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NF and ADHD study (brief overview)

• 11 participants with ADHD
• 16 sessions; no control group
• Assessments: Conners Adult ADHD Rating Scale, BDI-II; BAI; Self-Efficacy for Learning Form-Abridged
• Assessment points: pre, mid, post, and four week follow up.
• Friedman ANOVA
Results for NO and ADHD study

- The results of the current study indicate that there were significant improvements in scores in inattention ($X^2(3) = 10.268, p = .016$), hyperactivity ($X^2(3) = 10.151, p = .017$), self-concept ($X^2(3) = 11.745, p = .008$), depression ($X^2(3) = 13.165, p = .004$), anxiety ($X^2(3) = 10.078, p = .018$), and academic self-efficacy ($X^2(3) = 18.361, p < .001$) over time. A significant difference in scores was not found in the participants’ impulsivity scores ($X^2(3) = 3.284, p = .350$).
NO and Anxiety study
Statement of the Problem

Increased rates of anxiety, stress, and depression

Suicide is 2nd highest cause of death for ages 15-29

Impacts mental and physical functioning; decreased academic success

Limited availability of MH services; universities are failing to meet the needs of students
Purpose

• Determine whether there is a difference between college students receiving NF training (vs those who do not) and anxiety, depression, and stress scores over time
  – Treatment group: 16 sessions of NF training
  – Control group: assessments/cortisol only; no NF training sessions
Research Questions

• **Primary Research Question:**
  – Does Neurofeedback (NF) training reduce anxiety, depression, and stress scores over time for the treatment group as compared to the control group? If yes, how much do participants’ anxiety, depression, and stress scores decrease over time?

• **Exploratory Research Question 1:**
  – Does NF training reduce anxiety, depression, and stress scores for the treatment group over time? If yes, how much do treatment group participants’ anxiety, depression, and stress scores decrease over time?
  – Does NF training reduce anxiety, depression, and stress scores for the control group over time? If yes, how much do control group participants’ anxiety, depression, and stress scores decrease over time?
• **Exploratory Research Question 2:**
  – Is there a significant difference in mean scores over time between the treatment group and control group depending on specific demographic variables?

• **Secondary Research Question:**
  – Is there a significant difference in cortisol levels over time between the treatment and control groups?

• **Exploratory Research Question 3:**
  – Is there a relationship between treatment group and control group participants’ BAI, PSS, BDI-II, and SAT scores and their cortisol scores at each time point?
Research Design

• Quasi-experimental, nonequivalent control group design

Treatment Group *(16 NF training sessions)*

Waitlist Control Group *(assessments/saliva only)*
Sampling & Recruitment

• **Convenience sampling**, with inclusionary criteria
  – *For example*: no hearing impairment; at least part-time; self-report of anxiety/worry/nervousness/stress

Recruitment

• **Classrooms**
  – Psychology courses; Engineering & Computer Science; Health Sciences; Career

• **Flyer was created for advertising**
  – SARC, FYAE, Graduate Studies, & bulletin boards
  – Email to faculty and staff members
  – Social media pages for Counselors
Procedures

- IRB approval → Recruitment → Screening phone call

Treatment Group

- **Pre-test**
  - Consents
  - Demographic questionnaire
  - Assessments
  - Saliva
  - 15 min NF
  - Giftcard

- **Mid-Test**
  - 7 sessions (at 8th session)
  - Assessments
  - Saliva
  - 33.5 NF
  - Giftcard

- **Final Test**
  - 15 sessions (at 16th session)
  - Assessments
  - Saliva
  - 33.5 NF

- **Follow-Up**
  - 4 weeks after final sessions
  - Assessments
  - Saliva
  - Giftcard

Waitlist Control Group

- **Pre-test**
  - Consents
  - Demographic questionnaire
  - Assessments
  - Saliva
  - Giftcard

- **Mid-test**
  - Assessments & Saliva only
  - Giftcard

- **Final Test**
  - Assessments & Saliva only

- **Follow-Up**
  - Assessments & Saliva only
  - Giftcard
## Results

**Exploratory RQ1: Treatment Group (RM-MANOVA)**

### Multivariate Test (Within-Subjects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks’ λ</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Obs. Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.290</td>
<td>$F_{(12, 37)} = 7.53$</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Univariate Tests (Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Obs. Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>BAI</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 144)} = 21.24$</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PSS</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 144)} = 14.66$</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BDI-II</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 144)} = 13.55$</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SAT</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 144)} = 40.61$</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

**Exploratory RQ1: Control Group (RM-MANOVA)**

### Multivariate Test (Within-Subjects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilks’ λ</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Obs. Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.404</td>
<td>$F_{(12, 8)} = .985$</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Univariate Tests (Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Obs. Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>BAI</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 57)} = .907$</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PSS</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 57)} = .778$</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BDI-II</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 57)} = .440$</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SAT</em></td>
<td>$F_{(3, 57)} = 3.565$</td>
<td><strong>.046</strong></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exploratory RQ2: Demographics (RM-MANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demo. Variable</th>
<th>Wilks’ λ</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Obs. Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>$F_{(24,84)} = 1.075$</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic.</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>$F_{(24,84)} = 1.374$</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>$F_{(24,84)} = 1.207$</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>$F_{(36,125)} = 1.091$</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>$F_{(48,164)} = 0.581$</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations

• **Research Design**
  – Quasi-experimental
    • Lack of randomization
  – Different facilitators; pts may have developed rapport
  – Maturation effects (over 12 week period)
  – History effects
    • Hurricane Irma
    • Some pts reported beginning counseling/psychiatric care after beginning study
  – Music plays with audiofeedback; could make pts calm

• **Sampling**
  – Majority of participants from UCF (difficult to generalize)
  – Over 20% receiving current counseling

• **Instrumentation**
  – Social desirability (use self-report assessments)
  – Cortisol collection procedures
Thank you!

Questions?

Gulnora.Hundley@ucf.edu