WHEN SYSTEMS SEE RISK INSTEAD OF DIFFERENCE:

HOW ADULT ADHD IS STILL MISUNDERSTOOD BY INSTITUTIONS WORLDWIDE

When Systems See Risk Instead of Difference:

How Adult ADHD Is Still Misunderstood by Institutions Worldwide

Dr Alan Cross

Abstract

Across the UK and beyond, adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) still collide with systems that confuse neurological difference with behavioural danger. From police recruitment and safeguarding to courtroom assessments and military enlistment, official rules and everyday practices often rest on outdated science. This long read traces how those misconceptions took root, how they persist through paperwork and procedure, and why their human cost is larger than most institutions recognise.

The diagnosis–disadvantage paradox

ADHD is now recognised as a **lifelong neurodevelopmental condition** that affects children, adolescents and **adults**, with evidence-based treatments and management strategies across the lifespan (NICE Guideline NG87). Yet for many adults, diagnosis does not only unlock support; it can also trigger institutional suspicion. In recruitment, occupational health, family regulation and safeguarding, **clinical language** such as *impulsivity* or *emotional dysregulation* is routinely lifted out of context and reinterpreted as a **risk marker**.

Guidance such as NG87 makes two points that matter to public systems: ADHD tends to persist into adulthood; and medication and psychosocial supports are often needed **long-term**, reviewed rather than withdrawn. Those points, however, sit uneasily alongside **legacy rules** that still treat psychiatric labels as shorthand for instability, or medication as evidence of dependency. The result is a diagnosis–disadvantage paradox: the same step that should enable adjustments (a formal diagnosis) can become the cue for **heightened vetting and surveillance**, particularly in safety-critical professions. NICE

How paperwork turns difference into danger

Modern public services are built to exchange information quickly. Multi-agency hubs, shared safeguarding platforms and routine occupational-health disclosures mean that once an ADHD label appears in a record, it can **echo across institutions**. A line noting “impulsivity consistent with ADHD” can be copied, paraphrased and hardened into a more ominous claim by the time it reaches another desk.

This is a form of **bureaucratic amplification**. Each individual entry is defensible; taken together they construct a paper reality of **permanent suspicion**. Because risk frameworks are meant to prevent harm, they default to worst-case inference when they meet unfamiliar neurocognitive profiles. That is why the institutional conversation about ADHD so often slides from *difference* to *danger*, even in the absence of any adverse event.

Policing: inclusion on paper, risk culture in practice

Officially, UK policing has moved toward **neurodiversity inclusion**. The College of Policing links recruitment and assessment to the Equality Act 2010, which requires reasonable adjustments. Forces also respond to public scrutiny through **Freedom of Information** disclosures. The **British Transport Police (BTP)** state explicitly in recent FOI responses that ADHD **is not, by itself, a bar to recruitment**, and they outline adjustments across assessment and promotion processes (FOI 01/FOI/24/2595; FOI 01/FOI/25/3413). In other words, there is **no blanket ban**. BTP+1

Yet application and service often involve **medication disclosure** and **occupational-health review**, especially where controlled stimulants (e.g., methylphenidate) are prescribed. The case-by-case approach can function as **de facto gatekeeping** when internal cultures are highly risk-averse. Where forces do collect neurodiversity data, declared numbers remain very low (BTP reported **0.78% of employees** self-declared as neurodivergent as of 30 April 2024, almost certainly an undercount given national prevalence estimates), suggesting that **stigma and disclosure fears** are still active forces inside policing (BTP FOI 01/FOI/24/2613). BTP

The tension is most visible in safety-critical, high-scrutiny roles (firearms, public order, Taser-qualified units). Formal rules do *not* single out ADHD as an automatic bar, but **local interpretation** often equates active treatment with vulnerability. The paradox is stark: the very intervention that *reduces* impulsivity is sometimes treated as a reason to pause progression or deployment.

Social services: the child-protection lens

Safeguarding frameworks in England and Wales are designed to **minimise risk** to children, and rightly so. But these frameworks were not built with adult neurodiversity in mind. Training often prioritises autism over ADHD, and "emotional regulation" modules rarely draw on the contemporary neuroscience of **adult ADHD**, where heightened affect and slower stress-recovery are well-documented features rather than markers of malice or threat.

In practice, **affect is codified**. "Rapid speech," "tearfulness," "pressured presentation," or "over-talkative" can enter assessments as **behavioural red flags**. Once entered, they circulate through multi-agency systems and may be repeated (occasionally exaggerated) in onward reports. Over time, a **clinical description** becomes a **safeguarding narrative**. The person is not assessed as a parent with a neurodevelopmental difference; they are assessed as a **parent with volatility**. The distinction is not merely semantic — it **reshapes family**

contact outcomes and drives longer-term monitoring trajectories that are difficult to unwind.

Family courts: demeanour as data

The adversarial environment of family courts rewards calm delivery and penalises tangential or intense communication. That creates a **credibility trap** for adults with ADHD. Executive-function strain under stress can make speech faster, arguments less linear, and affect more visible — all of which can be misread as **instability**. Research on witness assessment shows that **emotionally expressive** individuals are systematically judged **less credible**, even when their accounts are accurate (for an overview of how demeanour biases credibility assessment, see this review of courtroom psychology: Vrij & Fisher, 2020). In the absence of routine, specialist ADHD expertise in court, demeanour continues to stand in for data

The MOD rule that time-caps treatment

No single UK standard reveals the gap between policy and science more clearly than the **Ministry of Defence** medical entry policy. The rulebook, **JSP 950** (Leaflet 6-7-7), treats ADHD under "hyperkinetic disorders" and **permits entry only if a candidate has been symptom-free and off medication for at least 12 months**, with corroboration of stability. Co-morbid common mental disorders or substance misuse are a bar (JSP 950 PDF, 2018 deposition). Data Parliament

On its face, this looks like a cautious, service-fit standard. In context, it's an artefact of **older assumptions**: that psychiatric medication masks rather than enables stability; that "true fitness" is proven in an **unmedicated state**; and that ADHD is primarily a behavioural condition of childhood, likely to remit. Contemporary clinical guidance says something different: **ADHD often persists** and **medication is frequently long-term and beneficial**, with ongoing review rather than planned withdrawal (NICE NG87 overview). NICE

The international picture rhymes with the UK's. The **United States** requires applicants to be symptom-free and **off ADHD medication for the previous 24 months** to meet accession standards, as set out in **DoD Instruction 6130.03, Volume 1** (May 28, 2024 version) — a more stringent bar than the UK's one-year rule. An earlier copy hosted on a U.S. Navy medical site shows the same core requirement (Nov 2022). esd.whs.mil+1

These policies **time-cap treatment** for accession while clinicians frame ongoing treatment as a **protective factor**. The contradiction matters because militaries and police forces are **norm-setting institutions**. When they equate medicated neurodivergence with risk, that logic often **spills over** into other public domains: safeguarding, employment vetting, and even court culture.

What the evidence actually shows about safety

The strongest population-level data point in the opposite direction to institutional fear. A landmark Swedish cohort study of more than **25,000** people with ADHD found that **criminal convictions were significantly lower during periods when individuals were on ADHD medication** (relative risk reductions of roughly a third, varying by sex and offence type) (New England Journal of Medicine, 2012; PubMed summary here). The plausible mechanism is straightforward: **improved executive control** lowers the probability of impulsive, high-stakes decisions. nejm.org+1

More recent registry analyses continue to associate treatment with reductions in **transport accidents**, **substance misuse** and other adverse outcomes; popular reporting has begun to catch up with the nuance, focusing not only on benefits to core symptoms but on **real-world risk reduction** (for a 2025 news summary of a large Swedish target-trial-emulation, see this report). While observational studies can't prove causation in the way randomised trials can, the **consistency** of findings across **large samples** is difficult to ignore. The Guardian

Put simply: the institutional assumption that **medication = vulnerability** is **not** what the best available evidence suggests. Properly managed treatment is more often a **safety intervention** than a risk.

Why systems keep getting ADHD wrong

1) Risk-first design

Public systems — policing, safeguarding, defence — are engineered to **avoid low-probability, high-impact failure**. That design ethos produces **conservative defaults**. When in doubt, the instinct is to exclude, escalate or delay. The costs of **over-caution** are diffuse and silent (lost careers, strained families); the costs of **under-caution** are visible and punished.

2) Knowledge gaps, especially in adult ADHD

For decades, formal training emphasised **child** ADHD, with little attention to adult presentations. Many frontline staff, lawyers and decision-makers learned about ADHD at a time when it was framed as a **behavioural problem**. Updating that knowledge has been slow. Clinically, **emotional dysregulation** is now recognised as common in adult ADHD; institutionally, **visible emotion** still reads as danger or unreliability.

3) The stickiness of old rules

Once encoded, **medical standards** change slowly. The MOD's accession language and the U.S. DoD's 24-month medication-free requirement are examples of **policy lag**. These documents often circulate, are cited in **FOI replies**, and become **templates** for other organisations' internal health criteria, especially for safety-critical roles. That's how a **legacy assumption** becomes **international common sense**.

4) Data that discourages disclosure

When employees suspect that disclosure leads to extra monitoring or stalled progression, **self-report rates plunge**. Low declared prevalence can then be cited as proof that ADHD is rare in the workforce — a circular justification for doing little to adapt processes (BTP's 0.78% neurodivergent declaration rate is illustrative of the mismatch with population prevalence). BTP

Global echoes and shared habits

The UK is not unique. Similar **medication-free** tests appear in accession standards abroad, notably in the **United States** (DoDI 6130.03, Vol. 1) and in requirements used by some **police services** in Australia and Canada for specific roles. Even where formal bans are absent, the **operational logic** converges: equate stability with **unassisted functioning**, treat stimulant therapy as a **confounder**, and translate clinical labels into **behavioural risk**. esd.whs.mil

What proportionate, evidence-based practice would look like

A risk-aware but **proportionate** approach would start from three premises:

First, ADHD is a **neurodevelopmental difference**, not a moral category. The **aim** of assessment should be to determine **functional capacity with treatment in place**, not to test whether a person can function **without** treatment against medical advice (NICE NG87). NICE

Second, where roles are safety-critical, **individualised, functional assessment** of performance under **stable treatment** is the appropriate test — the same principle already used for many **chronic physical conditions**. That approach puts the emphasis on **outcomes** (reaction times, judgment under stress, adherence to protocols), rather than on **labels**.

Third, information-sharing should be **contextualised**. The meaning of "impulsivity," "rapid speech" or "tearfulness" changes once **ADHD neurobiology** and **situational stressors** are

understood. Clinical descriptors must not be cut-and-pasted into risk templates **without** specialist interpretation.

The human texture behind the policy gaps

There are no transcripts quoted here and no single case to stand in for thousands of different lives. But the pattern is visible in the aggregate: adults who engage with services in good faith find themselves **re-described** by the system's paperwork; people who stabilise on treatment are asked to **prove stability without it**; parents whose minds run fast are recorded as **volatile**; professionals who disclose differences are invited into **long cycles of review**.

The effects compound. Income falls during investigations or periods of restricted practice. Legal and clinical costs rise. **Pension drawdowns** that were meant for later life become survival funds. Careers that rely on trust — frontline public service, safety-critical work, regulated practice — are especially vulnerable to a **single bureaucratic asterisk** that never seems to lift.

The cultural signal of all this is plain: **conformity equals safety**. Yet a great deal of public work gets done by people whose cognition does not conform — people who can hyper-focus when the pressure is high, who generate options quickly, who feel problems as much as they think them. Systems that cannot differentiate **emotionally visible** from **genuinely unsafe** will keep losing access to those capacities, not because of anything that happened, but because of what **might** happen.

What changes the story

This isn't a policy memo with a tidy checklist, and it doesn't end with a bullet-point plan. The route to better practice has been outlined many times by clinicians, advocates and some forward-looking services: **modernise standards**, **teach the science of adult ADHD**, **assess function under treatment**, **contextualise information-sharing**. Networks in the UK such as the ADHD Foundation and professional bodies including the Royal College of Psychiatrists have pressed the case; policing networks have begun to adapt adjustments and promotion processes in bounded ways (BTP neurodivergence FOI, 2025). Change is possible because it is already happening — just **unevenly**, and not yet in the places where symbolic rules set the tone for everyone else. BTP

What alters the lived experience most, however, is not a new form or a revised leaflet. It is a shift in **institutional imagination**. If systems can learn to see **treatment** as part of **competence**, to recognise **visible emotion** as a human signal rather than a hazard, and to interpret the word **"impulsivity"** with clinical precision instead of cultural fear, much of the

damage described here becomes avoidable. The thing many adults want from institutions is unremarkable: to be **assessed for what they can do, with the supports that work**, not continually re-tested for a kind of unsupported normality they do not — and need not — possess.

In that sense, the real measure of progress won't be found in a guidance footnote or an FOI response. It will be found in how ordinary the future can feel: when a diagnosis of ADHD no longer starts a file that shadows a person from office to office; when medication that steadies a life is read as a sign of **responsibility**, not suspicion; when the systems that exist to protect people can finally **tell the difference** between a risk and a way of being.

Sources and key documents (linked above)

- NICE Guideline NG87: ADHD—recognition, diagnosis and management. (Reviewed May 2025). NICE
- JSP 950, Joint Service Manual of Medical Fitness (Leaflet 6-7-7) (MOD medical entry policy; ADHD under hyperkinetic disorders). Data Parliament
- DoD Instruction 6130.03, Volume 1 (U.S. military accession standards; 24-month medication-free requirement). Also see archived/earlier copy. esd.whs.mil+1
- BTP FOI 01/FOI/24/2595: Employees with ADHD—recruitment points; BTP FOI 01/FOI/25/3413: Officer neurodivergence—adjustments; BTP FOI 01/FOI/24/2613: Declared neurodivergence %. BTP+2BTP+2
- Lichtenstein, P. et al. (2012). **Medication for ADHD and criminality**. *New England Journal of Medicine*. Article / PDF / PubMed. nejm.org+2nejm.org+2
- Contextual reporting on wider outcomes of ADHD treatment: news summary of 2025 Swedish registry analysis. The Guardian