

The Effects of Background White Noise on Memory Performance in Inattentive School Children

Göran B. W. Söderlund^{1,4*}, Sverker Sikström²⁾, Jan Morten Loftesnes³⁾, and

Edmund Sonuga-Barke^{4,5)}

¹⁾ Department of Linguistics, Stockholm University, Sweden

²⁾ Linné University, Växjö, Sweden

³⁾ Sogn and Fjordane University College, Norway

⁴⁾ University of Southampton, Dept. of Psychology, United Kingdom

⁵⁾ Department of Experimental Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University.

* Corresponding author

Dr Göran B. W. Söderlund, Department of Linguistics

Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

Phone: ++46 8 16 23 45

Email addresses:

GS: goran@ling.su.se

SS: sverker.sikstrom@lnu.se

JML: jan.loftesnes@hisf.no

ESB: ejb3@soton.ac.uk

Abstract

Background

Noise is typically conceived of as being detrimental for cognitive performance; however, a recent computational model based on the concepts of stochastic resonance and dopamine related internal noise postulates that a moderate amount of auditory noise benefit individuals in hypodopaminergic states. On the basis of this model we predicted that inattentive children would be enhanced by adding background white noise while attentive children's performance would deteriorate.

Methods

Fifty-one secondary school pupils carried out an episodic verbal free recall test in two noise conditions. In the high noise condition, verb-noun sentences were presented in the presence of auditory background noise (white noise, 78 dB), and in the low noise condition sentences were presented without noise.

Results

Exposure to background noise improved performance for inattentive children and deteriorated performance for attentive children and eliminated episodic memory differences between attentive and inattentive school children.

Conclusions

Consistent with the model, our data show that cognitive performance can be moderated by external background white noise stimulation in a non-clinical group of inattentive participants. This finding needs replicating in a larger sample using more noise levels but if replicated has great practical applications by offering a non-invasive help to improve school results in children with attentional problems.

Keywords:

Noise; attention; dopamine; cognitive performance; model; stochastic resonance; recall; episodic memory; children.

Background

It has long been known that cognitive processing is easily disturbed by incompatible environmental stimulation which distracts attention from the task [1]. This effect is believed to stem from competition for attentional resources between the distracting, and the target stimuli. Such negative distractor effects hold across a wide variety of tasks and stimuli as well as in different participant populations [2-6]. For some populations the effects are predicted to be especially strong. For instance, individuals with attentional problems such as attention deficit/ hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) are generally acknowledged to be more vulnerable to distraction than normal control children [7, 8].

At the same time there are reports of contradictory findings where certain types of task irrelevant noise actually improve the performance of children. Surprisingly, this effect seems most pronounced in children with attention deficits. Under certain circumstances children with attentional problems (including those with ADHD), rather than being distracted, actually benefit from background task-irrelevant noise presented concurrently with a target task. For instance, background music improved performance on a simple arithmetic task [9] and a continuous performance task (CPT) [10] for children with ADHD. More recently, Stansfeld et al. [11] found that under certain conditions road traffic noise can improve performance on episodic memory tasks, especially in children at risk for attentional problems and academic under-achievement. Research data from our group demonstrated that adding background white noise to the environment enhanced memory performance of children with ADHD [12].

Why these paradoxical effects should occur is not well understood.

Most accounts in the past, for example the optimal stimulation theory by Zentall and Zentall [13] and later models of cognitive energetic and motivational processes [14], have focused on the role of background stimulation as a generator of increased arousal which counteracts boredom. A recent computational model has attempted to explain these positive effects of background noise on performance in a different way [15]. This model combines two factors: (i) It explains how noise enhances attention and performance in general by the concept of stochastic resonance (SR) and (ii) explains why there are individual differences in the way noise affects the brain by a model of individual differences in dopamine.

Stochastic Resonance – how noise strengthens the signal: SR is a fundamental mechanism that contributes to the process of noise improved signaling. SR or noise-improved signaling is a well-established phenomenon across a range of experimental settings; SR exists in any threshold-based system with noise that requires passing of a threshold for the registering of a signal. SR can be observed in nature in any non-linear dynamical system, which is not working at its optimum, in particular SR has been found in the nervous system. The simplest examples of noise benefit can be seen in the detection of sensory signals. When a weak signal (e.g. a tone stimulus) is presented below the hearing threshold it becomes detectable when random or white noise is added to the signal. In essence, this account proposes that the additional variability provided by the noise interacts with the weak signal pushing it above the detection threshold [see 16 for a review]. SR has been found in several modalities; audition [17], vision [18], and touch [19] where stochastic noise improves sensory discriminability. Recently SR has been shown to work across modalities, for example when auditory noise improves visual signal detection [20]. Most SR studies

have used perception tasks, requiring the detection of weak peripheral sensory inputs. However few studies have examined how noise influences cognitive performance. Recent empirical evidence suggests that SR can also improve central processing and cognitive performance, for example, SR has been found in cognitive tasks where auditory noise improved the speed of arithmetic computations (Usher & Feingold, 2000) and visual memory recall [21]. Thus, adding noise to the input of information processing system can increase the signal-to-noise output of such systems. SR is usually quantified by plotting detection, or cognitive performance, as a function of noise intensity. This relationship follows an inverted U-curve function, where performance peaks at a moderate noise level. That is, moderate noise is beneficial for performance whereas too little, or too much, noise attenuates performance. For extensive reviews on the influence of noise on the nervous system the reader is referred to recent reviews [16, 22].

Individual differences in the SR effect: Dopamine is a neurotransmitter that modulates an neural cell response to its environment and determines the probability that it will fire to a stimulus [23]. Alterations in dopamine function are related to individual differences in attention [24, 25], cognition [26] and motivated behavior [27, 28]. Dopamine release has both tonic (background levels) and phasic (response to specific environmental events) components regulated by different brain regions [29, 30]. Tonic dopamine levels are suggested to modulate the phasic reactivity; a low tonic level increase stimulus dependent phasic release, and the opposite, a high tonic level suppress phasic release [31]. Low tonic levels cause neural instability associated with cognitive symptoms such as failure to sustain attention [32]. The hypodopaminergic state in ADHD is distinguished by low tonic dopamine levels leading to excessive reactivity to environmental stimulation [33, 34].

If the firing probability or gain parameter is low, neurons fire at random yielding poor cognitive performance and the opposite also occurs with a high gain yielding cognitive stability and thus high performance. This responsiveness of neurons is modulated through dopamine that enhances the differentiation between background, efferent firing and afferent external stimulation.

It has been shown recently that neural noise related to dopamine tone is an integral part of inter-neuronal communication and that a sufficient level of noise may be necessary for normal function of the nervous system [22, 35], through the process of SR. That is, there exists both external noise – outside of the nervous system – and neural noise (related to dopamine tone) inside the system. The moderate brain arousal model (MBA) [15], is a neurocomputational model that relies on classic conditions for stochastic resonance and the modulating properties of dopamine-related gain and neural noise in neural responsivity. It suggests that hypodopaminergic brains need higher input noise to function at their full potential. Thus the model suggests that external white noise could compensate for behavioral dysfunction connected to conditions caused by impaired dopamine transmission. Accordingly, ADHD children have a low gain parameter owing to low levels of baseline dopamine neuron firing. Neurocomputationally the MBA model shows that more external environmental noise is required for optimal performance in cognitive tasks in ADHD children (low gain) compared to normally developed (high gain). Accordingly, the external noise will compensate for reduced neural background activity (noise) in ADHD; increased levels of external auditive noise can activate internal noise and restore the activity level. Further, given the inverted U function that operates in relation to noise and performance in SR, it also predicts that levels of background noise that might be beneficial for ADHD children would be detrimental

for those with normal attention. Crucially, the beneficial effects are not specific to ADHD (Figure 1): they are also found in dopamine-related neurodegenerative disorders such as: akinesia [36], Parkinson's disease [37] and in aging [38]. These effects have been modeled in terms of age dependent dopamine loss [39].

In this paper we investigate, for the first time, how noise influence cognitive performance in a normal, non-clinical, group of children that differ from each other in their attentional abilities. Recent evidence suggests that dopamine plays a role in attention also in non-clinical groups. When a visual orienting task was used to study a normal group of children, it was found that those children who were homozygous for alleles influencing dopamine transportation displayed inattention on left-hand sided stimuli, whereas those who were heterozygotes did not [40]. The response to amphetamine has also been found to be influenced by genetic factors; it depends on the functional polymorphisms of the Catechol O-methyltransferase (COMT) gene in a normal population of humans. Mattay et al. [41] found that amphetamine enhanced prefrontal efficiency measured by fMRI for the val/val (high DA metabolism) genotype, whereas met/met (low DA metabolism), had no such effect on low to medium workload, and decreased efficiency on high workload tasks. Furthermore, preservation errors were decreased by amphetamine in the val/val, but not the met/met groups, in a Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST). In another study on healthy controls by Mattay et al. (2000) dextroamphetamine was found to increase N-back working memory performance in group with low baseline working-memory capacity, whereas the performance worsened in a group with high baseline performance [42]. Dextroamphetamine also had differential effects on the BOLD fMRI response on these groups. These findings have been corroborated in a study using a spatial working memory task where stimulant medication only improved

memory performance in healthy individuals with low baseline working memory capacity [43]. This was also mirrored by increased cerebral blood flow in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and posterior parietal cortex. Taken together these studies indicate that dopamine influences performance and brain activity differently also in groups consisting of healthy controls depending on tasks that are linked to attention and working memory (e.g., WCST, N-back, spatial working memory). This body of data is consistent with the view that ADHD is best conceptualized as a continuum rather than a discrete category and that ADHD symptoms are distributed in populations [44]. The syndrome of ADHD represents a transition of degree rather than of a kind and diagnostic thresholds are therefore somewhat arbitrary resting on general and cultural norms about behavior and development [45]. In addition, a comparison of the extreme points in a normal distribution shows the same heritability patterns as a comparison between ADHD and control [46]. This, in turn, suggests that non-clinical persons with low and high attention may show similar effect from noise as ADHD and control persons do.

In this paper, we study inattentive and normally attentive children's episodic memory in a verb-noun sentence recall task under two conditions varying in terms of the levels of background auditive white noise. Our prediction is that in the low noise condition the inattentive children will perform inferior to the attentive children and in the high noise condition these differences should disappear as noise benefits the inattentive but not the normally attentive children.

Methods

Participants

Fifty-one secondary school pupils (25 boys and 26 girls) between 11-12 years (M=11.7) participated in the study. The group consisted of children from two school classes, year seven (86% of children participated). Participants were divided into two groups depending on their attention ability, as assessed on a seven point Likert scale. Attention was evaluated by their teachers. The assessment scale is the same that was used in the longitudinal research program *Individual Development and Adaptation* [47]. Participants that scored high (6 or 7, having severe problems in the class room) on inattention were assigned to the inattentive group. This group consisted of 10 participants, 6 of them also scored high on hyperactivity as evaluated by the teachers. The comparison group comprised the remaining 41 children that scored 5 or lower at the scale, and were assessed as average- or highly attentive. None of the inattentive group had an ADHD diagnosis and none were treated with medication. Achievements and scholastic skills (3 point scale) and reading ability [7 point scale; 47] were also rated by their teachers. Children's school achievement was assessed in terms of whether their school performance was at the level expected for the age group. General cognitive skills and reasoning ability was assessed using the Raven's progressive matrices test [48]. The Raven's test assesses learning and problem solving ability and correlates highly with the g-factor in IQ tests. Finally, a forward and a backward digit span test were conducted, which measures short-term and working memory respectively. Table 1 shows the results from these tests divided into the high and low attentive group and other background characteristics. The groups were well matched

on school performance and general cognitive ability the inattentive group had less developed reading skills.

*** INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE ***

Design

The design was 2 x 2, where noise levels (low versus high) was the within participant manipulation and the between group variable was teacher rated classroom attention level (normal versus inattentive).

Materials

All participants undertook a verbal episodic recall test. The to-be-remembered (TBR) items consisted of 96 sentences divided into 8 separate lists with 12 verb-noun sentences in each list. Each sentence consisted of a unique verb and a unique noun (e.g., “roll the ball”) in Swedish. The sentences were placed in random order. List-order (1-8) and condition-order (no noise vs. noise) were counterbalanced and noise was present on every second list. All to-be-remembered sentences were recorded on a CD. A new item was read every 9th second. The sentences were read in both the low noise and the high noise condition. The equivalent continuous sound level of the white noise and the speech signal was 78 and 86 dB, respectively and the signal-to-noise ratio was 8 dB. The signal was sufficiently strong so that all participants could errorless perceive the content of the words in both conditions (i.e., the tests were a cognitive memory test and not a perceptual test). The two noise levels were chosen to correspond to levels where earlier studies have found effect of SR on cognition in an arithmetic’s test for a normal population [49] and on working memory for Alzheimer patients [4]. Recordings were made in a sound studio.

Procedure

The testing was conducted at the child's school, following permission from parents and children. University College of Sogndal, Norway and the regional ethic board in Stockholm approved the study. The participants were tested individually in a room during the school day. The test lasted for about 45 minutes including instructions. Before starting the experiment proper, two practice sentences were presented. The time taken to present each list was approximately 1 minute and 40 seconds. The noise exposure was continuous during the encoding phase and was present every second list; no noise was present during retrieval. Directly after presentation of the last item in a list, participants performed a free recall test in which they spoke out loud as many sentences as possible, in any order.

Results

Recall performance

A 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was conducted with one between-subject factor, Group (normal attention vs inattentive) and one within-subjects factor, encoding condition (low noise vs high noise). We choose the standard scoring procedure in the action memory literature [12, 50], where strict scoring are used for the nouns (exact matches were required) and lenient scoring are used for verbs (where non-exact matches are scored as correct). This is because nouns are typically recalled somewhat better compared to verbs [51]. There were no main effects of noise ($F(49,1) = .01, p = .94$) or group ($F(49,1) = .30, p = .59$) both groups performed at the same level overall across the two conditions. However, the interaction between noise and group was significant ($F(49,1) = 9.96, p = .003, \eta^2 = .17$) (Fig 2). This interaction was further explored with planned simple contrasts for the within subjects factors, using paired

sample t-tests. Consistent with the hypothesis addition of white noise enhanced performance for the inattentive group ($M = .39$ vs. $.44$), and impaired performance for the attentive group ($M = .46$ vs. $.41$). Inattentive children performed better in the high rather than the low noise condition ($t(9) = 1.84, p = .05$ one-tailed). The opposite was the case for the normally attentive group ($t(40) = -3.46, p = .001$).

*** Insert Figure 1 about here ***

As reported above the two groups differed with respect to reading skills, as judged by teachers; with the inattentive group possessed inferior reading skills compared to the attentive group. However, when reading ability was added as a covariate to the main analysis the original interaction effect, although diminished, persisted ($F(48,1) = 7.13, p = .010$), even though reading level was independently related to performance ($F(6,1) = 1.46, p = .213$). A Spearman's rank order correlation revealed negative correlation between reader skills and positive effect of noise ($r = .335, N = 51, p = .016$), a positive correlation between attention and reading ability ($r = .498, N = 51, p < .001$) and finally, a high positive correlation between teacher ratings of inattention and hyperactivity ($r = .789, N = 51, p < .001$).

Discussion

We have proposed a framework for understanding individual difference in the facilitative effects of auditory white noise on performance. As predicted the results show different effects of noise in attentive and inattentive children selected from the normal population. There was significant improvement in performance for the

children rated as inattentive by their teachers, and a significant decline in performance for those rated as attentive. Furthermore these effects seem independent of other factors measured in the study – attentional ability seems to be a key marker of this effect. These results are similar to those previously reported with ADHD patients [12]. Here we discuss theoretical and practical implications of these findings.

From a theoretical point of view the findings are consistent with the suggestion that the neural noise level associated with dopamine tone in inattentive children is sub-optimal (see also Sikström & Söderlund, 2007) and that noise may enhance performance through the phenomenon of stochastic resonance (SR). According to our view, noise in the environment yields an input to the perceptual system, which can either compensate for low noise in the neural system leading to an output consisting of improved cognitive performance, or, depending on pre-existing levels of neural noise, can add too much to an already well functioning system. The specific neuro-biological and neuro-chemical mechanisms responsible for these effects need further research. For instance, auditive white noise may have its effects either at a perceptual or neuro-psychological level or may operate a neuro-chemical level directly altering levels of dopamine release [15, 52]. Animal models of dopamine function or pharmacological probes to manipulate tonic and phasic dopamine are called for to investigate these effects.

Stimulant medication (e.g. methylphenidate) also improves cognitive performance in children with ADHD [53, 54]. This medication increases dopamine levels by blocking the dopamine transporter [55]. Low performing healthy controls also benefit from increased dopamine transmission, which is manifested in improved cognitive performance and increased prefrontal cortical activity [43]. Our data show that auditory white noise exerts potentially similar effects on cognition as medication

through the phenomenon of stochastic resonance (SR). Noise is characterized by randomness, and introduces variability in the nervous system [16]. A poorly tuned neural system benefit from noise. In fact, the stochastic resonance theory predicts that noise that is applied to the signal as an input to a neural cell, improves the signaling efficiency of the output of the cell, where the non-linearity in the firing threshold of the neural cells is the key to improvement of the signal to noise ratio [16, 56].

Despite the fact that it appears that noise and methylphenidate improves cognitive performance, the underlying mechanism that is the basis of these phenomena are likely to be different. Theoretically speaking the difference between these phenomena is clear. Methylphenidate changes the strength (but not the variability) of the input, which is typically modeled by the gain parameter in abstract neural networks [23]. In contrast, noise changes the variability of the input (but per definition does not influence the strength) of the input. However, despite these clear differences in the underlying level, the behavioral outcome may be similar, and the two mechanisms interact in a complex way, making it difficult to distinguish the phenomena at the behavioral level [57]. Furthermore, direct evidence of difference between these levels is emerging. Pålsson and Söderlund et al. [58] studied the effect of methylphenidate, dopamine and noise on the startle response in a rat model of ADHD. They found that both control and ADHD strains (SHR) benefited from noise; however, this effect was also found in dopamine lesioned rats, suggesting that dopamine is not a necessary requirement for the stochastic resonance phenomenon to occur.

Another theoretical interpretation of the data is that noise in a general way increase arousal that makes the subject more alert, and less drowsy. The optimal stimulation model states that hyperactivity is as a homeostatic response to

underarousal in order to achieve an optimal arousal level [13]. However, this model does not make any explicit predictions about the selective effects of external stimulation whereas in the current study inattentive persons benefited from extra stimulation and attentive children did not. In the cognitive energetic model state factors like arousal, activation and effort are taken into account to explain shortcomings in ADHD patients [59]. According to this model state factors can be moderated by event rate (inter-stimulus-intervals, ISI) and workload in cognitive tasks both under- and over arousal can be produced. Recent research has shown that stimulant medication (methylphenidate) and shortened event rate can produce the same effect in a Go-Nogo task [60]. From our point of view the term arousal is poorly defined in the literature, and could be interpreted in terms of wakefulness or in term of neural arousal. To fully investigate the arousal-noise hypothesis an experiment would have to be designed where arousal is explicitly manipulated and measured. We argue that that proposed framework, including the dopaminergic influence on stochastic resonance, provides a more elaborated view both at the neural and at the behavioral level. To account for the current data an arousal view would have to argue for a selective lower arousal for the inattentive children. Finally, our experience is that the subjects in our experiment are fully aroused, the testing condition at hand are very stimulating, and subjects are very motivated to perform well.

By highlighting the role of individual differences in the facilitative effects of auditive noise the current study refines our understanding of SR. SR exhibits an inverted U-curve function, where performance peaks at a moderate noise level. However, this is an oversimplification, as there is no absolute sense in which a moderate noise level is optimal. An “optimal” noise level for one individual could be either too high, or too low amount of noise for another individual. These complex

interactions between noise and performance may account for some of the contradictory findings in the previous literature. For example, earlier research on noise in normal populations has shown both enhancing and detrimental effects of auditory white noise on cognition in non-clinical groups (90 dB) on simpler, short-term memory tasks like anagrams, whereas speech noise was detrimental [61]. These noise effects also interacted with other variables such as gender and time of the day [62], which makes these results equivocal. No effect of white noise was found in digit span recall in two experiments, whereas speech noise had a detrimental effect [4, 5]. However, noise improvement was found in a simple addition task in selected groups, elderly and young participants [63] and among elderly and Alzheimer patients [4]. In Broadbent's early research negative effects of noise have been found using high (excessive) noise levels around 100 dB [64-66]. In later experiments by Broadbent and colleagues, (word recall tasks) lower noise levels (80-85 dB) were used; results showed no effects of noise when exposed during the encoding phase but deteriorating results if exposed during the recall phase [67, 68]. More recently, episodic memory has been found to be particularly vulnerable to speech noise, whereas traffic noise showed no effect [2]. Results from the present study would indicate that the effects of external noise would have look quite different in many of these studies if participants had been divided into attentive and inattentive or young and elderly, that is high and low gain participants (tentatively high / low dopamine groups). Selective effects of noise can easily get hidden in group-means if some participants improve and others are impaired. Our data may encourage noise researchers to reanalyze their experiments dividing participants by individual differences in attention and performance. Preliminary data from our lab, on an ADHD rat model provide further support for noise benefit. The Spontaneous hypertensive rat (SHR) showed improved

sensorymotor gating by showing more a pronounced pre-pulse inhibition of the startle reflex when exposed to white noise as compared to control strains, even though control rats also increased their inhibition in noise conditions (Pålsson, Söderlund et al., submitted).

Reading disability is a common co-morbidity in ADHD. Consistent with these findings, our data show lower reading skill for the inattentive group. Reading disability is also linked with reduced short-term verbal memory that requires phonetic coding of material, but not necessarily with executive functions or long-term memory [69, 70]. This is also consistent with our data that show a lower performance in the digits forward task that measures short-term memory, but no deficits for digits backward task that is related to working memory capacity. The MBA model accounts for these findings because the digits backward task is a more demanding task leading to higher brain arousal and thus good performance for inattentive children, whereas the less demanding digit forwards task does not sufficiently arouse the brain for the low attention children [15]. Additionally, the positive correlation between reading ability and noise enhancement suggests that noise enhances phonemic awareness. This is consistent with the idea that dyslexia is caused by phonological deficits [71], however, a further investigation of phonologic awareness is outside the scope of the present study.

Limitations

The current study has a number of limitations. First, ratings of academic attainment and reading were based on single item non-validated scales. Second, only two noise levels were investigated. It would be interesting to include different levels so that the entire stochastic resonance curve can be mapped out. One prediction from our model

is that in attentive group, a subset of participants will benefit from noise when levels are individually adjusted. Furthermore, it would be of interest to investigate if the SR effect depends on tasks that puts different demands on cognitive control. Third, only one test of cognitive ability was tested. Future research may study whether the effects found here generalizes to other tasks such as executive and inhibitory functions. This is of particular importance while investigating the possibility of noise, as an intervention in ADHD. A final limitation of the present study is that the experiment was not designed to study differential effects of noise on study and recall. The experiment manipulates noise at encoding, but not at retrieval, so the effects of noise seen can only be attributed to the conditions at encoding. To what extent noise presented at recall influences performance cannot be determined by the experiment. However, the MBA predicts that the conditions where noise is beneficial during encoding should also be beneficial for performance during retrieval. At same time it may be difficult to directly compare encoding and retrieval conditions, because the task demand for encoding task may differ from the demands at retrieval.

Conclusions

In summary, the present study suggests that cognitive performance can be moderated by external stimulation in a non-clinical group of teacher rated inattentive participants. This finding could have great practical applications offering a non-invasive help to improve school results in children with attentional problems.

Increasing the awareness of this phenomenon in teachers' opens up for a possibility of more efficient learning. In particular awareness should be raised regarding the possibility that the environment has be individually adjusted to the need of the

children, where inattentive children in a normal population show noise benefit when performing cognitive tasks. In our data these effects eliminated the differences between high performing, attentive and low performing inattentive children. The possibility that attention can be improved by the addition of carefully controlled levels of white noise into ones environment is potentially of major practical significance. Currently ADHD children are treated successful with medication, where environmental stimulation could be seen as a complementary method to deal with inattentive problems. This could be of particular importance for the significant population of parents that are at unease with medication. Environmental stimulation could provide a compelling complement in the future.

Competing interests

The authors G. Söderlund, S. Sikström and, J-M. Loftesnes declare that they have no competing interest.

Financial disclosures and conflicts of interest statement E. Sonuga-Barke:

Recent speaker board: Shire, UCB Pharma

Current & recent consultancy: UCB Pharma, Shire

Current & recent research support: Janssen Cilag, Shire, Qbtech, Flynn Pharma

Advisory Board: Shire, Flynn Pharma, UCB Pharma, Astra Zeneca

Conference support: Shire

Authors' contributions

GS planned and designed the experiment, performed the statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript. SS have been involved in drafting and revision of the manuscript. LML was responsible for the data collection. ESB have been involved in revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The study was supported by the Swedish Research Council, grant VR 421-2007-2479.

References

1. Broadbent DE: **The effects of noise on behaviour.** In. Elmsford, NY, US: Pergamon Press, Inc; 1958
2. Boman E, Enmarker I, Hygge S: **Strength of noise effects on memory as a function of noise source and age.** *Noise Health* 2005, **7**:11-26.
3. Hygge S, Boman E, Enmarker I: **The effects of road traffic noise and meaningful irrelevant speech on different memory systems.** *Scandinavian Journal Psychology* 2003, **44**:13-21.
4. Belleville S, Rouleau N, Van der Linden M, Collette F: **Effect of manipulation and irrelevant noise on working memory capacity of patients with Alzheimer's dementia.** *Neuropsychology* 2003, **17**:69-81.
5. Rouleau N, Belleville S: **Irrelevant speech effect in aging: an assessment of inhibitory processes in working memory.** *The Journals of Gerontology Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 1996, **51**:P356-363.
6. Shidara M, Richmond BJ: **Effect of visual noise on pattern recognition.** *Exp Brain Res* 2005, **163**:239-241.
7. Corbett B, Stanczak DE: **Neuropsychological performance of adults evidencing Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.** *Archives in Clinical Neuropsychology* 1999, **14**:373-387.
8. Geffner D, Lucker JR, Koch W: **Evaluation of auditory discrimination in children with ADD and without ADD.** *Child Psychiatry & Human Development* 1996, **26**:169-180.
9. Abikoff H, Courtney ME, Szeibel PJ, Koplewicz HS: **The effects of auditory stimulation on the arithmetic performance of children with ADHD and nondisabled children.** *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 1996, **29**:238-246.

10. Gerjets P, Graw T, Heise E, Westermann R, Rothenberger A: **Deficits of action control and specific goal intentions in hyperkinetic disorder. II: Empirical results/Handlungskontrolldefizite und störungsspezifische Zielintentionen bei der Hyperkinetischen Störung: II: Empirische Befunde.** *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie: Forschung und Praxis* 2002, **31**:99-109.
11. Stansfeld SA, Berglund B, Clark C, Lopez-Barrio I, Fischer P, Ohrstrom E, Haines MM, Head J, Hygge S, van Kamp I, Berry BF: **Aircraft and road traffic noise and children's cognition and health: a cross-national study.** *Lancet* 2005, **365**:1942-1949.
12. Söderlund GBW, Sikström S, Smart A: **Listen to the noise: Noise is beneficial for cognitive performance in ADHD.** *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2007, **48**:840-847.
13. Zentall SS, Zentall TR: **Optimal stimulation: A model of disordered activity and performance in normal and deviant children.** *Psychological Bulletin* 1983, **94**:446-471.
14. Sonuga-Barke EJ, Wiersma JR, van der Meere JJ, Roeyers H: **Context-dependent Dynamic Processes in Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: Differentiating Common and Unique Effects of State Regulation Deficits and Delay Aversion.** *Neuropsychol Rev* 2009.
15. Sikström S, Söderlund GBW: **Stimulus-dependent dopamine release in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder.** *Psychological Review* 2007, **114**:1047-1075.

16. Moss F, Ward LM, Sannita WG: **Stochastic resonance and sensory information processing: a tutorial and review of application.** *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2004, **115**:267-281.
17. Zeng FG, Fu QJ, Morse R: **Human hearing enhanced by noise.** *Brain Research* 2000, **869**:251-255.
18. Simonotto E, Spano F, Riani M, Ferrari A, Levero F, Pilot A, Renzetti P, Parodi RC, Sardanelli F, Vitali P, et al: **fMRI studies of visual cortical activity during noise stimulation.** *Neurocomputing: An International Journal Special double volume: Computational neuroscience: Trends in research 1999* 1999, **26-27**:511-516.
19. Wells C, Ward LM, Chua R, Timothy Inglis J: **Touch noise increases vibrotactile sensitivity in old and young.** *Psychological Science* 2005, **16**:313-320.
20. Manjarrez E, Mendez I, Martinez L, Flores A, Mirasso CR: **Effects of auditory noise on the psychophysical detection of visual signals: cross-modal stochastic resonance.** *Neurosci Lett* 2007, **415**:231-236.
21. Wilkinson D, Nicholls S, Pattenden C, Kilduff P, Milberg W: **Galvanic vestibular stimulation speeds visual memory recall.** *Exp Brain Res* 2008, **189**:243-248.
22. McDonnell MD, Stocks NG, Abbott D: **Optimal stimulus and noise distributions for information transmission via suprathreshold stochastic resonance.** *Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys* 2007, **75**:061105.
23. Servan-Schreiber D, Printz H, Cohen JD: **A network model of catecholamine effects: gain, signal-to-noise ratio, and behavior.** *Science* 1990, **249**:892-895.

24. Servan-Schreiber D, Bruno RM, Carter CS, Cohen JD: **Dopamine and the mechanisms of cognition: Part I. A neural network model predicting dopamine effects on selective attention.** *Biological Psychiatry* 1998, **43**:713-722.
25. Prince J: **Catecholamine dysfunction in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: an update.** *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2008, **28**:S39-45.
26. Braver TS, Barch DM: **A theory of cognitive control, aging cognition, and neuromodulation.** *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2002, **26**:809-817.
27. Wise RA: **Dopamine, learning and motivation.** *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 2004, **5**:483-494.
28. Grace AA, Floresco SB, Goto Y, Lodge DJ: **Regulation of firing of dopaminergic neurons and control of goal-directed behaviors.** *Trends Neurosci* 2007, **30**:220-227.
29. Goto Y, Otani S, Grace AA: **The Yin and Yang of dopamine release: a new perspective.** *Neuropharmacology* 2007, **53**:583-587.
30. Floresco SB, West AR, Ash B, Moore H, Grace AA: **Afferent modulation of dopamine neuron firing differentially regulates tonic and phasic dopamine transmission.** *Nature Neuroscience* 2003, **6**:968-973.
31. Grace AA: **Phasic versus tonic dopamine release and the modulation of dopamine system responsivity: a hypothesis for the etiology of schizophrenia.** *Neuroscience* 1991, **41**:1-24.
32. Bilder RM, Volavka J, Lachman HM, Grace AA: **The catechol-O-methyltransferase polymorphism: relations to the tonic-phasic dopamine hypothesis and neuropsychiatric phenotypes.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2004, **29**:1943-1961.

33. Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Fowler JS, Ding YS: **Imaging the effects of methylphenidate on brain dopamine: new model on its therapeutic actions for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder.** *Biological Psychiatry* 2005, **57**:1410-1415.
34. Seamans JK, Yang CR: **The principal features and mechanisms of dopamine modulation in the prefrontal cortex.** *Prog Neurobiol* 2004, **74**:1-58.
35. Ghosh A, Rho Y, McIntosh AR, Kotter R, Jirsa VK: **Noise during rest enables the exploration of the brain's dynamic repertoire.** *PLoS Comput Biol* 2008, **4**:e1000196.
36. Pan W, Soma R, Kwak S, Yamamoto Y: **Improvement of motor functions by noisy vestibular stimulation in central neurodegenerative disorders.** *J Neurol* 2008, **255**:1657-1661.
37. Yamamoto Y, Struzik ZR, Soma R, Ohashi K, Kwak S: **Noisy vestibular stimulation improves autonomic and motor responsiveness in central neurodegenerative disorders.** *Ann Neurol* 2005, **58**:175-181.
38. Priplata AA, Niemi JB, Harry JD, Lipsitz LA, Collins JJ: **Vibrating insoles and balance control in elderly people.** *Lancet* 2003, **362**:1123-1124.
39. Li SC, von Oertzen T, Lindenberger U: **A neurocomputational model of stochastic resonance and aging.** *Neurocomputing* 2006, **69**:1553-1560.
40. Bellgrove MA, Chambers CD, Johnson KA, Daibhis A, Daly M, Hawi Z, Lambert D, Gill M, Robertson IH: **Dopaminergic genotype biases spatial attention in healthy children.** *Mol Psychiatry* 2007, **12**:786-792.
41. Mattay VS, Goldberg TE, Fera F, Hariri AR, Tessitore A, Egan MF, Kolachana B, Callicott JH, Weinberger DR: **Catechol O-methyltransferase**

- val158-met genotype and individual variation in the brain response to amphetamine.** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the U S A* 2003, **100**:6186-6191.
42. Mattay VS, Callicott JH, Bertolino A, Heaton I, Frank JA, Coppola R, Berman KF, Goldberg TE, Weinberger DR: **Effects of dextroamphetamine on cognitive performance and cortical activation.** *Neuroimage* 2000, **12**:268-275.
43. Mehta MA, Owen AM, Sahakian BJ, Mavaddat N, Pickard JD, Robbins TW: **Methylphenidate enhances working memory by modulating discrete frontal and parietal lobe regions in the human brain.** *J Neurosci* 2000, **20**:RC65.
44. Sonuga-Barke EJ, Halperin JM: **Early developmental phenotypes and causal pathways in attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder: towards the identification of putative targets and potential treatments for early intervention.** *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry* 2010.
45. Timimi S, Taylor E: **ADHD is best understood as a cultural construct.** *Br J Psychiatry* 2004, **184**:8-9.
46. Gjone H, Stevenson J, Sundet JM: **Genetic influence on parent-reported attention-related problems in a Norwegian general population twin sample.** *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1996, **35**:588-596; discussion 596-588.
47. Bergman LR, Andershed AK: **Predictors and outcomes of persistent or age-limited registered criminal behavior: a 30-year longitudinal study of a Swedish urban population.** *Aggress Behav* 2009, **35**:164-178.

48. Raven JC: *Coloured Progressive Matrices*. Oxford: Oxford Psychological Press; 1995.
49. Usher M, Feingold M: **Stochastic resonance in the speed of memory retrieval**. *Biological Cybernetics* 2000, **83**:L11-16.
50. Nilsson LG: **Remembering actions and words**. In *The Oxford handbook of memory*. Edited by Tulving E, Craik FIM; 2000: 137-148
51. Engelkamp J: **Modality-specific encoding and word class in verbal learning**. In *Practical aspects of memory: Current research and issues, Vol 1: Memory in everyday life*. Edited by Gruneberg MM, Morris PE. Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons; 1988: 415-420
52. Vicente-Torres MA, Munoz E, Davila D, Gil-Loyzaga P: **Changes in the cochlear dopaminergic system of the aged rat**. *Brain Res* 2001, **917**:112-117.
53. Boonstra AM, Kooij JJ, Oosterlaan J, Sergeant JA, Buitelaar JK: **Does methylphenidate improve inhibition and other cognitive abilities in adults with childhood-onset ADHD?** *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* 2005, **27**:278-298.
54. Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Fowler JS, Telang F, Maynard L, Logan J, Gatley SJ, Pappas N, Wong C, Vaska P, et al: **Evidence that methylphenidate enhances the saliency of a mathematical task by increasing dopamine in the human brain**. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 2004, **161**:1173-1180.
55. Volkow ND, Fowler JS, Wang G, Ding Y, Gatley SJ: **Mechanism of action of methylphenidate: insights from PET imaging studies**. *Journal of Attention Disorders* 2002, **6 Suppl 1**:S31-43.

56. Stein RB, Gossen ER, Jones KE: **Neuronal variability: noise or part of the signal?** *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2005, **6**:389-397.
57. Li SC, Sikström S: **Integrative neurocomputational perspectives on cognitive aging, neuromodulation, and representation.** *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 2002, **26**:795-808.
58. Pålsson E, Söderlund GBW, Klamér D, Bergquist F: **Effects of Noise on Pre-pulse Inhibition in the Spontaneous Hypertensive Rat.** submitted.
59. Sergeant JA: **Modeling attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a critical appraisal of the cognitive-energetic model.** *Biological Psychiatry* 2005, **57**:1248-1255.
60. van der Meere JJ, Shalev RS, Borger N, Wiersema JR: **Methylphenidate, Interstimulus Interval, and Reaction Time Performance of Children with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A Pilot Study.** *Child Neuropsychol* 2009:1-13.
61. Baker MA, Holding DH: **The effects of noise and speech on cognitive task performance.** *The Journal of General Psychology* 1993, **120**:339-355.
62. Holding DH, Baker MA: **Toward meaningful noise research.** *The Journal of General Psychology* 1987, **114**:395-410.
63. Harrison DW, Kelly PL: **Age differences in cardiovascular and cognitive performance under noise conditions.** *Perception and Motor Skills* 1989, **69**:547-554.
64. Broadbent DE: **Noise, paced performance and vigilance tasks.** *British Journal of Psychology* 1953, **44**:295-303.
65. Broadbent DE: **Some effects of noise on visual performance.** *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 1954, **6**:1-5.

66. Broadbent DE: **The twenty dials and twenty lights test under noise conditions.** *Medical Research Council, Applied Psychology Research Unit Report* 1951, **160:8.**
67. Smith AP, Broadbent DE: **The effects of noise on recall and recognition of instances of categories.** *Acta Psychologica* 1982, **51:257-271.**
68. Smith AP, Jones DM, Broadbent DE: **The effects of noise on recall of categorized lists.** *British Journal of Psychology* 1981, **72:299-316.**
69. Willcutt EG, Pennington BF, Boada R, Ogline JS, Tunick RA, Chhabildas NA, Olson RK: **A comparison of the cognitive deficits in reading disability and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder.** *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 2001, **110:157-172.**
70. Kibby MY, Cohen MJ: **Memory functioning in children with reading disabilities and/or attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a clinical investigation of their working memory and long-term memory functioning.** *Child Neuropsychol* 2008, **14:525-546.**
71. Papageorgiou C, Giannakakis GA, Nikita KS, Anagnostopoulos D, Papadimitriou GN, Rabavilas A: **Abnormal auditory ERP N100 in children with dyslexia: comparison with their control siblings.** *Behav Brain Funct* 2009, **5:26.**

Figures

Figure 1: Individual difference in SR curves

Note. Performance on cognitive tests (y-axis) is optimal for moderate noise levels (x-axis), and attenuated for both too low and too high noise levels. More noise is required for optimal performance in inattentive or low performing children compared to attentive or high performing children.

Figure 2: Recall performance as a function of noise and attention; inattentive vs. attentive children (teachers judgments: attentive N= 41; inattentive: N= 10).

Tables

Table 1: Participant characteristics and cognitive test scores

Cognitive and behavioral measures	Attentive group N = 41 <i>(20 boys, 21 girls)</i>		Inattentive group N = 10 <i>(5 boys, 5 girls)</i>		Attentive vs. Inattentive		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	t-test score
Inattention <i>(1 = low, 7 = high)</i>	2.8	(1.6)	1 – 7	6.2	(0.4)	1 – 7	t(49)= 6.67***
Hyperactivity <i>(1 = low, 7 = high)</i>	2.5	(1.6)	1 – 7	4.9	(2.0)	1 – 7	t(49)= 4.11***
School performance <i>(1= below, 2= average, 3= above)</i>	2.3	(0.7)	1 - 3	2.1	(0.7)	1 - 3	t(49)= 0.94
Reading skill <i>(1 = low, 7 = high)</i>	5.0	(2.0)	1 - 7	3.5	(1.7)	1 - 7	t(49)= 2.38*
Raven score	41.2	(8.6)	16 - 55	37.3	(10.6)	19 - 53	t(49)= 1.09
Digits forward	23.1	(9.1)	4 - 42	15.0	(6.6)	4 - 23	t(49)= 3.22**
Digits backwards	14.9	(6.9)	2 - 34	13.2	(4.2)	7 - 18	t(49)= 0.97

*Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001*