Rigidity

SCHIZOPHRENIA LIBRARY

Introduction

Rigidity is an inability to change mental or behavioural sets when required. This resistance to change can be behavioural, cognitive or attitudinal. Rigidity requires two processes: *set formation*, where sets are learned patterns formed through repetition and *set perseveration*, or continuation of the learned pattern.

Rigidity can be measured by assessing perseveration on the Wisconsin Card Sorting Task (WCST). Participants are asked to match cards and are given feedback as to whether their choices are correct based on undisclosed category rules. Perseverative errors occur when a participant continues matching cards according to a previous rule, despite having been given negative feedback. The Test of Behavioural Rigidity (TBR) requires participants to copy a paragraph containing random upper- and lower-case letters and then copy the same paragraph replacing the lower-case letters with capitals and vice versa. Participants are also asked to think of synonyms and anonyms for words, and alternate between the two.

Method

We have included only systematic reviews with detailed literature search, methodology, and inclusion/exclusion criteria that were published in full text, in English, from the year 2000. Reviews were identified by searching the databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, and PsycINFO. Reviews with pooled data are prioritized for inclusion. Reviews reporting fewer than 50% of items on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA[1]) checklist have been excluded from the library. The evidence was graded guided by the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group approach[2]. The resulting table represents an objective summary of the available evidence, although the conclusions are solely the opinion of staff of NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia).

Results

We found one systematic review that met our inclusion criteria[3].

- Moderate to high quality evidence finds a medium to large effect of more rigidity in people with schizophrenia than in controls, with largest effects found in studies of unmedicated patients and in studies using the WCST.

- Moderate to low quality evidence finds medium-sized associations between increased rigidity and greater symptom severity.

Schultz PW, Searleman A **Rigidity of thought and behaviour: 100 years of research** **Genetic, Social, and Genaral Psychology Monographs 2002; 128(2): 165-207** View review abstract online	
Comparison	Rigidity in people with schizophrenia vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate to high quality evidence (large samples, inconsistent, precise, direct) finds a medium to large effect of more rigidity in people with schizophrenia, with largest effects found in studies of unmedicated patients and in studies using the WCST. Moderate to low quality evidence (small sample, unable to assess consistency or precision) finds a medium-sized association between increased rigidity and greater symptom severity.

Rigidity
Overall, a significant, medium to large effect of greater rigidity in people with schizophrenia;   37 studies, N = 2,290, d = 0.71, 95%CI 0.63 to 0.80, p < 0.05, Q_w = 118.8, p < 0.001   *Subgroup analyses suggest larger effects in unmedicated vs. medicated patients, and on the WCST (perseverative errors) task vs. the Einstellung water jug task;*   Medicated vs. controls: 13 studies, N = 841, d = 0.52, 95%CI 0.38 to 0.66, p < 0.05, Q_w = 27.64, p < 0.01   Unmedicated vs. controls: 24 studies, N = 1,449, d = 0.83, 95%CI 0.72 to 0.94, p < 0.05, Q_w = 81.07, p < 0.001   WCST: 21 studies, d = 1.01, 95%CI 0.88 to 1.27, p < 0.05, Q_w = 28.34, p = 0.10   Einstellung water jug task: 3 studies, d = 0.05, 95%CI -0.21 to 0.31, p > 0.05, Q_w = 10.03, p < 0.01

Association with symptoms	
Three studies (N = 105) reported medium-sized associations between increased rigidity and symptom severity in people with schizophrenia; r = 0.31, r = 0.61 and r = 0.36.	
Consistency‡	Inconsistent apart from WCST performance, unable to assess symptoms.
Precision§	Precise, unable to assess symptoms.

Directness‖	Direct

Explanation of acronyms

CI = confidence interval, *d* = Cohen's *d* and Hedge's *g* = standardised mean differences (see below for interpretation of effect size), N = number of participants, *p* = statistical probability of obtaining that result ($p < 0.05$ generally regarded as significant), Q_w = Q statistic for the test of heterogeneity, *r* = correlation coefficient, vs. = versus, WCST = Wisconsin Card Sorting Task

NeuRA | Rigidity

March 2022

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

Page 3

Explanation of technical terms

* Bias has the potential to affect reviews of both RCT and observational studies. Forms of bias include; reporting bias – selective reporting of results; publication bias - trials that are not formally published tend to show less effect than published trials, further if there are statistically significant differences between groups in a trial, these trial results tend to get published before those of trials without significant differences; language bias – only including English language reports; funding bias - source of funding for the primary research with selective reporting of results within primary studies; outcome variable selection bias; database bias - including reports from some databases and not others; citation bias - preferential citation of authors. Trials can also be subject to bias when evaluators are not blind to treatment condition and selection bias of participants if trial samples are small[4].

---

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

Prevalence refers to how many existing cases there are at a particular point in time. Incidence refers to how many new cases there are per population in a specified time period. Incidence is usually reported as the number of new cases per 100,000 people per year. Alternatively some studies present the number of new cases that have accumulated over several years against a person-years denominator. This denominator is the sum of individual units of time that the persons in the population are at risk of becoming a case. It takes into account the size of the underlying population sample and its age structure over the duration of observation.

Reliability and validity refers to how accurate the instrument is. Sensitivity is the proportion of actual positives that are correctly identified (100% sensitivity = correct identification of all actual positives) and specificity is the proportion of negatives that are correctly identified (100% specificity = not identifying anyone as positive if they are truly not).

Weighted mean difference scores refer to mean differences between treatment and comparison groups after treatment (or occasionally pre to post treatment) and in a randomised trial there is an assumption that both groups are comparable on this measure prior to treatment. Standardised mean differences are divided by the pooled standard deviation (or the standard deviation of one group when groups are homogenous) that allows results from different scales to be combined and compared. Each study's mean difference is then given a weighting depending on the size of the sample and the variability in the data. Less than 0.4 represents a small effect, around 0.5 a medium effect, and over 0.8 represents a large effect[4].

Odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) refers to the probability of a reduction (< 1) or an increase (> 1) in a particular outcome in a treatment group, or a group exposed to a risk factor, relative to the comparison group. For example, a RR of 0.75 translates to a reduction in risk of an outcome of 25% relative to those not receiving the treatment or not exposed to the risk factor. Conversely, a RR of 1.25 translates to an increased risk of 25% relative to those not receiving treatment or not having been exposed to a risk factor. A RR or OR of 1.00 means there is no difference between groups. A medium effect is considered if RR > 2 or < 0.5 and a large effect if RR > 5 or < 0.2[5]. lnOR stands for logarithmic OR where a lnOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios

NeuRA | Rigidity   March 2022

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au   Page 4
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

measure the effect of an explanatory variable on the hazard or risk of an event.

Correlation coefficients (eg, r) indicate the strength of association or relationship between variables. They can provide an indirect indication of prediction, but do not confirm causality due to possible and often unforseen confounding variables. An r of 0.10 represents a weak association, 0.25 a medium association and 0.40 and over represents a strong association. Unstandardised (*b*) regression coefficients indicate the average change in the dependent variable associated with a 1 unit change in the independent variable, statistically controlling for the other independent variables. Standardised regression coefficients represent the change being in units of standard deviations to allow comparison across different scales.

---

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of effect across studies (i.e. heterogeneity or variability in results) that is not explained by subgroup analyses and therefore reduces confidence in the effect estimate. I² is the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance) - 0% to 40%: heterogeneity might not be important, 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: may represent considerable heterogeneity and over this is considerable heterogeneity. I² can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula;[4]

$$I^2 = \left(\frac{Q - df}{Q} \right) \times 100\%$$

§ Imprecision refers to wide confidence intervals indicating a lack of confidence in the effect estimate. Based on GRADE recommendations, a result for continuous data (standardised mean differences, not weighted mean differences) is considered imprecise if the upper or lower confidence limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction, and for binary and correlation data, an effect size of 0.25. GRADE also recommends downgrading the evidence when sample size is smaller than 300 (for binary data) and 400 (for continuous data), although for some topics, these criteria should be relaxed.[6]

‖ Indirectness of comparison occurs when a comparison of intervention A versus B is not available but A was compared with C and B was compared with C that allows indirect comparisons of the magnitude of effect of A versus B. Indirectness of population, comparator and/or outcome can also occur when the available evidence regarding a particular population, intervention, comparator, or outcome is not available and is therefore inferred from available evidence. These inferred treatment effect sizes are of lower quality than those gained from head-to-head comparisons of A and B.

References

1. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMAGroup (2009): Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal* 151: 264-9.
2. GRADEWorkingGroup (2004): Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal* 328: 1490.
3. Schultz PW, Searleman A (2002): Rigidity of thought and behavior: 100 years of research. *Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs* 128: 165-207.
4. CochraneCollaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
5. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
6. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows*