approach to the categorization of mental disorders adopted in the latest International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10; WHO, 1992) is therefore appropriately cautious. The term 'disorder':

is used to imply the existence of a clinically recognizable set of symptoms or behaviour that in most cases is associated with distress and with interference with functions, always at the individual level and often at the group or social level (but not the latter only).

To make an ICD-10 diagnosis of mental disorder is not, therefore, to specify the presence of a disease, but to recognise the presence of the designated syndrome. It does, however, allow hypotheses concerning a pathology or other biological abnormality to be tested. The epidemiology of the disorder can be investigated and may provide a basis for further hypotheses. Another obvious test of usefulness is whether making the diagnosis is helpful to the individual concerned. Does it accurately predict forms of treatment that reduce disability

without harmful side-effects? Does it give some idea of the future course and outcome? Are there means of primary, secondary or tertiary prevention? These are matters for scientific inquiry.

At the very least, can the person afflicted and family carers be given the consolation that the condition has a name, that there are other people with similar problems and that experiences and methods of coping can be shared? The many charitable organisations that have been set up to help those who have a named syndrome, such as those attributed to Alzheimer, Asperger, Down, Kanner and Rett, demonstrate the value placed on the recognition of syndromes even at times when there was no hard-and-fast knowledge about causes and no cure was firmly available. The name is not a mere label, but an indispensable basis for communication and investigation.

A further benefit from testing disease theories is that there is often a bonus, both in the form of a reformulation of the original clinical syndrome and in the emergence of new knowledge of pathological, physiological, biochemical or etiological mechanisms that hitherto had been unsuspected. It is possible to hypothesise, on the basis of recently acquired biological knowledge, the existence of new syndromes within the old concepts.

Successful disease theories tend to evolve over time; from an initial association between a syndrome and a biological abnormality, towards a sophisticated complex of interlocking dimensional criteria based on deviations from normal biological functioning. The amount of knowledge involved in such concepts is immense by comparison with that in the initial categorical description. By the same token, the power to relieve suffering derived from the application of the knowledge may also increase dramatically (Häfner, 1987; Scadding, 1990).

This does not mean that it would have been possible to reach such a satisfactory formulation without having gone through a stage of simple categorisation, nor that disease categories can now be dismissed. To argue this would be to misunderstand the nature and value of scientific classification. Tycho Brahe and Linnaeus were part of a progressive scientific tradition, no less valuable because their contributions, if frozen into orthodoxy, would have persisted as a static and sterile preoccupation with description and classification. In fact, astronomy and botany could not have developed without them. Kepler and Darwin, and their successors in turn, would have had no foundations upon which to build.

The essentialist alternative to the empirical approach, in which disease entities are regarded as having an existence independent of the observer, was the main basis of medicine for 2000 years, notably in the Galenic humoral theory. But recent advances in knowledge have demonstrated the dimensional relationships underlying more and more apparently discrete clinical syndromes. Although we cannot avoid classifying, we can avoid reifying the resultant classes. Scientists should have no difficulty in passing from the categorical to the dimensional mode as it suits their purposes. Diabetes and hypertension are obvious examples.

International nosological systems, such as Chapter F of the new ICD-10, which provide standardised Diagnostic Criteria for Research (DCR; WHO, 1993) to guide clinical recognition of the syndromes of mental disorder, serve essential public-health and scientific purposes. It is necessary to use them sensibly and work to improve them. But they can only help to further knowledge if two conditions are met. First, and more important, the rules must be applied to a base of clinical observations ('symptoms and signs') that accurately reflect the condition of the patient. In other words, the application of standard rules does not of itself guarantee accuracy. Second, the resulting categories should not be regarded as disease entities, but as technical aids for testing clinical hunches and research hypotheses, and for providing good-quality records that can be used for public-health and epidemiological purposes.

This book describes the development and use of methods that help to ensure the fulfilment of both these essential conditions: the reliable and accurate description of symptoms and syndromes, and the testing of hypotheses concerning their relationship to damage and dysfunction in underlying biological systems.

It should be added that this approach does not in any way suggest that environmental influences are irrelevant, or deny their common role in causing, exacerbating or otherwise influencing the expression of symptoms, syndromes and disorders.

### **The development of psychiatric syndromes**

The syndromes of 'schizophrenia', as described by Emil Kraepelin (1896) and Eugen Bleuler (1911), and the syndromes of 'autism', as described by Leo Kanner (1943) and Hans Asperger (1944), illustrate

the fitful progress made in the clinical description of two groups of severely disabling mental disorders.

*The importance of labels: early childhood autism*

The problems of defining and labelling syndromes are clearly illustrated in the case of 'early childhood autism'. Victor, the 'wild boy of Aveyron' first described with stunning clarity by J. M. G. Itard in his reports of 1801 and 1806 (Lane, 1977), provides an illustration. The phenomena delineated by Itard are as recognisable now as they were then, but, because he did not formulate the abnormal behaviours as symptoms, nor name them as a syndrome, it was not recognised that the techniques he used could be generalised to a class of children who were not simply mentally retarded in a global fashion but had highly specific impairments. It was not until Kanner described the phenomena and pointed out the similarities between them (only eleven children, but that was enough), and Asperger described in equally convincing manner a variant of the same set of problems in young men (Frith, 1991; Wing, 1981, 1996), that the syndrome and its boundaries could be investigated epidemiologically, and its relationship to diseases of known etiology and to intellectual disability more generally could be elucidated.

The development of the concept also illustrates the dangers that can follow the adoption of a name. Kanner used Bleuler's term 'autism' to label the syndrome. The confusion with 'childhood schizophrenia' still persists, but both DSM-III-R and ICD-10 now distinguish between the two types of syndrome. Autism and schizophrenia may yet prove to be linked (Frith and Frith, 1991; Frith, 1992) but the principle involved in separating them for classification purposes is important. It is simpler to link categories at a higher level than to distinguish between them once they are merged. It must remain possible to retrieve and study the elements right down to symptom level.

*The importance of labels: schizophrenia*

Schizophrenia is a condition at present defined only in terms of certain abnormalities of experience and behaviour. With only conjectural underpinning in biological knowledge, there is room for a

wide range of opinion as to which elements should be included or excluded. Two decades before Emil Kraepelin's views became influential, there was much the same discussion as now concerning the value of classifying severe mental disorders. The adherents of one school argued for the concept of a unitary psychosis; pointing out that there is an infinite variety of experience and behaviour and that to delineate boundaries between named classes is as fruitless as to try to classify the shapes of clouds. States of madness dissolved into each other, with or without a temporal sequence. Some proponents held that all mental illness began as melancholia and progressed through paranoia to dementia; others that virtually any sequence could occur.

Clouds can usefully be classified. The clarification in the fifth and sixth (1899) editions of Kraepelin's textbook brought to an end a period of chaos and introduced a simple, though crude, distinction between conditions characterised by mental deterioration, such as catatonia, hebephrenia and dementia phantastica, and the more periodic forms of mania and melancholia. He also hypothesised different causes for the two new 'disease entities'. The formulation was thankfully adopted because of its convenience.

The form in which dementia praecox has remained a dominant feature of psychiatric nosology is, of course, Eugen Bleuler's creation. The convenience of the new name, 'schizophrenia', must have played a large part in its acceptance, as did the fact that the connotations of the term 'dementia' seemed to have been dropped. Nevertheless, Bleuler's primary symptom was cognitive – loosening of the associations. This was his link to the biological origins of schizophrenia and also, through 'psychic complexes', to the disorders of affectivity, ambivalence, autism, attention and will. Catatonia, delusions, hallucinations and behavioural disturbance he regarded as accessory. These theoretical assumptions held for the largest sub-group, latent schizophrenia.

Bleuler's concept was subsequently used in markedly different ways. Under the influence of psychoanalysis in the United States, the least differentiated forms – latent and simple schizophrenia – dominated diagnosis to such an extent that descriptive psychopathology was derided and neglected. A similarly broad and vague approach to diagnosis in the Soviet Union, notably under the influence of the Moscow school, this time with a supposedly biological basis, was exploited for political purposes.

At a symposium held on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of the University of Heidelberg, a later occupant of Kraepelin's Chair, Werner Janzarik, described the history and discussed the problems of the concept of schizophrenia. He began his paper with the incontrovertible observation that the history of schizophrenia is the history of the clinical syndromes that were 'only gradually, and at a relatively late period, grouped under the new designation after numerous differentiations and reclassifications.' He ended the lecture with the statement: 'So far, there is no conclusively defined disease known as schizophrenia. The history of the concept is a history, not of medical discoveries, but of the intellectual models on which the orientation of psychiatry is based' (Janzarik, 1987).

The US-UK Diagnostic Project (Cooper et al., 1972) and the International Pilot Study of Schizophrenia (IPSS: WHO, 1973), in which the seventh and eighth editions of the Present State Examination (PSE: Wing, Cooper and Sartorius, 1974) were used, were set up as part of the reaction against the use of terms like 'schizophrenia' without any technical provenance. The studies demonstrated the extent to which such a diagnosis in the USA and USSR was broader and less definable compared with usage elsewhere. The strong resurgence of public-health psychiatry in the USA and the growth of biological psychiatry led to the creation of DSM-III and its subsequent editions, DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) and DSM-IV (APA, 1994), which provided top-down algorithms for classification that set real technical standards. ICD-10 (1993) moved in the same direction by providing international standards for Chapter F (WHO, 1993).

The limitations of these rule-based nosologies are obvious and accepted. A paper on possible future criteria for schizophrenia (Flaum and Andreasen, 1991) illustrates the problem. DSM-III-R, ICD-10 and three proposed options for DSM-IV were compared. It is clearly unlikely that one of these five sets of rules will be found to represent the clinical manifestations of a disease process, while the other four are not. 'State-of-the-art' rules formulated in the absence of external validating criteria are likely to be fragile and transitory unless there is a consensus among professional opinion that they should only be used in order to exploit the advantages for clinical comparability, professional education and scientific study provided by a reference classification.

Within these limits, the ICD-10 rules should remain the world standard until the next revision, to be used irrespective of whatever local



or hypothesis-based criteria are used in addition. However, there remains the necessity to define and measure the phenomena on which the rules should operate.

### **International Classification of Diseases, tenth edition, ICD-10**

The term ‘disorder’, as used in ICD-10, is a higher order equivalent to ‘syndrome’. The structure of Chapter F does not conform to Hempel’s ideal classification (1959), which is ‘mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive’. Such a structure is based on unattainable Aristotelian verities. Chapter F is one of 21 chapters in ICD-10, each using several axes of classification; some based on aetiology, some on pathology, some on syndrome. ICD-10 represents a stage in a gradual evolution that will continue as long as distressing and disabling disorders persist. The top-down classifying criteria for Chapter F make diagnoses more internationally comparable, thus enhancing clinical, educational, public health and research functions. That is good progress. But it is essential that the rules are applied to a base of clinical observation that accurately reflects the condition of the patient.

### **Categories and dimensions**

As disease theories become more successful in providing a solid basis of knowledge about abnormalities of biological and psychological functioning, the dimensional aspects of measurement within and between clinical syndromes become apparent. Both modes of measurement are necessary for advance, and it should be possible to move from one to the other as appropriate, without any sense of incongruity. This is as true of mental disorders as it is of a condition like diabetes. A system of clinical measurement cannot be purely categorical or purely dimensional (Wing, 1995). The most obvious example of the dimensional approach is in defining severity of symptom types, whether for investigation, for treatment purposes or for the assessment of outcomes. But the symptoms themselves must first be defined.

### **Defining symptoms**

The formulation and development of medical disease concepts requires an interaction between reliable recognition and labelling of

one or a cluster of physical and/or psychological characteristics (regarded as undesirable because of the distress or disability that accompanies them) and demonstrable damage and dysfunction in underlying biological systems (pathology and/or aetiology). Medical terminology tends to label many such characteristics as 'symptoms' if a hypothetical link has been suggested, even when the evidence for it is inconclusive. The usage is so universal that it is adopted here. However, the caveat stated at the beginning of this chapter, that many such hypotheses have proved false, and even harmful when acted upon, must be kept in mind.

Undesired or undesirable physical symptoms are easier to define and recognise than psychological or behavioural equivalents, but a physical characteristic (sweating for example) is not necessarily symptomatic of a disorder simply because it *is* clearly 'physical'.

On the other hand, the closer the definitions of an abnormal subjective experience comes to what Lewis (1953) called a 'psychological dysfunction', because it is defined in terms of deviation from a standard of normal psychological functioning, the more easy it is likely to be to find a link to an abnormality of biological function. For example, a description of thoughts or impulses intruding into the mind against conscious resistance has long been familiar to psychiatrists who make a practice of listening in detail to the unpleasant experiences described by their clients. The name 'obsession' is a convenient label, which can be given a precise definition that differentiates it from other symptoms such as phobia or thought insertion (see Chapter 4). Thought insertion can similarly be differentially defined, and there are already testable theories of how it might be linked through a neuropsychological intermediary to neural processes (Frith and Frith, 1991; Frith, 1992).

The obverse is also true. Symptoms should be defined as far as possible without recourse to purely social factors in the definition. Shoplifting and vandalism, for example, are undesirable behaviours, defined in purely social terms, and relatively easy to define reliably. Biological theories can be invoked to help explain some aspects in some people, but are not likely to account for a useful proportion of the variance. The more exclusive the social component in defining deviance, the less applicable is a symptom label.

The problems of defining individual symptoms (and problem behaviours, often called 'signs') are considered in Chapter 4, which describes the SCAN Glossary.

### **Clusters or syndromes**

Some symptoms are clearly members of a group because they have a core quality in common but manifest it in different ways. Obsessional symptoms, for example, have as a core quality the characteristic of intrusion into consciousness against the person's active willed resistance. But the content of the obsession varies widely. Many types of delusion, hallucination, phobia etc, are like this.

Another characteristic that helps, if present, to give solidity to a syndrome construct is when individual symptoms that are not apparently members of the same group nevertheless tend to occur together. The negative and positive symptoms 'of schizophrenia', for example, are so called because they do tend to coexist, and are thus thought likely to be related in some basic way.

Symptoms may also tend to occur in sequence rather than (or as well as) together, i.e. as a syndrome over time. There may be a recognisable 'natural' syndromatic course, episodic or developing, and also perhaps a characteristic outcome. Such syndromes have been refined over a century and a half of clinical observation, and elegantly described in such classics as Jaspers' *General Psychopathology*. On the whole, they have been supported by statistical analyses.

### **The social context of diagnosis**

Diagnosis and treatment are central, though by no means exclusively, to the medical role. That is why, ostensibly at any rate, patients consult doctors. But these functions provide the occasion for others. Doctors should be familiar with the range of human experience and behaviour. Many of them should be able to take on something of the role of counsellor, befriender, teacher, psychotherapist, social worker or advocate. Moreover, diagnosis is at least as much to do with ruling out disease explanations as with establishing that one or other of them would prove useful for helping a patient.

The problems brought to psychiatrists are therefore far from exclusively biological. Biological abnormalities can have social causes; many biological systems depend for their proper functioning on interaction with the psychosocial as well as the physical environment; and social influences can amplify biological impairments. The extent to which an individual is socially disabled depends, in addition, on

psychosocial factors such as disadvantage and public, family and self attitudes. The resulting problems of classification and measurement of long-term psychiatric disorders have been discussed elsewhere (Wing, 1992, 1995,; WHO, 1980).

Scientists must nevertheless try to keep the various factors contributing to social disablement theoretically separate, since they are likely to have different causes and practical effects and to require different types of intervention. This conclusion can be applied to most psychiatric syndromes, from phobias to dementia. The more clearly symptoms are described, and the more precisely the rules for grouping them into syndromes are specified, the more comparable will be tests of hypotheses of all kinds.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association (1987) *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, third edition – revised. Washington, DC: APA.
- American Psychiatric Association (1994) *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, fourth edition. Washington, DC: APA.
- Asperger H. (1944) Die autistischen Psychopathen im Kindesalter, *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, 117: 76–136.
- Bleuler E. (1911) Dementia praecox oder die Gruppe der Schizophrenien. In: Aschaffenburg G. (Hgr) *Handbuch der Psychiatrie*, Spezieller Teil, 4. Abt. 1. Hälfte. Leipzig: Deuticke.
- Cooper J. E., Kendell R. E. Gurland B. J., Sharpe L., Copeland J. R. M. and Simon R. (1972) *Psychiatric diagnosis in New York and London*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Flaum M. and Andreasen N. C. (1991) Diagnostic criteria for schizophrenia and related disorders. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 17: 133–56.
- Frith C. (1992) *The cognitive neuropsychology of schizophrenia*. Hove: Erlbaum.
- Frith C. D. and Frith U. (1991) Elective affinities in schizophrenia and childhood autism. In: Bebbington P. (ed.) *Social psychiatry. Theory, methodology and practice*, pp. 65–88. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Frith U. (ed.) (1991) *Autism and Asperger syndrome*, Cambridge University Press.
- Häfner H. (1987) The concept of a disease in psychiatry. *Psychological Medicine* 17: 11–14.
- Hempel C. G. (1959) Introduction to problems of taxonomy. In: Zubin J.

- (ed.) *Field studies in the mental disorders*. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Itard J. M. G. (1801, 1807) *Memoire et rapport sur Victor de l'Aveyron*. In: Maisson L. (ed.) *Les enfants sauvages*. 1964. Paris: Union Generale d'Editions.
- Janzarick W. (1987) The concept of schizophrenia. History and problems. In: Häfner H., Gattaz W. F. and Janzarick W. (eds.) *Search for the causes of schizophrenia*, pp. 11–18. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Jaspers K. (1946) *Allgemeine Psychopathologie*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Kanner L. (1943) Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Nervous Child*, 2: 217–50.
- Kraepelin E. (1896) *Psychiatrie*, 5te Auflage, pp. 426–41. Leipzig: Barth.
- Lane H. (1977) *The wild boy of Aveyron*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Lewis A. J. (1953) Health as a social concept. *British Journal of Sociology*, 4: 109–24.
- Scadding J. K. (1990) The semantic problems of psychiatry. *Psychological Medicine*, 20: 243–48.
- Wing J. K. (1976) Kanner's syndrome. A historical introduction. In: Wing L. (ed.) *Early childhood autism*, pp. 3–14. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Wing J. K. (1992) Social consequences of severe and persistent psychiatric disorders. In: Leff J. and Bhugra D. (eds.) *Principles of social psychiatry*. London: Blackwell.
- Wing J. K. (1995) Concepts of schizophrenia. In: Hirsch S. R. and Weinberger D. (eds.) *Schizophrenia*, chapter 1. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wing J. K., Cooper J. E. and Sartorius N. (1974) *The description classification of psychiatric symptoms. An instruction manual for the PSE and CATEGO system*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Wing L. (1981) Asperger's syndrome. *Psychological Medicine*, 11: 115–29.
- Wing L. (1996) *The Autistic Spectrum*. London: Constable.
- World Health Organization (1973) *The international pilot study of schizophrenia*. Geneva: WHO.
- World Health Organization (1980) *International classification of impairments, disabilities and handicaps*. Geneva: WHO.
- World Health Organization (1990) *International classification of diseases*, tenth edition. Geneva: WHO.
- World Health Organization (1993) *International classification of diseases*, tenth edition. Chapter F. Mental and behavioural disorders. Diagnostic Criteria for Research. Geneva: WHO.