Do working memory deficits cause social problems in ADHD? OPEN METHODS, OPEN DATA, AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

JOSEPH RAIKER, PH.D., MICHAEL KOFLER, PH.D., MILEINI CAMPEZ, M.S., KELCEY LITTLE, B.S.

"Crowdsource our experiment"



Correct Response Sequence



Good ideas we didn't use (but hope you will!)

- Use child confederate
- Manipulate group size, tasks involving more than 2 children
- Manipulate emotional valence of tasks
- Design alternate tasks



Social-working memory task development

		Working Memory			
		Low	High		
Modality	Verbal				
poM	Spatial				







Go!

Measuring social behavior

Peer ratings

- Self ratings
- Examiner (live global ratings)
 - ▶ Hoza et al. (2000)
- Observer (videotaped granular ratings)
 - Normand et al. positive/negative/neutral affect
 - Erhardt & Hinshaw (1994) codes (e.g., prosocial, non-compliance/disruption, verbal aggression)
 - Mikami et al. (2007) verbalization codes

1. What is y	our name?						
2. What is y	our partner's	name?					
			a scale from 1 to 7.				
1. How friendly	was the child	to you?	4	5	6	7	
Not at all	2	3	4 A little	5	6	Very friendly	
friendly			friendly			very menuly	
2.			includy				
	e child try ha	rd to work	together with you	12			
1	2	3	<u>a</u>	5	6	7	
Did not try	2	0	Tried a little	0	0	Tried very	
at all			inou u indo			hard	
	child try han	d to do goo	d on the games?				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Did not try	-	č	A little	5	č	Tried very	
at all			good			hard	
3. Was the child	good at pl	aying the a	ames?				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not good	_	-	A little	-	-	Very good	
Ű			good			, 0	
4. Was the child	good at co	ooperating	with you?				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not good			A little			Very good	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			good			, 0	
How happy w	as the child o	during the ga					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not happy			A little			Very happy	
			happy				
6. How frustrate					0		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not frustrated			A little frustrated			Very frustrated	
7. Was the child	I nice to you?		Indollated			ilusilateu	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not nice	-	Ũ	A little	Ū	Ū	Very nice	
			nice			10191100	
8. Did the child say mean things about themselves?							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
No			A few mean			A lot of	
			things			mean things	
9.							
a. Were things the child said <u>helpful for working together</u> ?							
	hings the chil	d said <u>helpf</u>	ul for working to	<u>ogetner</u> ?			
1	hings the chil 2	d said <u>helpf</u> 3	4	5	6	7	
1 No	-		4 A little	-	6	7 Very helpful	
No	2	3	4 A little helpful	5	6	7 Very helpful	
No b. Were t	2 hings the chil	3	4 A little helpful ful for playing th	5 <u>e games</u> ?		7 Very helpful	
No b. Were t	2	3	4 A little helpful ful for playing th 4	5	6	7	
No b. Were t	2 hings the chil	3	4 A little helpful ful for playing th 4 A little	5 <u>e games</u> ?		7 Very helpful 7 Very helpful	
No b. Were t	2 hings the chil	3	4 A little helpful ful for playing th 4	5 <u>e games</u> ?		7	

Feasibility of the dyadic socialworking memory tasks



Twenty-nine children were administered at least one task; however, the current results focus on the 24 children (12 dyads) who completed both versions (i.e., high WM, low WM) of the phonological and visuospatial tasks.

Feasibility of the dyadic social-working memory manipulation

- Scores reflect each child dyad's performance (not individual children)
- Averaged stimuli correct per trial across the first six trials (or fewer if dyad failed to complete six trials in 15 minutes)



Paired Samples T-Test

			statistic	df	р	Mean difference	SE difference	Cohen's d
PH Percent Correct (Low WM)	PH Percent Correct (High WM)	Student's t	11.8	23.0	< .001	0.507	0.0431	2.40
VS Percent Correct (Low WM)	VS Percent Correct (High WM)	Student's t	11.8	23.0	< .001	0.396	0.0336	2.40

Feasibility of examiner-rated social behavior

- Scores reflect each individual child
- Averaged across items loading on relevant factors (i.e., social effectiveness, frustration/helplessness; Pelham et al., 2001)
- Collapsed across PH and VS tasks so unclear if effect is different across modality
 - Currently recoding via videotape review



Paired Samples T-Test

			statistic	df	p	Mean difference	SE difference	Cohen's d
Social Effectiveness (Low WM)	Social Effectiveness (High WM)	Student's t	1.245	23.0	0.226	0.2521	0.202	0.254
Frustration/Helplessness (Low WM)	Frustration/Helplessness (High WM)	Student's t	-0.585	23.0	0.564	-0.0670	0.115	-0.119

Setting expectations How big of an effect can we reasonably expect?

Previous studies linking working memory & social problems in ADHD

- **β**= .18-.36
 - ▶ i.e., 1 SD change in WM = 0.18-0.36 SD change in social skills
- Estimated size of our WM manipulation
 - Cohen's d=2.40
 - ▶ i.e., 2.40 SD change in working memory from low to high condition
- Expected change in social behavior during low to high conditions (assuming WM/social correlation is fully causal)
 - Cohen's d = 0.43-0.86

Questions

What data do you want to see to be convinced that working memory manipulation was successful?

How to best analyze the dyadic WM task data?

- Different child pairing across conditions
- Feedback on peer, examiner (global), and observer (granular) coding schemes?
- Proposals for additional behavioral codes?
 - Opportunities for collaboration: Your coding scheme, our coders!
- Control group(s)? Cross-diagnosis dyads?

Experiment modifications?

Download materials & methods

[Open Science Framework (OSF) link here, will be available by time of presentation]

	Joe Raiker	Michael Kofler
	jraiker@fiu.edu	kofler@psy.fsu.edu
\bigcirc	palmlab.fiu.edu	psy.fsu.edu/clc
Y		@clinicalpsyence
f		facebook.com/childrenslearningclinic