

1  
2  
3 **Autistic-Like Traits in Children are Associated with Enhanced Performance in a**  
4  
5 **Qualitative Visual Working Memory Task.**  
6

7  
8 Running Head: Child ALTs associated with enhanced visual memory  
9

10 \*Colin J Hamilton<sup>1</sup>, Irene C. Mammarella<sup>2</sup> and David Giofrè<sup>3</sup>  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK;  
14

15 [colin.hamilton@northumbria.ac.uk](mailto:colin.hamilton@northumbria.ac.uk) ; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5099-6449.  
16  
17

18 <sup>2</sup>Department of Developmental and Social Psychology, University of Padova, Padova, Italy;  
19

20 [irene.mammarella@unipd.it](mailto:irene.mammarella@unipd.it) ; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6986-4793.  
21  
22

23 <sup>3</sup> Department of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University,  
24

25 Liverpool, UK; [D.Giofre@ljmu.ac.uk](mailto:D.Giofre@ljmu.ac.uk) ; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1992-6271  
26  
27

28  
29 \*Communicating Author

30  
31 Colin J Hamilton, Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne,  
32 NE1 8ST, UK

33  
34 Email: [colin.hamilton@northumbria.ac.uk](mailto:colin.hamilton@northumbria.ac.uk); Telephone +44(0)191 227 3086.  
35  
36

37  
38 Main Body of text pages: 8, 2 Figures, 1 Table  
39

40 No Grant sponsor  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Abstract**

Prior research has suggested that individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) demonstrate heterogeneity in cognitive efficacy, challenged executive resources but efficient visual processing. These contrasts lead to opposing predictions about visuospatial working memory competency in both ASD and the broader autism phenotype (BAP); compromised by constrained executive processes, but potentially scaffolded by effective visual representation. It is surprising therefore, that there is a paucity of visual working memory (VWM) research in both the ASD and BAP populations. focusing upon the visual features of the to-be-remembered stimulus. We assessed whether individual differences in VWM were associated with autistic-like traits (ALT) in the BAP. 76 children carried out the Visual JND task, designed to measure high fidelity feature representation within VWM. ALTs were measured with the Children's Empathy Quotient and Systemizing Quotient. Analyses revealed a significant positive relationship between Systemizing and VWM performance. This complements ASD studies in visual processing and highlights the need for further research on the working memory – long-term memory interface in ASD and BAP populations.

**Lay Summary**

This study was interested in how well children with high levels of autistic-like traits (ALTs) carry out a task which involved memorizing, for brief time, the precise size of coloured shapes. The results suggested that children with high levels of ALTs performed the task relatively well. This finding is in contrast to many previous studies suggest that ALTs are associated with poor memory, and suggests that future research needs to look more finely at how individuals carry out these tasks.

Key terms: broader autism phenotype, children, cognition, visual working memory, long-term memory.

## Introduction

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is characterized by sustained challenges in reciprocal communication, social interaction and restricted behaviors or activities; these behaviors are present in early development and may limit everyday activities (DSM-5; APA, 2013). In recent years, there has been an increasing recognition that the characteristics associated with ASD form a continuum and are continuously distributed throughout a wider population (Constantino & Todd, 2003; Le Couteur et al., 1996). The Broader Autism Phenotype (BAP) refers to the subclinical possession of these characteristics. One key characteristic of this continuum conceptualization is that observations made within ASD can generate research questions within the BAP population, and vice versa (Wallace, Budgett & Charlton, 2016)

Individuals with ASD frequently present with an uneven profile of cognitive efficacy (e.g., Shah & Frith, 1983). A major contrast lies in the cognitive processes of visual perception and executive function (Chouinard, Parkington, Clements, & Landry, 2015). Extensive research findings have emphasized efficient perceptual processing relating to 'attention to detail' of visual stimuli (Baron-Cohen, 2009; Happé & Frith, 2006; Mottron, et al., 2006). However, with executive and attentional control resources, the findings have indicated severe challenges. This is evidenced across a number of functions: verbal fluency/long term memory (LTM) access difficulties (Demetriou et al., 2017), generic executive challenges (Geurts, de Vries, & van den Bergh, 2014), and is congruent with Frith's (2012) suggestion of challenged top-down control processes. This also appears to be the case in the BAP population (Christ, Kanne & Reiersen, 2010).

These contrasting competencies raise interesting questions about the efficacy of working memory in ASD and BAP populations. Working memory has been defined as the limited amount of information held in memory when undertaking tasks such as

1  
2  
3 comprehension, learning and problem solving; a process containing domain-general executive  
4  
5 attentional resources interacting with domain-specific maintenance processes (Cowan, 2014).  
6  
7 Within this definition, working memory in these populations could experience discrete and  
8  
9 opposing impacts: impaired by challenged executive attentional resources but scaffolded by  
10  
11 domain specific representations underpinned by efficient visual perceptual encoding. A first  
12  
13 glance at the ASD working memory literature indicates that the challenged executive  
14  
15 resources appear to have the greatest impact with Kercood, Grskovic, Banda, and Begeske,  
16  
17 (2014) and Wang and co-authors (2017) concluding that visuospatial working memory is  
18  
19 compromised in the ASD population. However, both raise caveats in their conclusions,  
20  
21 emphasizing that in the majority of studies, it was spatial working memory (SWM) which was  
22  
23 being examined and was impaired.  
24  
25

26  
27 Research has suggested that visual working memory (VWM) and SWM can be  
28  
29 dissociated both at the cognitive level (Darling, Della Sala & Logie, 2007; Della Sala, Gray,  
30  
31 Baddeley, Allamano & Wilson,., 1999; Hamilton, Coates & Heffernan, 2003; Logie, 2011;  
32  
33 Logie & Pearson, 1997) and at the neural level (Bellgowan et al., 2009; Konstantinou,  
34  
35 Constantinidou, & Kanai, 2017). In addition, evidence has suggested that SWM is more  
36  
37 demanding of executive resources (Logie, 2011; Rudkin, Pearson & Logie, 2007;  
38  
39 Vandierendonck, 2004). Consequently, one could argue that whilst SWM could be challenged  
40  
41 in ASD, VWM on the other hand could be more efficient due to enriched visual perceptual  
42  
43 representation. What is therefore surprising, given the emphasis upon efficient visual  
44  
45 processes within ASD, is the relative paucity of VWM research within both the ASD and  
46  
47 BAP populations. Cui, Gao, Chen, Zou and Wang (2010) carried out a study with children  
48  
49 with Asperger's syndrome and observed that in a task demanding memory for visual patterns,  
50  
51 the Asperger group were impaired in performance. However, Hamilton (2011; 2013) has  
52  
53 argued that tasks such as the one employed in Cui et al., demand executive attentional control  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 resources in the form of grouping, organization and LTM underpinning (Unsworth et al.,  
4  
5 2014). Consequently, performance in such VWM tasks could still be compromised due to  
6  
7 executive resource impairment. Mammarella, Giofrè, Cornoldi and Hamilton (2014) found in  
8  
9 a small ASD sample that when the visual patterns were manipulated in order to afford  
10  
11 opportunities for semantic underpinning from LTM, the ASD group was particularly  
12  
13 challenged. This indicated that the source of the difficulty was not necessarily in the memory  
14  
15 process per se, but in a compromised executive attentional scaffolding memory performance  
16  
17 (Wang et al., 2017).  
18

19  
20 There is also a lack of VWM studies in the BAP population; one exception to this is  
21  
22 the Richmond and co-authors (2013) article. This study looked at the relationship between  
23  
24 autistic-like traits (ALT) as measured by the Autism Spectrum Questionnaire (Baron-Cohen  
25  
26 et al., 2001) and VWM performance in adults. An important element of their protocol was the  
27  
28 use of memory stimuli that were difficult to verbalize. This manipulation most likely  
29  
30 precluded the requirement for attentional control in the form of re-coding and recruitment of  
31  
32 verbal LTM semantics. They found that participants high in ALT characteristics performed  
33  
34 the task more effectively. Unfortunately, one limitation in their protocol was that a sequential  
35  
36 presentation format was employed and prior research has indicated that the final (recency)  
37  
38 item presented is likely to have a different underlying visual memory representation from the  
39  
40 pre-recency items (Allen et al., 2014; Phillips & Christie, 1977). Consequently, it is uncertain  
41  
42 which component(s) contributed to the high ALT advantage in the Richmond et al. study.  
43  
44  
45

46 The present study recruited a child sample and employed a qualitative VWM  
47  
48 paradigm which aimed to minimize the requirement for semantic underpinning of the  
49  
50 representation as it focuses upon the quality or fidelity of the memory stimulus being  
51  
52 maintained. To the authors' knowledge, no prior research has investigated qualitative VWM  
53  
54 performance in the BAP. A simultaneous presentation procedure derived from the Thompson  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 et al. (2006) was employed. In this protocol, participants were exposed to a memory stimulus  
4  
5 and, after a maintenance period of 1 second were shown a probe stimulus and had to determine  
6  
7 whether this probe stimulus was larger or smaller compared to the initially encoded stimulus.  
8  
9 The Children's Empathy Quotient and Systemizing Quotient (Auyeung et al., 2009) was  
10  
11 employed to identify systemizing characteristics in children. Baron-Cohen (2009) has argued  
12  
13 that systemizing characteristics should be associated with attention to detail in perception and  
14  
15 memory. Age and gender were recorded as control variables. It was predicted that children  
16  
17 high in systemizing ALT characteristics would perform the qualitative VWM task more  
18  
19 effectively.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Methods**

### 26 **Participants**

27  
28 The study involved 76 children (29 boys and 47 girls) recruited from within  
29  
30 mainstream schools in the XXX. Exclusion criteria were impaired visual acuity and the  
31  
32 presence of any developmental disorder. The age, Systemizing Quotient (SQ) and visual  
33  
34 memory scores are shown in Table 1.  
35  
36

37 Insert Table 1 here  
38

### 39 **Materials**

40  
41  
42 *Children's Empathy Quotient and Systemizing Quotient Questionnaire* (Auyeung, et  
43  
44 al., 2009). This ALT questionnaire was given to the children's parents/carers to complete; and  
45  
46 is composed of 28 Systemizing items. Systemizing scores conventionally range from 0 – 56.  
47  
48 With the current Systemizing data, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.72$ .  
49  
50

51 *Size JND* (Just Noticeable Difference). This task was adapted from Thompson et al.,  
52  
53 (2006) (see Figure 1a, b below). Children. The retinal misalignment of the memory and probe  
54  
55 stimuli ensured that iconic memory did not contribute to task performance (Phillips, 1974).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Red or blue elliptical and rectangular stimuli were employed. The maintenance duration was 1  
4  
5 second following conventional change detection protocols (Luck & Vogel, 1997, 2013). All  
6  
7 size changes were in the horizontal dimension. In no trial was the shape change categorical,  
8  
9 e.g. elliptical to circular; across the 24 trials, changes in horizontal axis varied from 5%, to  
10  
11 30%, in either a larger or smaller extent (see Figure 1b below). The maximum score was 24.  
12  
13 The internal reliability of the Size JND was  $\alpha = .683$ . All viewing was within the child's arm  
14  
15 reach of the laptop keyboard. Prior research has indicated that the Size JND task significantly  
16  
17 reduces the demands upon executive attentional control (Hamilton, 2013; Phillips &  
18  
19 Hamilton, 2001; Thompson et al., 2006). The Size JND task is categorised as a visual  
20  
21 working memory task (Cornoldi & Vecchi, 2003; Mammarella, Borella, Pastore, & Pazzaglia,  
22  
23 2013; Mammarella, Pazzaglia & Cornoldi, 2008) which requires the precise memory for the  
24  
25 size of a shape. This is in contrast to tasks viewed as simultaneous-spatial such as the Visual  
26  
27 Patterns Task (VPT, Della Sala et al., 1999), where participants have to remember stimulus  
28  
29 elements presented across space in a simultaneous manner. Also, in contrast to spatial-  
30  
31 sequential tasks where spatially discrete elements of stimulus to be remembered are presented  
32  
33 in a temporal sequence, such as the Corsi Blocks task.  
34  
35

36  
37 Insert Figure 1 here  
38

### 39 **General Procedure**

40  
41 Children carried out the tasks in a quiet location within their school, and in the  
42  
43 presence of the research assistant. The task took 10-15 minutes to complete. Ethical consent  
44  
45 was granted by the Department of Psychology, xxx. Written informed consent was obtained  
46  
47 from the schools and the participants' families, along with oral assent from the children.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Statistical analyses

Hierarchical regression was employed initially, with subsequent regression moderation analysis using PROCESS (Hayes, 2017)

## Results

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to identify whether age, gender and the SQ score significantly predicted participants' Size JND performance. The three predictors explained 19.7% of the variance in Size JND task performance,  $F(3,72) = 5.878, p = .001$ . Age significantly predicted Size JND performance ( $\beta = .245, p = .033$ ), however gender did not ( $\beta = -.134, p = .229$ ). Having controlled for age and gender, the SQ score uniquely predicted Size JND performance ( $\beta = .476, p < .001$ ), and in addition, uniquely accounted for 18.9% of the variance in the memory scores (see figure 2 below). Additional PROCESS analysis revealed that neither gender ( $p = .610$ ) nor age ( $p = .433$ ) moderated the relationship between the Systemizing score and Size JND task scores.

Insert Figure 2 here

## Discussion

This study investigated visual working memory performance and its association with Systemizing characteristics in children. A qualitative task was employed where participants had to briefly remember the precise size of the memory stimulus; a task emphasizing the quality of the memory representation, rather than the quantity of information held in working memory. Given the executive challenges found in ASD and BAP population it was anticipated that Size JND task demands would minimize recruitment from executive attentional control resources and thus reveal an advantage in the task for high Systemizers. This was indeed the case, with the Systemizing Quotient accounting for almost 19% of unique variance in visual memory performance. The present findings support the suggestion that



1  
2  
3 observations of attention to detail in ASD (Baron-Cohen, 2009; Frith, 2012; Mottron et al.,  
4  
5 2006) have positive implications for VWM task performance in the BAP population in a task  
6  
7 context where the executive resource demand is attenuated.

8  
9 The present study with children reveals a similar pattern of results to that of Richmond  
10  
11 et al. (2012) study with adults in that higher autistic-like-traits (ALT) were associated with  
12  
13 improved VWM task performance. However, it should be noted that this earlier study by  
14  
15 Richmond et al. employed the AQ measure to assess *attention to detail* and *imagination*  
16  
17 autistic-like characteristics (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Skinner, Martin, & Clubley, 2001).  
18  
19 The VWM stimuli were random object shapes designed to preclude the recruitment of verbal  
20  
21 semantics. Thus, the Richmond et al. study looked at object representation as opposed to the  
22  
23 requirement of the retention of a surface visual feature (shape) in this current study (Dent,  
24  
25 2011). It is possible that the Richmond et al. and the current study found an advantage for  
26  
27 individuals high in autistic-like characteristics because the two task protocols precluded the  
28  
29 use of long-term memory verbal semantics in order to underpin task performance. Whereas in  
30  
31 VWM tasks known to provide opportunities to recruit LTM verbal semantics, tasks such as  
32  
33 the VPT, ASD individuals seem unable to access and/or recruit these verbal semantics  
34  
35 (Mammarella et al., 2014).  
36  
37  
38

39 The present finding with its contrast to earlier SWM and executive resource findings  
40  
41 has major implications for learning in both the ASD and BAP populations. The contrast  
42  
43 between tasks demanding high quality VWM representation versus tasks demanding  
44  
45 executive attentional control; tasks requiring ‘effort after meaning’ (Frith, 2012). Given the  
46  
47 key importance of the working memory - executive attention - long-term memory interface  
48  
49 for education and learning (Cowan, 2014; Swanson & McMurren, 2018); future VWM  
50  
51 research should be directed at understanding where, within this interface, individuals with  
52  
53 ASD and/or high levels of systemizing characteristics have challenges in this complex  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 interaction process. Clarification of this process in ASD may lead to the structuring of more  
4  
5 effective learning environments, and putatively more effectively designed working memory  
6  
7 intervention (de Vries, Prins, Schmand & Geurts, 2015).  
8

9  
10 In conclusion, this study investigated the relationship between systemizing  
11  
12 characteristics in children within the BAP population and performance in the qualitative Size  
13  
14 JND visual working memory task. The results suggest a strong positive relationship between  
15  
16 systemizing characteristics and the Size JND performance. This relative competence  
17  
18 associated with ALTs is consistent with other VWM research in adults but in contrast to ASD  
19  
20 visual working memory research indicating a compromised access to, and/or retrieval of,  
21  
22 long-term memory verbal semantics. There is a need for future ASD and BAP working  
23  
24 memory research to articulate in more detail the interface between working memory and long-  
25  
26 term memory resources, and identify the relevant attentional control processes which are  
27  
28 crucial for learning and education.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

#### **Acknowledgements**

The authors are extremely grateful to Chris Neasham and Jasmine Hassan for the collection of this data.

#### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

Colin Hamilton states that he has no conflict of interest in pursuing and publishing this research. Irene Mammarella states that she has no conflict of interest in pursuing and publishing this research. David Giofre states that he has no conflict of interest in pursuing and publishing this research.

## References

- Allen, R. J., Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. J. (2014). Evidence for two attentional components in visual working memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40(6), 1499-1509. doi:10.1037/xlm0000002
- American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Auyeung, B., Wheelwright, S., Allison, C., Atkinson, M., Samarawickrema, N., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2009). The children's empathy quotient and systemizing quotient: Sex differences in typical development and in autism spectrum conditions. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 39(11), 1509-1521. doi:10.1007/s10803-009-0772-x
- Baron-Cohen, S. (2009). Autism: the empathizing-systemizing (E-S) theory. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1156, 68-80. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04467.x
- Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Skinner, R., Martin, J., & Clubley, E. (2001). The autism-spectrum quotient (AQ): Evidence from Asperger syndrome/high-functioning autism, males and females, scientists and mathematicians. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 31(6), 603-603.
- Bellgowan, P.S.F., Buffalo, E.A., Bodurka, J., & Martin, A. (2009) Lateralized spatial and object memory encoding in entorhinal and perirhinal cortices. *Learning & Memory*, 16, 433-438.
- Chouinard, P., Parkington, K., Clements, B., & Landry O., (2015). Dissociable visual perception and executive functioning processes in typically developing adults with varying degrees of autistic-like characteristics. *Frontiers Human Neuroscience*. doi:10.3389/conf.fnhum.2015.217.00109
- Christ, S. E., Kanne, S. M., & Reiersen, A. M. (2010). Executive function in individuals with subthreshold autism traits. *Neuropsychology*, 24(5), 590. doi:10.1037/a0019176

- 1  
2  
3 Constantino, J. N., & Todd, R. D. (2003). Autistic traits in the general population - A twin  
4 study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *60*(5), 524-530. doi:DOI  
5  
6 10.1001/archpsyc.60.5.524  
7  
8  
9 Cornoldi, C., & Vecchi, T. (2003). *Visuospatial working Memory and Individual Differences*.  
10 Hove, England: Psychology Press.  
11  
12  
13 Cowan, N. (2014). Working Memory Underpins Cognitive Development, Learning, and  
14 Education. *Educ Psychol Rev*, *26*(2), 197-223. doi:10.1007/s10648-013-9246-y  
15  
16  
17 Cui, J. F., Gao, D. G., Chen, Y. H., Zou, X. B., & Wang, Y. (2010). Working Memory in  
18 Early-School-Age Children with Asperger's Syndrome. *Journal of Autism and*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Darling, S., Della Sala, S., & Logie, R. H. (2007). Behavioural evidence for separating  
26 components within visuo-spatial working memory. *Cognitive Processing*, *8*(3), 175-  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Della Sala, S., Gray, C., Baddeley, A., Allamano, N., & Wilson, L. (1999). Pattern span: A tool for unwelding visuo-spatial memory. *Neuropsychologia*, *37*(10), 1189-1199.
- Demetriou, E. A., Lampit, A., Quintana, D. S., Naismith, S. L., Song, Y. J. C., Pye, J. E., ... Guastella, A. J. (2017). Autism spectrum disorders: a meta-analysis of executive function. *Molecular Psychiatry*. doi:10.1038/mp.2017.75
- Dent, K. (2010). Dynamic Visual Noise Affects Visual Short-Term Memory for Surface Color, but not Spatial Location. *Experimental Psychology*, *57*(1), 17-26.

- 1  
2  
3 Frith, U. (2012). Why we need cognitive explanations of autism. *The Quarterly Journal of*  
4  
5 *Experimental Psychology*, 65(11), 2073-2092.  
6
- 7 Geurts, H. M., de Vries, M., & van den Bergh, S. F. W. M. (2014). Executive functioning  
8  
9 theory and autism. *Handbook of Executive Function*. New York: Springer.  
10
- 11 Hamilton, C. J. (2011). The nature of visuospatial representation within working memory. In  
12  
13 A. Vandierendonck; & A. Smalec (Eds.), *Spatial Working Memory*. Hove: Psychology  
14  
15 Press.  
16
- 17 Hamilton, C. J. (2013). The Development of Visuo Spatial Working Memory in Children. In  
18  
19 H. S. Clair-Thompson (Ed.), *Working Memory: Developmental Differences,*  
20  
21 *Component Processes and Improvement Mechanisms*. New York: NOVA.  
22  
23
- 24 Hamilton, C., Coates, R., & Heffernan, T. (2003). What develops in visuo-spatial working  
25  
26 memory development? *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 15(1), 43-69.  
27
- 28 Happé, F., & Frith, U. (2006). The weak coherence account: Detail-focused cognitive style in  
29  
30 autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 5-  
31  
32 25.  
33  
34
- 35 Hayes, A., F. (2017). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process*  
36  
37 *Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach Second Edition*. New York: Guildford Press.  
38
- 39 Kercood, S., Grskovic, J. A., Banda, D., & Begeske, J. (2014). Working memory and autism:  
40  
41 A review of literature. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 8(10), 1316-1332.  
42  
43
- 44 Konstantinou, N., Constantinidou, F., & Kanai, R. (2017). Discrete capacity limits and  
45  
46 neuroanatomical correlates of visual short-term memory for objects and spatial  
47  
48 locations. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 38(2), 767-778. doi:10.1002/hbm.23416  
49
- 50 Le Couteur, A., Bailey, A., Goode, S., Pickles, A., Robertson, S., Gottesman, I., & Rutter, M.  
51  
52 (1996). A broader phenotype of autism: the clinical spectrum in twins. *Journal of*  
53  
54 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 37(7), 785-801.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Logie, R. H. (1995). *Visuo-Spatial Working Memory*. Hove: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates  
4  
5 Ltd.  
6  
7 Logie, R. H. (2011). The Functional Organization and Capacity Limits of Working Memory.  
8  
9 *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 240-245.  
10  
11 doi:10.1177/0963721411415340  
12  
13 Logie, R.H., & Pearson, D.G. (1997) The Inner Eye and the Inner Scribe of Visuo-spatial  
14  
15 Working Memory: Evidence from Developmental Fractionation. *European Journal of*  
16  
17 *Cognitive Psychology*, 9(3), 241-257.  
18  
19  
20 Luck, S. J., & Vogel, E. K. (1997). The capacity of visual working memory for features and  
21  
22 conjunctions. *Nature*, 390(6657), 279.  
23  
24 Luck, S. J., & Vogel, E. K. (2013). Visual working memory capacity: from psychophysics  
25  
26 and neurobiology to individual differences. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(8), 391-  
27  
28 400.  
29  
30  
31 Mammarella, I. C., Borella, E., Pastore, M., & Pazzaglia, F. (2013). The structure of  
32  
33 visuospatial memory in adulthood. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 25, 99-110.  
34  
35 Mammarella, I. C., Giofrè, D., Caviola, S., Cornoldi, C., & Hamilton, C. (2014). Visuospatial  
36  
37 working memory in children with autism: The effect of a semantic global  
38  
39 organization. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 35(6), 1349-1356.  
40  
41 Mammarella, I. C., Pazzaglia, F., & Cornoldi, C. (2008). Evidence for different components  
42  
43 in children's visuospatial working memory. *British Journal of Developmental*  
44  
45 *Psychology*, 26(3), 337-355.  
46  
47  
48 Mottron, L., Dawson, M., Soulieres, I., Hubert, B., & Burack, J. (2006). Enhanced perceptual  
49  
50 functioning in autism: An update, and eight principles of autistic perception. *Journal*  
51  
52 *of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 27-43.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Mottron, L., Dawson, M., Soulieres, I., Hubert, B., & Burack, J. (2006). Enhanced perceptual  
4  
5 functioning in autism: An update, and eight principles of autistic perception. *Journal*  
6  
7 *of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 27-43.  
8
- 9 Phillips, W. A. (1974). Distinction between Sensory Storage and Short-Term Visual Memory.  
10  
11 *Perception & Psychophysics*, 16(2), 283-290.  
12
- 13 Phillips, W. A., & Christie, D. F. M. (1977). Components of Visual Memory. *Quarterly*  
14  
15 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 29(Feb), 117-133.  
16  
17 doi:10.1080/00335557743000080  
18
- 19 Phillips, L. H., & Hamilton, C. (2001). The working memory model in adult aging research.  
20  
21 In J. Andrade (Ed.), *Working Memory in Perspective* (pp. 101-125). Hove, UK:  
22  
23 Psychology Press.  
24
- 25 Richmond, L. L., Thorpe, M., Berryhill, M. E., Klugman, J., & Olson, I. R. (2013). Individual  
26  
27 differences in autistic trait load in the general population predict visual working  
28  
29 memory performance. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 66(6),  
30  
31 1182-1195. doi:10.1080/17470218.2012.734831  
32  
33
- 34 Rudkin, S. J., Pearson, D. G., & Logie, R. H. (2007). Executive processes in visual and spatial  
35  
36 working memory tasks. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 60(1), 79-  
37  
38 100.  
39  
40
- 41 Shah, A., & Frith, U. (1983). An islet of ability in autistic children: a research note. *Journal of*  
42  
43 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 24(4), 613-620.  
44
- 45 Swanson, H. L., & McMurrin, M. (2018). The impact of working memory training on near  
46  
47 and far transfer measures: Is it all about fluid intelligence? *Child Neuropsychology*,  
48  
49 24(3), 370-395. doi:10.1080/09297049.2017.1280142  
50  
51
- 52 Thompson, J. M., Hamilton, C. J., Gray, J. M., Quinn, J. G., Mackin, P., Young, A. H., &  
53  
54 Ferrier, I. N. (2006). Executive and visuospatial sketchpad resources in euthymic  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 bipolar disorder: Implications for visuospatial working memory architecture. *Memory*,  
4  
5 *14*(4), 437-451. doi:10.1080/09658210500464293  
6  
7 Unsworth, N., Fukuda, K., Awh, E., & Vogel, E. K. (2014). Working memory and fluid  
8  
9 intelligence: Capacity, attention control, and secondary memory retrieval. *Cognitive*  
10  
11 *Psychology*, *71*, 1-26.  
12  
13 Vandierendonck, A., Kemps, E., Fastame, M. C., & Szmalec, A. (2004). Working memory  
14  
15 components of the Corsi blocks task. *British journal of Psychology*, *95*(1), 57-79.  
16  
17 Wallace, G. L., Budgett, J., & Charlton, R. A. (2016). Aging and autism spectrum disorder:  
18  
19 Evidence from the broad autism phenotype. *Autism Research*, *9*(12), 1294-1303.  
20  
21  
22 Wang, Y., Zhang, Y. B., Liu, L. L., Cui, J. F., Wang, J., Shum, D. H. K., van Amelsvoort, T.,  
23  
24 & Chan, R. C. K. (2017). A meta-analysis of working memory impairments in autism  
25  
26 spectrum disorders. *Neuropsychology Review*, *27*(1), 46-61.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




## Figure Legends

**Figure 1.** The size JND task protocol. 1a, the temporal sequence of the procedure, 1b, an example of the memory stimulus and examples of the alternative probe stimuli which could be employed with this stimulus.


**Figure 2.** The relationship between Systemizing and Size JND visual working memory task performance.

## Table Legends

**Table 1.** Mean (SD) Age, Systemizing Quotient Score, and Size JND task performance as a function of gender.



**Figure 1.** The size JND task protocol. 1a, the temporal sequence of the procedure, 1b, an example of the memory stimulus and examples of the alternative probe stimuli which could be employed with this stimulus.



**Figure 2.** The relationship between Systemizing and Size JND visual working memory task performance.

Participant Characteristics			
	Age in Months(SD)	SQ Score (SD)	Size JND Task Correct (SD)
Girls n = 47	100.32 (-15.09)	27.43 (-7.05)	21.43 (2.20)
Boys n = 29	102.24 (-15.71)	31.21 (-8)	21.41 (2.40)
Cohen d	<i>0.13</i>	<i>0.51</i>	<i>0.01</i>
(95% CI)	<i>-0.34, 0.59</i>	<i>0.03, 0.97*</i>	<i>-0.47, 0.45</i>

Note. CI = confidence intervals for Cohen's d

\*  $p < .05$

**Table 1.** Mean (SD) Age, Systemizing Quotient Score, and Size JND task performance as a function of gender.