Published in final edited form as:

Exp Clin Psychopharmacol. 2014 April ; 22(2): 100–109. doi:10.1037/a0035338.

Interactive association of dopamine receptor (*DRD4*) genotype and ADHD on alcohol expectancies in children

Steve S. Lee, Ph.D.¹ and Kathryn L. Humphreys, Ed.M., M.A.¹

¹ Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

Abstract

Positive and negative alcohol expectancies (AE) are beliefs about the consequences of alcohol use (e.g., happy, sad, lazy) and they predict patterns of adolescent and adult alcohol engagement in clinical and non-clinical samples. However, significantly less is known about predictors of AE in children, despite significant variability in AE early in and across development. To identify temporally-ordered risk factors that precede AE, we evaluated the independent and interactive association of the functional 7-repeat polymorphism of the dopamine D₄ receptor (*DRD4*) genotype and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) with respect to individual differences in positive-social, negative-arousal, sedative/impaired, and wild/crazy AE in school-age children (N = 149) followed prospectively from 6-9 years to 8-13 years. Controlling for age, sex, and wave, *DRD4* 7+ carriers reported more wild/crazy AE, but *DRD4* was unrelated to the remaining AE domains. ADHD symptoms independently predicted higher negative-arousal, sedative/impaired, and wild/crazy AE, but not positive-social. We also observed a significant interaction where ADHD symptoms positively predicted wild/crazy AE only in youth with the 7-repeat *DRD4* genotype; the same interaction marginally predicted sedative/impaired AE. No interactive effects were observed for the remaining AE domains. These preliminary results suggest that among 7+ *DRD4* youth, early ADHD symptoms predicted children's expectations that alcohol would have wild/crazy effects. We consider these results within a developmental framework to better understand pathways to and from youth alcohol problems.

Keywords

DRD4; ADHD; alcohol expectancies; children

Alcohol problems and related alcohol use disorders are prevalent conditions with significant clinical and public health consequences. In the U.S., lifetime prevalence estimates ranged from 14.0% to 16.3% and 6.0% to 6.4% for alcohol abuse and alcohol dependence, respectively, and impairment is also typically moderate to severe (Kessler et al., 2005). Further, alcohol problems cause significant economic loss due to crime, social problems, foster care, and related health services (Demyttenaere et al., 2004). In addition to its frequent

Address correspondence to Steve S. Lee, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, UCLA, 1285 Franz Hall, Box 951563, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563. Phone: 310-794-5921, Fax: 310-206-5895, stevelee@psych.ucla.edu..

Disclosure

All authors report no real or potential financial and personal conflicts of interest that could affect interpretations from this study.

co-occurrence with other mental health problems, alcohol problems predict violence, accidental injuries, risky behavior (e.g., sexually transmitted disease), and poor health outcomes (e.g., hypertension) (Courtney & Polich, 2009; Hingson, Heeren, & Winter, 2006; Odgers et al., 2008). To facilitate the development of innovative interventions, reliable precursors of alcohol problems, particularly early in development, must be identified. Ultimately, targeted interventions may prevent alcohol problems, make them more amenable to treatment, and/or minimize their negative sequelae.

One potentially unique expression of alcohol problems is early-onset alcohol use. Early alcohol use has demonstrated predictive validity for later alcohol problems, alcohol use disorders, and health impairment (Grant & Dawson, 1997; Odgers et al., 2008). Despite being implicated as a potential causal risk factor for alcohol problems and clinically significant outcome, relatively little is known about precursors of early-onset alcohol use (Donovan & Molina, 2011). One potentially important construct is alcohol expectancies (AE), individual differences in expectations about the consequences or effects of alcohol consumption (Chartier, Hesselbrock, & Hesselbrock, 2010). Consisting of positive (e.g., arousal, increased sociability) and negative expectations (e.g., mad, sad) about alcohol use, AE emerge early in development (Noll, Zucker, & Greenberg, 1990) and precede explicit alcohol engagement or experimentation (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2012). Positive AE prospectively predicted increased alcohol consumption in adolescence (Brown, Christiansen, & Goldman, 1987; Chartier et al., 2010), and predicted multiple indicators of problem drinking in young adults beyond other established predictors (e.g., drinking refusal self-efficacy; Connor et al., 2008). AE predicts alcohol engagement in clinical and non-clinical populations, suggesting they represent a potential common pathway to later alcohol problems (Christiansen, Smith, Roehling, & Goldman, 1989; Young & Oei, 2000). Finally, a controlled intervention significantly reduced youth positive and arousing AE and concurrently raised negative AE (Cruz & Dunn, 2003). Thus, by virtue of their predictive validity and sensitivity to intervention effects, further understanding of youth AE is a significant priority to prevent later alcohol problems.

Despite evidence that AE is a potential causal risk factor for alcohol engagement and alcohol problems, "there has been relatively little research on antecedents of AE" (Donovan, Molina, & Kelly, 2009; p. 249). That is, individual differences in AE are typically treated as predictors of alcohol outcomes whereas far less is known about predictors of AE. Moreover, to distinguish simple correlates from potential risk factors for AE, temporally-ordered designs are necessary (Kraemer, Stice, Kazdin, Offord, & Kupfer, 2001) given that replicated risk factors for AE represent logical targets for intervention. Preliminary work on youth AE has emphasized familial and socialization influences, including parental alcohol use (Molina, Pelham, & Lang, 1997). However, the acquired preparedness model proposed the centrality of trait disinhibition to the development of positive AE, which in turn predicted alcohol use (Smith & Anderson, 2001). In other words, positive AE mediated the association of trait disinhibition and alcohol problems. This model has been substantiated in young adult samples (Anderson, Schweinsburg, Paulus, Brown, & Tapert, 2005), although non-replications have also been reported, including in children (Anderson et al., 2005). Given that dopamine neurotransmission and frontostriatal circuitry are associated with correlates of disinhibition including loss aversion (Tom, Fox, Trepel, & Poldrack, 2007),

gambling (Chambers, Taylor, & Potenza, 2002) and substance disorders (Volkow, Fowler, Wang, Swanson, & Telang, 2007), functional genetic variants regulating dopamine are plausible candidate genes for AE. Among alcohol dependent patients, AE partially mediated the association of the A1 allele of the dopamine (D2) receptor gene and alcohol problems, suggesting that AE were sensitive to genetic influences. In another study, AE were sensitive to GABA-ergic, but not dopaminergic variants (Young, Lawford, Feeney, Ritchie, & Noble, 2004). A critical limitation of this literature is that studies have been limited exclusively to adults, despite the fact that there are individual differences in AE in childhood. This limitation is problematic given that early alcohol use may reflect *unique* genetic influences (and causal risk factors more generally) relative to later onset alcohol use (Connor et al., 2002). Therefore, future studies consisting of predictions of *youth* AE must be developmentally-sensitive (e.g., narrow age-band of youth participants prior to alcohol engagement) and genetically-informative.

The dopamine D₄ receptor (*DRD4*) gene is located on 11p15.5 and contains a 48 base pair variable number tandem repeat polymorphism in exon 3. This locus consists of 2 to 11 repeats, although 4 and 7 repeats are the most common. *DRD4* genotypes produce variation in the third cytoplasmic loop of the receptor protein that affects D₄ receptor functioning and mediates signal transduction through changes in intracellular cAMP levels. Broadly, genetic variation at this locus is thought to underlie individual differences in risk taking, reward sensitivity, and perhaps reactivity to both positive and negative environmental experiences. For example, the 7-repeat allele (7+) predicted increased novelty seeking in adults (Benjamin et al., 1996) and non-human primates (Bailey, Breidenthal, Jorgensen, McCracken, & Fairbanks, 2007) as well as sexual promiscuity and sexual infidelity (Garcia et al., 2010), although meta-analytic findings suggested 7+ and adult personality “approach” traits were only modestly associated (Munafò et al., 2003). These associations are biologically plausible given that *DRD4* 7+ differentially activated ventral striatum during a reward task (Forbes et al., 2009) as well as orbitofrontal cortex and striatum in response to alcohol cues (Filbey et al., 2008). Therefore, we conceptualized the functional *DRD4* 7+ polymorphism within the larger framework of the acquired preparedness model because it may represent an “upstream” causal influence where dopamine neurotransmission influences reward sensitivity, reward-based learning, and disinhibition. In other words, whereas the acquired preparedness model *begins* with disinhibition (Smith & Anderson, 2001), *DRD4* may extend this causal model by testing etiological influences *on* disinhibition.

Genetic influences on complex phenotypes are likely to include interactive effects with other constructs; thus, developmental models of AE should explicitly consider both independent and transactional effects. One factor that may alter predictions of AE from *DRD4* 7+ is attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Defined by extreme and impairing levels of inattention and/or hyperactivity, ADHD may be related to youth AE for several reasons. First, there is meta-analytic evidence that childhood ADHD prospectively predicts adolescent and adult alcohol problems including alcohol abuse and dependence (Lee, Humphreys, Flory, Liu, & Glass, 2011; Charach, Yeung, Climans, & Lillie 2011). Second, dopamine dysregulation, deficient inhibitory control and executive functioning, as well as sensitivity to reward are central to theories of ADHD and alcohol problems (Nigg, 2001;

Smith & Anderson, 2001). A recent study of young adults found that the combination of elevated ADHD and positive alcohol expectancies was particularly predictive of alcohol problems (e.g., social dysfunction; Dattillo, Murphy, Van Eck, & Flory, 2013), suggesting that interactive effects with respect to ADHD and AE are plausible. Similarly, in a sample of young adult drinkers, whereas risk taking and poor behavioral inhibition were positively associated with alcohol consumption, deficient attentional inhibition was *uniquely* associated with heavy drinking in adults with ADHD (Weafer, Milich, & Fillmore, 2011); also, adults with ADHD demonstrated more alcohol-induced impaired inhibitory control relative to non-ADHD controls (Weafer, Fillmore, & Milich, 2009). However, we know of no published study of the independent and interactive association of childhood ADHD and *DRD4* 7+ genotype with respect to individual differences in youth AE. Moreover, given that alcohol use predicts altered neurocognitive performance (e.g., executive functioning; Squeglia, Spadoni, Infante, Myers, & Tapert, 2009), temporally-ordered measures of childhood ADHD are valuable to strengthen the inference that ADHD symptoms are a risk factor for AE rather than a simple correlate of AE and/or potentially reflect the effects of alcohol problems. Taken together, these studies collectively suggest that ADHD designates a unique group with respect to pathways to and from alcohol problems and related phenotypes.

By virtue of their predictive validity, AE are a potentially important precursor of alcohol problems for both clinical and non-clinical populations (Connor et al., 2008). Despite being implicated as a potential causal risk factor for early-onset alcohol use and alcohol problems, virtually nothing is known about risk factors for individual differences in AE (Donovan et al., 2009). Given the centrality of deficient dopamine neurotransmission and disinhibition to theories of ADHD and alcohol problems, we examined the independent and interactive association of *DRD4* genotype and childhood ADHD with respect to emergent AE (i.e., positive-social, negative-sedative, sedative/impaired, wild/crazy). Based on 149 ethnically diverse children with and without DSM-IV ADHD followed prospectively from 6-9 years-old to 8-13 years-old, we tested whether youth *DRD4* 7+ genotype and initial ADHD independently and interactively predicted emergent individual differences in positive-social, negative-arousal, sedative/impaired, and wild/crazy AE at a two-year follow-up. Given that the ADHD and AE are temporally-ordered, the current study is well-positioned to differentiate correlates versus risk factors for youth AE and to identify potentially important targets for intervention.

Methods

Participants

At baseline (i.e., Wave 1), participants were 219 (68% male) children with ($n=119$) and without ($n=110$) DSM-IV ADHD. Children were 6 to 9 years old ($M=7.89$, $SD=1.19$) and forty-nine percent of the sample was Caucasian, 8% African-American, 9% Hispanic, 3% Asian, 22% mixed, and 10% as Other or missing (see Table 1 for demographic characteristics). Participants were recruited using presentations to self-help groups for ADHD, advertisements mailed to local elementary schools, pediatric offices, clinical service providers, and some referrals from mental health clinics. English fluency was required for

parents and children. Exclusion criteria for all participants consisted of a Full Scale IQ <70 or pervasive developmental, seizure, or neurological disorder that prevented full participation in the study. Characteristics of participants at Wave 1 have been described elsewhere (Humphreys, Aguirre, & Lee, 2012; Lee, Aguirre, & Falk, 2012). Examiners obtained written consent from all parents and written assent from all children. Children were reminded that participation was optional, and that they could stop at any time. All procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board.

Procedures

At Wave 1, families who contacted the study completed a telephone screener to determine their eligibility based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria listed above. Eligible families were then invited to the research laboratory for in-person assessments. Following signed parental consent and child assent, clinical psychology graduate students or bachelor's-level extensively trained staff separately assessed children and parents. All interviewers were initially blind to the child's diagnostic status, although the blind could not be guaranteed given the amount of information gathered about the child. Approximately 85% of children were assessed during their laboratory visit without medication. Parents were asked to rate each child based on his or her unmedicated behavior.

Approximately two years after their original evaluation, families were invited back to the laboratory to participate in a follow-up study (i.e., Wave 2; ages 8-13) that consisted of highly parallel procedures to Wave 1 (e.g., structured diagnostic interviews), but also included the assessment of children's alcohol expectancies using the Memory-Model Based Expectancy Questionnaire (MMBEQ). Overall, at Wave 2, 91% of the total Wave 1 sample was ascertained with no significant demographic (i.e., age/sex) or clinical (i.e., number of oppositional defiant disorder or conduct disorder symptoms) differences between the overall Wave 2 sample versus participants who did not participate at Wave 2. However, for the current study, alcohol expectancy data were available for 149 participants.

Measures

Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children – Fourth Edition (DISC-IV; Shaffer, Fisher, Lucas, Dulcan, & Schwab-Stone, 2000)—At Wave 1 and Wave 2, we administered the computerized DISC-IV to each participant's parent using graduate students and advanced undergraduates who completed intensive assessment training. This fully structured interview probes required symptom levels, duration/persistence, age of onset, and functional impairment. The total number of ADHD symptoms at each wave was used in these analyses. Test-retest reliability for ADHD from the DISC ranged from .51 and .64 in the DSM-IV Field Trials (Lahey et al., 1994) and diagnostic designations from the DISC showed predictive validity in other studies of children with versus without ADHD (Lee, Lahey, Owens, & Hinshaw, 2008).

Disruptive Behavior Disorder Rating Scale (DBD; Pelham, Gnagy, Greenslade, & Milich, 1992)—At Wave 1 and Wave 2, parents completed this 45-item rating scale of DSM-IV child ADHD symptoms. Ratings ranged from 0 for “not at all” to 3 for “very much,” resulting in total ADHD symptom counts. This measure has excellent psychometric

properties and is widely considered an evidence-based assessment measure of ADHD and disruptive behavior disorders (Pelham, Fabiano, & Massetti, 2005). We used the total number of ADHD symptoms.

Alcohol Expectancies—At Wave 2, children were interviewed using the 41-item Memory-Model Based Expectancy Questionnaire (Dunn, 1999; Dunn & Goldman, 1996). Children were first read the definition of a single alcohol expectancy word (e.g., talkative, cool, sleepy) and then reported how often people experienced that word following alcohol consumption. With the help of a graphic anchor (i.e., rectangular boxes differentiated by varying levels of being “filled”), children rated their expectancies according to a four-point scale (i.e., never, sometimes, usually, always). The reliability of the MMBEQ has been established across development, with coefficient alphas of .76 for 2nd to 5th graders, .81 for 3rd, 6th, 9th, and 12th graders, and .83 for college undergraduates (Dunn & Goldman, 1996, 1998). Scoring reflected four separable expectancy factors: positive-social (e.g., happy, fun), negative-arousal (e.g., mad, sad), sedated/impaired (e.g., sleepy, stupid), and wild/crazy (e.g., goofy, hyper). Cronbach's alphas for the subscales were adequate to good (positive-social: .82, negative-arousal: .79, sedated/impaired: .70, wild/crazy: .77). Although the precise age range where AE peak is unknown (see Miller, Smith, & Goldman, 1990 and Donovan, Molina, & Kelly, 2009 for divergent reports), we contend that the age range of the participants at Wave 2 represent a unique period in development given that only 7 children (less than 5% of the sample) endorsed alcohol use in the past 6 months greater than a sip. Thus, the vast majority of the sample is alcohol naïve.

DRD4 genotype—DNA was extracted from saliva using Genotek Oragene™ Self-Collection (DNA Genotek, Inc., Ottawa, CA). Genomic DNA was isolated from buccal cells using standard methods (Freeman et al., 1997). The 48-bp VNTR element in the third exon was determined in two separate polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplifications. The distribution was as follows: 2/2 ($n = 2$), 2/3 ($n = 1$), 2/4 ($n = 23$), 2/7 ($n = 6$), 2/8 ($n = 1$), 3/4 ($n = 10$), 3/7 ($n = 4$), 4/4 ($n = 78$), 4/5 ($n = 2$), 4/6 ($n = 4$), 4/7 ($n = 46$), 4/8 ($n = 3$), 7/7 ($n = 8$), and 7/8 ($n = 2$). *DRD4* genotypes were in Hardy Weinberg Equilibrium (Fisher's exact test, $p = .91$). Population stratification is a threat to the internal validity of genetic association studies. However, given that race-ethnicity was unrelated to *DRD4* ($\chi^2 = .09$, $p = .76$), a necessary condition for population stratification (Hutchinson et al., 2004), it is unlikely that the effects reported herein are spurious.

Data Analysis

We used linear mixed modeling (LMM) in SPSS (version 20) to examine the independent association of *DRD4* genotype, the total number of Wave 1 and Wave 2 ADHD symptoms, and their interaction (i.e., *DRD4* $\times$ ADHD) with respect to individual differences in each of the four AE domains (i.e., positive-social, negative-arousal, sedated/impaired, wild/crazy). LMM is appropriate for nested data given that it creates a two-level hierarchical model with repeated data (i.e., ADHD symptoms from both dimensions across two time points) within individuals and flexibly accommodates missing data. A dummy variable was created for *DRD4* (i.e., one or more 7 repeat allele [7+] vs. individuals without this allele [7-]). Given that *DRD4* was unrelated to ADHD diagnostic status and the total number of ADHD

symptoms (chi-square = .25, $p = .62$, $r = -.04$, $p = .62$, respectively), *DRD4* and ADHD were interpreted as independent predictors.

Separate LMMs were created for each AE domain to estimate the independent and interactive association of *DRD4* and ADHD. ADHD symptoms were based on inattention and hyperactivity across Wave 1 and Wave 2. To capitalize on the multiple measures of ADHD, we used LMM to estimate time-varying prediction ADHD measured from the DISC at Wave 1 and Wave 2 (i.e., Wave 1 inattention and hyperactivity plus Wave 2 inattention and hyperactivity). This process was identically reconstructed in separate models consisting of ADHD from the DBD rating scale. Each model controlled for the effects of wave of assessment, sex, and age, and specified fixed effects for all variables. The potential differential association of ADHD on AE based on wave of data collection was examined for all outcomes, and removed from the model following a non-significant interaction ($p < .10$).

Results

Association of *DRD4* and ADHD with Positive-Social Alcohol Expectancies

Controlling for wave of assessment, age, and sex, ADHD symptoms from the DISC [$F(1,489.00) = 2.67$, $p = .10$] and *DRD4* genotype [$F(1,495.96) = 1.31$, $p = .25$] were unrelated to positive-social AE. The *DRD4* x ADHD symptom (from the DISC) interaction was also non-significant [$F(1,493.43) = 0.18$, $p = .68$]. Similarly, based on the DBD rating scale, neither *DRD4* genotype [$F(1,488.00) = 1.80$, $p = .18$] nor DBD ADHD symptoms [$F(1,480.62) = 0.66$, $p = .42$] significantly predicted positive-social AE. Finally, the *DRD4* x ADHD (from the DBD) interaction was unrelated to positive-social AE [$F(1,484.49) = 0.003$, $p = .96$]. Time did not significantly moderate the association of *DRD4* or ADHD with positive AE.

Association of *DRD4* and ADHD with Negative-Arousal Alcohol Expectancies

We observed a significant main effect of the total number of ADHD symptoms from the DISC [$F(1,489.50) = 9.41$, $p = .002$] and a marginal association of *DRD4* genotype [$F(1,495.94) = 3.02$, $p = .08$] with negative-arousal AE, again controlling for wave of assessment, age, and sex. Specifically, the number of ADHD symptoms from the DISC was positively associated with negative AE (Est. = 0.22 [0.07]), and the *DRD4* 7- group had marginally lower negative AE than the 7+ group (12.19 [0.03] vs. 12.99 [0.38]). The *DRD4* x DISC ADHD symptoms interaction marginally incremented predictions of negative-arousal AE [$F(1,483.75) = 3.23$, $p = .07$]. We then reproduced the same model but used the number of ADHD symptoms from the DBD rating scale. Once again, there was a significant main effect of ADHD symptoms [$F(1,479.33) = 9.57$, $p = .002$], and a marginal effect for *DRD4* genotype ($F(1,487.94) = 3.39$, $p = .066$). The *DRD4* 7- group reported lower negative AE than the 7+ group (12.17 [0.30] vs. 13.02 [0.38]), and negative AE increased with more DBD ADHD symptoms (Est. = 0.09 [0.03]). The *DRD4* x ADHD interaction was unrelated to negative-arousal AE [$F(1,483.57) = 0.04$, $p = .85$]. Time did not significantly moderate the prediction of negative AE from *DRD4* and ADHD.

Association of *DRD4* and ADHD with Sedated/Impaired Alcohol Expectancies

Neither *DRD4* genotype [$F(1,496.00) = 0.03, p = .87$], DISC ADHD symptoms [$F(1,489.80) = 1.89, p = .17$], nor their interaction [$F(1,493.98) = 0.15, p = .70$] significantly predicted sedated/impaired AE. However, based on ADHD symptoms from the DBD, we observed a significant main effect [$F(1,480.09) = 9.00, p = .003$] where ADHD positively predicted sedated/impaired AE (Est. = 0.07 [0.02]). There was no significant effect of *DRD4* genotype [$F(1,487.90) = 0.05, p = .83$], however. The *DRD4* × ADHD (from the DBD) interaction was marginally significant [$F(1,483.75) = 3.23, p = .07$]. Because detecting significant interactions in non-experimental designs is difficult (McClelland & Judd, 1993), we probed the interaction in an exploratory spirit. Whereas ADHD symptoms on the DBD were unrelated to sedative AE in the *DRD4* 7- group (Est. = 0.04 [0.03], $p = .23$), they positively predicted sedative AE in the *DRD4* 7+ group (Est. = 0.15 [0.04], $p < .001$) (see Figure 1). Time did not significantly moderate the prediction of sedative/impaired AE from *DRD4* and ADHD.

Association of *DRD4* and ADHD with Wild/Crazy Alcohol Expectancies

For wild/crazy AE, there were significant main effects for *DRD4* genotype [$F(1,491.96) = 14.88, p < .001$] and DISC ADHD symptoms ($F(1,484.67) = 8.89, p = .003$). The *DRD4* 7+ group had greater expectancies than alcohol would have wild/crazy effects than *DRD4* 7- youth (11.08 [0.23] vs. 9.98 [0.18]) and wild/crazy expectancies increased linearly with the number of DISC ADHD symptoms (Est. = 0.13 [0.04]). A significant *DRD4* × ADHD interaction was also found [$F(1,489.27) = 3.94, p = .048$] such that ADHD symptoms on the DISC were unrelated to wild/crazy AE in the *DRD4* 7- group, but ADHD symptoms robustly predicted wild/crazy AE in the *DRD4* 7+ group (see Figure 2). These results were replicated with significant main effects for *DRD4* [$F(1,483.96) = 15.16, p < .001$] and DBD ADHD symptoms [$F(1,475.62) = 14.97, p < .001$]. Once again, the ADHD × *DRD4* interaction was significant [$F(1,479.27) = 10.55, p < .001$] where ADHD symptoms on the DBD were unrelated to wild/crazy AE in the 7- group, but positively predicted wild/crazy AE in the 7+ group (Figure 3). Time did not significantly moderate the prediction of wild/crazy from *DRD4* and ADHD.

DRD4 × ADHD × Sex Interaction: Prediction of Alcohol Expectancies

Given sex differences in ADHD (Barkley, 2006), we conducted exploratory analyses of sex as a moderator of the *DRD4* × ADHD interaction described above. The *DRD4* × ADHD × sex interaction was unrelated to positive, sedative, and wild/crazy AE. However, with respect to negative AE, there was a significant *DRD4* effect [$F(1,162.34) = 4.09, p = .045$] where *DRD4* 7+ girls had significantly more negative AE than *DRD4* 7- girls [(12.66 [0.57] vs. 12.10 [0.53]); there was also a significant effect of ADHD symptoms according to the DISC [$F(1,155.99) = 4.34, p = .039$]. We also observed a significant *DRD4* × ADHD (based on the DISC) × sex interaction [$F(1,157.83) = 4.60, p = .034$]. Specifically, among girls with the *DRD4* 7- genotype, DISC ADHD symptoms predicted more negative AE. The patterns of association were highly similar when ADHD was estimated from the DBD rating scale. No significant *DRD4* × ADHD interaction was detected for boys, however, for any AE domain using both the DBD and DISC.

Discussion

Developmental perspectives on alcohol problems are recognized (Brown et al., 2008), but many studies have focused on narrow developmental periods (e.g., adolescence) and *explicit* alcohol use and alcohol problems. Although childhood AE predict adolescent and adult alcohol engagement, relatively little is known about factors contributing to the development of AE in children (Donovan et al., 2009). In particular, prospective longitudinal designs are necessary to temporally disentangle simple correlates of AE from genuine risk factors for AE that represent logical targets for intervention. Controlling for age, sex, and wave, we examined the independent and interactive association of youth *DRD4* genotype and ADHD symptoms with respect to emergent positive-social, negative-arousal, sedative/impaired, and wild/crazy AE in 6-9 year-old children followed prospectively to 8-13 years of age. First, *DRD4* 7+ youth reported higher expectations that alcohol would have wild/crazy effects, but no other AE domains were sensitive to a main effect of *DRD4*. Second, ADHD positively predicted more negative-arousal, sedative/impaired, and wild/crazy AE. Finally, an interaction was detected such that ADHD symptoms positively predicted wild/crazy AE but only among *DRD4* 7+ youth. These preliminary findings suggest that *DRD4* 7+ status and ADHD are independent risk factors for individual differences in multiple AE domains; the interaction of *DRD4* 7+ and ADHD symptoms specifically predicted children's expectations that alcohol had wild/crazy effects.

Although genetic association studies of AE are rare (Connor et al., 2008; Young et al., 2004), dopamine neurotransmission is plausibly related to AE for several reasons. In this study, *DRD4* 7+ carriers, independent of ADHD symptoms and demographic factors, specifically reported more wild/crazy AE. Wild/crazy AE may be part of a broad phenotypic constellation, including reward sensitivity and risk taking, reflecting the consequence of genetic variation regulating dopamine. Functional dopamine polymorphisms, including *DRD4* 7+, differentially activated reward circuitry (Stice, Yokum, Burger, Epstein, & Smolen, 2012) and uniquely accounted for nearly 11% of variance in ventral striatum reactivity (Nikolova, Ferrell, Manuck, & Hariri, 2011). *DRD4* 7+ status may also underlie exposure to putative environmental correlates of AE (e.g., parental alcohol consumption; Molina et al., 1997) through evocative, active, and passive gene-environment correlation (Jaffee & Price, 2007). Alternatively, wild/crazy AE may disproportionately reflect executive and/or inhibitory processes rather than reward per se. Because *DRD4* 7+ is associated with executive dysfunction (Froehlich, et al., 2007), wild/crazy AE may reflect deficits in attention, working memory, and planning. However, a recent twin study found that AE predicted alcohol use largely through shared environmental influences (controlling for genetic influences) (Samek, Keyes, Iacono, & McGue, 2013). Finally, AE in youth reflect a 2×2 dimension of good-bad and arousal-sedation, which is sensitive to developmental influences. For example, whereas identical descriptions of “wild and dangerous” AE were endorsed across 2nd and 5th grade children, the association of those terms differed dramatically – whereas the former group associated wild and dangerous negatively, 5th graders identified them favorably (Dunn & Goldman, 1996). Thus, studies must separately examine positive and negative AE given that they may be differentially sensitive to reward-based learning, emotion regulation, inhibitory control, all of which are

changing dynamically with development (Malter, Cohen, Tottenham, & Casey, 2013). Overall, there is a critical shortage of integrative explanatory models underlying the development childhood positive and negative AE, despite their centrality to emergent alcohol engagement.

The positive association in this study of childhood ADHD symptoms with AE (e.g., wild/crazy), independent of *DRD4* 7+ genotype, may reflect several important processes. ADHD predictions of AE may result from shared or correlated risk factors for childhood ADHD and AE including parental alcohol use and disinhibition (Molina et al., 1997; Smith & Anderson, 2001). Next, two independent meta-analyses established the predictive validity of early ADHD with respect to alcohol outcomes (e.g., abuse/dependence) (Lee et al., 2011; Charach et al., 2011). Future research must elucidate the mechanisms underlying the prediction of alcohol use from early ADHD given that risk factor research does not inherently identify risk processes. A key exception is where Molina et al. (2012) reported that ADHD symptom persistence, related functional impairment, and parental monitoring mediated predictions of escalating alcohol use. Although speculative, it may be that positive AE similarly mediates and/or moderates predictions of alcohol problems from ADHD. In one study, lower positive AE partially mediated the inverse association of high parental respect and alcohol use (Shih, Miles, Tucker, Zhou, & D'Amico, 2012), although this was evident only in specific cultural groups. Also, although impulsivity, a defining feature of ADHD, predicted alcohol quantity, frequency, and binge drinking in college students, this association was evident among those with average and elevated positive AE only (Carlson & Johnson, 2012). Finally, although negative AE may protect against alcohol use, there is also evidence that negative AE positively predicted alcohol problems (Mann, Chassin, & Sher, 1987; McMahon, Jones, & O'donnell, 1994). Furthermore, among individuals with *high* impulsivity and poor inhibitory control (e.g., ADHD), negative AE predicted *more* alcohol consumption (Finn, Bobova, Wehner, Fargo, & Rickert, 2005). These findings collectively suggest the need to replicate and extend the association of childhood ADHD with separate measures of positive and negative AE and their ultimate association with alcohol use.

Perhaps the most interesting finding in the current study was the positive prediction of wild/crazy AE from childhood ADHD symptoms, but only among *DRD4* 7+ individuals. Although childhood ADHD was measured dimensionally, rather than diagnostically, these findings substantiate previous reports that *DRD4* 7+ status predicted a more persistent and stable pattern of ADHD among children and adults with ADHD (Biederman et al., 2009). Similarly, among children and adolescents with ADHD, *DRD4* 7+ genotype differentially predicted individual differences in response to treatment with methylphenidate (McGough et al., 2009). These studies suggest that the considerable *within group* heterogeneity frequently associated with ADHD, ranging from comorbidity (e.g., conduct problems) to long-term outcome (e.g., alcohol and substance use disorders), may be usefully prosecuted based on genetic markers. For example, Caspi et al. (2008) reported that antisocial behavior, a frequent concomitant feature of ADHD, was partially the result of genetic heterogeneity within ADHD. By extension, perhaps the sensitivity of wild/crazy AE to the interactive effect of *DRD4* 7+ and elevated ADHD symptoms reflects an empirically distinct subgroup and/or pathway to important alcohol phenotypes. However, this is speculative until

genetically-informative, prospective designs mature into adolescence with careful ascertainment of ADHD, AE, and alcohol engagement (e.g., age of onset, frequency, amount). Finally, given that there are multiple pathways to and from adaptive and negative outcomes (e.g., alcohol problems) (Cicchetti & Rogosch, 1996), we contend that post-hoc mediational tests secondary to significant interactions underlying AE be investigated. That is, if the interaction of *DRD4* 7+ status and childhood ADHD symptoms is replicated with respect to wild/crazy AE, we await follow-up studies of plausible mediational constructs *within* that subgroup (i.e., elevated ADHD symptoms and *DRD4* 7+) to more fully identify the development of these specific cognitive expectations.

We also emphasize that the development of positive-social, negative-arousal, sedated/impaired, and wild/crazy AE in children remains poorly understood (Donovan & Molina, 2009). Not only are there likely to be multiple risk factors for AE in childhood, the consequences of individual differences in AE are likely to be similarly diverse (i.e., multifinality; Cicchetti & Rogosch, 1996). We contend that developmentally-sensitive studies are necessary given that AE may function differentially across development. This is particularly true with respect to developmental aspects of alcohol use, including the progression from use to heavy use and to eventual alcohol problems as well as reciprocal associations with other important influences. For example, a cross-lagged study of college students found that AE predicted the frequency of alcohol use but alcohol use did not affect AE; however, alcohol use did affect perceived norms around alcohol use (Wardell & Read, 2013). Further underscoring the potential that AE are sensitive to developmental influences, positive AE for sociability were central to alcohol use in 18-24 year-olds whereas expectations around the tension reducing properties of alcohol were more predictive of adult alcohol use (Pabst, Kraus, Piontek, Mueller, & Demmel, 2013). Collectively, these studies reinforce that prospective longitudinal studies are necessary to fully understand the multiple ways that AE are likely to develop and potentially influence patterns of alcohol engagement that are empirically distinct and also highly sensitive to development (e.g., early onset alcohol use; Odgers et al. 2008).

Although this study is strengthened by its prospective design and relatively large and ethnically diverse sample, we noted several important limitations. First, linkages between ADHD symptoms and AE were combined across inattention and hyperactivity dimensions, potentially masking differential patterns of association with respect to alcohol and substance outcomes (Molina & Pelham, 2003). Second, parental alcohol use is an important aspect of AE (Molina et al., 1997), but these data are not available in the current study. Third, ADHD frequently cooccurs with other disruptive behavior, mood, and anxiety disorders. Thus, the specificity of AE predictions from ADHD must be made cautiously. Third, less than 5% ($n = 7$) of the sample self-reported recent alcohol use greater than a sip. Although detailed information on frequency and quantity was not queried, we cannot be certain that these findings completely generalize to other alcohol naïve samples. Fourth, unmeasured interactions with other *DRD4* variants (e.g., linkage disequilibrium) and other environmental factors (e.g., parental alcohol use) were not investigated, once again reinforcing the preliminary nature of these results; related, candidate gene studies of individual differences trait often do not replicate. We readily acknowledge that the associations reported herein

must be interpreted cautiously, that they necessitate cross-validation in independent samples, and may reflect atypical effect sizes given statistical significance in a small study according to the standards of genetic epidemiology.

Based on an ethnically-diverse sample of 6-9 year-old children with and without ADHD followed prospectively to 8-13 years of age, we observed a reliable positive association of childhood ADHD symptoms with multiple AE dimensions; *DRD4* 7+ genotype also independently and positively predicted wild/crazy AE. Moreover, we detected a significant interaction where ADHD symptoms predicted elevated levels of expectations that alcohol would have wild/crazy effects, but this association was limited to individuals with the *DRD4* 7+ genotype. Although AE predict individual differences in alcohol engagement in adults and related special populations (e.g., college students), there remains a substantial gap in knowledge about AE in children generally and their precursors more specifically. This preliminary study suggests that genetic variation regulation dopamine neurotransmission and ADHD are two potential sources of influence for child AE. Future studies of emergent AE in children must prioritize developmental theories and related methods, including the centrality of disinhibition (Smith & Anderson, 2001), to more fully understand their association with the onset, progression, and escalation of alcohol use and alcohol problems.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by NIH grant 1R03AA020186-01 to Steve S. Lee. NIH was not involved in the design and conduct of the study nor in the analysis or interpretation of study data.

All authors contributed significantly to the study and reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

We gratefully acknowledge the participation of families in this study as well as the collective contribution of graduate and undergraduate research staff.

References

- Anderson KG, Smith GT, McCarthy DM, Fister S, Grodin D, Boerner LM, Hill KK. Elementary school drinking: The role of temperament and learning. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*. 2005; 19:21–27.
- Anderson KG, Schweinsburg MA, Paulus MP, Brown SA, Tapert S. Examining personality and alcohol expectancies using functional magnetic re. 2005
- Bailey JN, Breidenthal SE, Jorgensen MJ, McCracken JT, Fairbanks LA. The association of *DRD4* and novelty seeking is found in a nonhuman primate model. *Psychiatric Genetics*. 2007; 17(1):23–27. [PubMed: 17167341]
- Barkley, RA. Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: A handbook for diagnosis and treatment. 3rd ed.. Guilford; New York: 2006.
- Benjamin J, Li L, Patterson C, Greenberg BD, Murphy DL, Hamer DH. Population and familial association between the *D4* dopamine receptor gene and measures of Novelty Seeking. *Nature Genetics*. 1996; 12(1):81–84. [PubMed: 8528258]
- Biederman J, Petty CR, Ten Haagen KS, Small J, Doyle AE, Spencer T, Mick E, Monuteaux MC, Smoller JW, Faraone SV. Effect of candidate gene polymorphisms on the course of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Psychiatry Research*. 2009; 170:199–203. [PubMed: 19906444]
- Brown SA, Christiansen BA, Goldman MS. The Alcohol Expectancy Questionnaire: An instrument for the assessment of adolescent and adult alcohol expectancies. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 1987; 48(5):483–491. [PubMed: 3669677]

- Brown SA, McGue M, Maggs J, Schulenberg J, Hingson R, Swartzwelder S, Murphy S. A developmental perspective on alcohol and youths 16 to 20 years of age. *Pediatrics*. 2008; 121:S290–S310. [PubMed: 18381495]
- Carlson SR, Johnson SC. Impulsivity is not always associated with student drinking: a moderation study of impulsivity and drinking by positive alcohol expectancies. *Addictive Behavior*. 2012; 37:556–560.
- Caspi A, Langley K, Milne B, Moffitt TE, O'Donovan M, Owen MJ, Thapar A. A replicated molecular genetic basis for subtyping antisocial behavior in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2008; 65:203–210. [PubMed: 18250258]
- Chambers RA, Taylor JR, Potenza MN. Developmental neurocircuitry of motivation in adolescence: a critical period of addiction vulnerability. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2003; 160(6):1041–1052. [PubMed: 12777258]
- Christiansen BA, Smith GT, Roehling PV, Goldman MS. Using alcohol expectancies to predict adolescent drinking behavior after one year. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1989; 57:93–99. [PubMed: 2925979]
- Cicchetti D, Rogosch FA. Equifinality and multifinality in developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*. 1996; 8(4):597–600.
- Charach A, Yeung E, Climans T, Lillie E. Childhood attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and future substance use disorders: Comparative meta-analyses. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2011; 50(1):9–21. [PubMed: 21156266]
- Chartier KG, Hesselbrock MN, Hesselbrock VM. Development and vulnerability factors in adolescent alcohol use. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*. 2010; 19(3):493–504. [PubMed: 20682217]
- Connor JP, Young R McD, Lawford B, Ritchie T, Noble EP. Dopamine receptor (DRD2) polymorphism is associated with severity of alcohol dependence. *European Psychiatry*. 2002; 17:17–23. [PubMed: 11918988]
- Connor JP, Young RM, Saunders JB, Lawford BR, Ho R, Ritchie TL, Noble EP. The A1 allele of the D2 dopamine receptor gene region, alcohol expectancies and drinking refusal self-efficacy are associated with alcohol dependence severity. *Psychiatry Research*. 2008; 160(1):94–105. [PubMed: 18514919]
- Courtney KE, Polich J. Binge drinking in young adults: Data, definitions, and determinants. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2009; 135:142–156. [PubMed: 19210057]
- Cruz IY, Dunn ME. Lowering risk for early alcohol use by challenging alcohol expectancies in elementary school children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2003; 71:493–503. [PubMed: 12795573]
- Dattilo L, Murphy KG, Van Eck K, Flory K. Do ADHD symptoms moderate the relation between positive alcohol expectancies and alcohol-related outcomes? *Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorders*. 2013; 5(2):93–104. [PubMed: 23229745]
- Demyttenaere K, Bruffaerts R, Posada-Villa J, Gasquet I, Kovess V, Lepine JP, WHO World Mental Health Survey Consortium. et al. Prevalence, severity and unmet need for treatment of mental disorders in the World Health Organization World Mental Health (WMH) surveys. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2004; 291:2581–2590. [PubMed: 15173149]
- Donovan JE, Molina BG. Children's introduction to alcohol use: Sips and tastes. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2008; 32:108–119.
- Donovan JE, Molina BG. Childhood risk factors for early-onset drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2011; 72:741–751. [PubMed: 21906502]
- Donovan JE, Molina BG, Kelly TM. Alcohol outcome expectancies as socially shared and socialized beliefs. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*. 2009; 23:248–259.
- Dunn ME. Memory model-based expectancy questionnaire for children and adults (MMBEQ). 1999
- Dunn ME, Goldman MS. Empirical modeling of an alcohol expectancy memory network in elementary school children as a function of grade. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 1996; 4(2):209–217.

- Dunn ME, Goldman MS. Age and drinking-related differences in the memory organization of alcohol expectancies in 3rd-, 6th-, 9th-, and 12th-grade children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1998; 66:579–585. [PubMed: 9642899]
- Filbey FM, Ray L, Smolen A, Claus ED, Audette A, Hutchison KE. Differential neural response to alcohol priming and alcohol taste cues is associated with DRD4 VNTR and OPRM1 genotypes. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2008; 32:1113–1123.
- Finn PR, Bobova L, Wehner E, Fargo S, Rickert ME. Alcohol expectancies, conduct disorder, and early-onset alcoholism: negative alcohol expectancies are associated with less drinking in non-impulsive versus impulsive subjects. *Addiction Biology*. 2005; 100:953–962.
- Forbes EE, Brown SM, Kimak M, Ferrell RE, Manuck SB, Hariri AR. Genetic variation in components of dopamine neurotransmission impacts ventral striatal reactivity associated with impulsivity. *Molecular Psychiatry*. 2009; 14(1):60–70. [PubMed: 17893706]
- Froehlich TE, Lanphear BP, Dietrich KN, Cory-Slechta DA, Wang N, Kahn RS. Interactive effects of a DRD4 polymorphism, lead, and sex on executive functions in children. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2007; 62(3):243–249. [PubMed: 17239353]
- Garcia JR, MacKillop J, Aller EL, Merriweather AM, Wilson DS, Lum JK. Associations between dopamine D4 receptor gene variation with both infidelity and sexual promiscuity. *PLoS One*. 2010; 30:e14162. [PubMed: 21152404]
- Grant BF, Dawson DA. Age at onset of alcohol use and its association with DSMIV alcohol abuse and dependence: Results from the National Longitudinal Alcohol Epidemiologic Survey. *Journal of Substance Abuse*. 1997; 9:103–110. [PubMed: 9494942]
- Hingson RW, Heeren T, Winter MR. Age at drinking onset and alcohol dependence: Age at onset, duration, and severity. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*. 2006; 160:739–746. [PubMed: 16818840]
- Humphreys KL, Aguirre VP, Lee SS. Association of anxiety and conduct problems in children with and without ADHD. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 2012; 41:370–377. [PubMed: 22420771]
- Hutchison KE, Stallings M, McGeary J, Bryan A. Population stratification in the candidate gene study: Fatal threat or red herring? *Psychological Bulletin*. 2004; 130:66–79. [PubMed: 14717650]
- Jaffee SR, Price TS. Gene–environment correlations: a review of the evidence and implications for prevention of mental illness. *Molecular Psychiatry*. 2007; 12(5):432–442. [PubMed: 17453060]
- Johnston, LD.; O'Malley, PM.; Bachman, JG.; Schulenberg, JE. Monitoring the Future national results on adolescent drug use: Overview of key findings. Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan; Ann Arbor: 2012.
- Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Merikangas KR, Walters EE. Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2005; 62(6):593–602. [PubMed: 15939837]
- Kraemer HC, Stice E, Kazdin A, Offord D, Kupfer D. How do risk factors work together? Mediators, moderators, and independent, overlapping, and proxy risk factors. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2001; 158(6):848–856. [PubMed: 11384888]
- Lahey B, Applegate B, McBurnett K, Biederman J, Greenhill L, Hynd G, Shaffer D. DSM-IV field trials for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 1994; 151(11):1673–1685. [PubMed: 7943460]
- Lee SS, Falk A, Aguirre VA. Association of comorbid anxiety with social functioning in school-age children with and without ADHD. *Psychiatry Research*. 2012; 197:90–96. [PubMed: 22455859]
- Lee SS, Humphreys KL, Flory K, Liu R, Glass K. Prospective association of childhood attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and substance use and abuse/dependence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2011; 31(30):328–341. [PubMed: 21382538]
- Lee SS, Lahey BB, Owens EB, Hinshaw SP. Few preschool boys and girls with ADHD are well-adjusted during adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 2008; 36(3):373–383. [PubMed: 17914666]
- McClelland GH, Judd CM. Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1993; 114:376–390. [PubMed: 8416037]

- Malter Cohen M, Tottenham N, Casey BJ. Translational developmental studies of stress on brain and behavior: implications for adolescent mental health and illness. *Neuroscience*. 2013; 249:53–62. [PubMed: 23340244]
- Mann LM, Chassin L, Sher KJ. Alcohol expectancies and the risk for alcoholism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1987; 55(3):411–417. [PubMed: 3597957]
- McGough JJ, McCracken JT, Loo SK, Manganiello M, Leung MC, Tietjens JR, Sugar CA. A candidate gene analysis of methylphenidate response in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2009; 48:1155–1164. [PubMed: 19858760]
- McMahon J, Jones BT, O'donnell P. Comparing positive and negative alcohol expectancies in male and female social drinkers. *Addiction Research & Theory*. 1994; 1(4):349–365.
- Miller PM, Smith GT, Goldman MS. Emergence of alcohol expectancies in childhood: A possible critical period. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 1990; 51(4):343–349.
- Molina BS, Pelham WE, Cheong J, Marshal MP, Gnagy EM, Curran PJ. Childhood attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and growth in adolescent alcohol use: The roles of functional impairments, ADHD symptom persistence, and parental knowledge. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2012; 121(4):922–935. [PubMed: 22845650]
- Molina BS, Pelham WE. Childhood predictors of adolescent substance use in longitudinal study of children with ADHD. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2003; 112(3):497–507. [PubMed: 12943028]
- Molina BS, Pelham WE, Lang AR. Alcohol expectancies and drinking characteristics in parents of children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 1997; 21(3):557–566.
- Munafo MR, Clark TG, Moore LR, Payne E, Walton R, Flint J. Genetic polymorphisms and personality in health adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Molecular Psychiatry*. 2003; 8:471–484. [PubMed: 12808427]
- Nigg JT. Is ADHD a disinhibitory disorder? *Psychological Bulletin*. 2001; 127:571–598. [PubMed: 11548968]
- Nikolova YS, Ferrell RE, Manuck SB, Hariri AR. Multilocus genetic profile for dopamine signaling predicts ventral striatum reactivity. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2011; 36(9):1940–1947. [PubMed: 21593733]
- Noll RB, Zucker RA, Greenberg GS. Identification of alcohol by smell among preschoolers: Evidence for early socialization about drugs occurring in the home. *Child Development*. 1990; 61(5):1520–1527. [PubMed: 2245743]
- Odgers CL, Caspi A, Nagin DS, Piquero AR, Slutske WS, Milne BJ, Moffitt TE. Is it important to prevent early exposure to drugs and alcohol among adolescents? *Psychological Science*. 2008; 19(10):1037–1044. [PubMed: 19000215]
- Pabst A, Kraus L, Piontek D, Mueller S, Demmel R. Direct and indirect effects of alcohol expectancies on alcohol-related problems. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*. 2013 Advanced online publication.
- Pelham WE, Gnagy EM, Greenslade KE, Milich R. Teacher ratings of DSM III-R symptoms for the disruptive behavior disorders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 1992; 31:210–218. [PubMed: 1564021]
- Pelham WE, Fabiano GA, Massetti GM. Evidence-based assessment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children and adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 2005; 34(3):449–476. [PubMed: 16026214]
- Samek DR, Keyes MA, Iacono WG, McGue M. Peer deviance, alcohol expectancies, and adolescent alcohol use: Explaining shared and nonshared environmental effects using an adoptive sibling pair design. *Behavior Genetics*. 2013; 43(4):286–296. [PubMed: 23644917]
- Shaffer D, Fisher P, Lucas CP, Dulcan MK, Schwab-Stone ME. NIMH diagnostic interview schedule for children version IV (NIMH DISC-IV): Description, differences from previous versions, and reliability of some common diagnoses. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2000; 39:28–38. [PubMed: 10638065]

- Shih RA, Miles JN, Tucker JS, Zhou AJ, D'Amico EJ. Racial/ethnic differences in the influence of cultural values, alcohol resistance self-efficacy, and alcohol expectancies on risk for alcohol initiation. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*. 2012; 26:460–470.
- Smith, GT.; Anderson, KG. Adolescent risk for alcohol problems as acquired preparedness: A model and suggestions for intervention.. In: Monti, PM.; Colby, SM.; O'Leary, TA., editors. *Adolescents, Alcohol, and Substance Abuse: Reaching Teens through Brief Interventions*. Guilford Press; New York: 2001. p. 109-141.
- Squeglia LM, Spadoni AD, Infante MA, Myers MG, Tapert SF. Initiating moderate to heavy alcohol use predicts changes in neuropsychological functioning for adolescent girls and boys. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*. 2009; 23:715–722.
- Stice E, Yokum S, Burger K, Epstein L, Smolen A. Multilocus genetic composite reflecting dopamine signaling capacity predicts reward circuitry responsivity. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2012; 18:10093–10100. [PubMed: 22815523]
- Tom SM, Fox CR, Trepel C, Poldrack RA. The neural basis of loss aversion in decision-making under risk. *Science*. 2007; 315(5811):515–518. [PubMed: 17255512]
- Volkow ND, Fowler JS, Wang GJ, Swanson JM, Telang F. Dopamine in drug abuse and addiction: results of imaging studies and treatment implications. *Archives of Neurology*. 2007; 64(11):1575–1579. [PubMed: 17998440]
- Wardell JD, Read JP. Alcohol expectancies, perceived norms, and drinking behavior among college students: examining the reciprocal determinism hypothesis. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*. 2013; 27:191–196.
- Weafer J, Fillmore MT, Milich R. Increased sensitivity to the disinhibiting effects of alcohol in adults with ADHD. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 2009; 17:113–121. [PubMed: 19331488]
- Weafer J, Milich R, Fillmore MT. Behavioral components of impulsivity predict alcohol consumption in adults with ADHD and healthy controls. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2011; 113:139–146. [PubMed: 20863628]
- Young, R, McD.. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Queensland; 1994. The measurement of alcohol related expectancies..
- Young R McD, Lawford BR, Feeney GFX, Ritchie T, Noble EP. Alcohol-related expectancies are associated with the D₂ dopamine receptor and GABA_A receptor β 3 subunit genes. *Psychiatry Research*. 2004; 127:171–183. [PubMed: 15296817]
- Young R McD, Oei TPS. The predictive utility of drinking refusal self-efficacy and alcohol expectancy: a diary based study on tension reduction. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2000; 25:415–421. [PubMed: 10890294]

Figure 1.

Interaction of youth *DRD4* × DISC ADHD symptoms on sedated/impaired alcohol expectancies.

Figure 2.

Interaction of Youth *DRD4* × DISC ADHD symptoms on wild/crazy alcohol expectancies.

Figure 3.

Interaction of Youth *DRD4* × DBD ADHD symptoms on wild/crazy alcohol expectancies.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of the sample based on Wave 1 ADHD diagnostic status.

	ADHD (N = 119)	No ADHD (N = 110)	F or χ^2
Age at Wave 1	7.77 (1.16)	8.01 (1.22)	2.27
Sex (% Male)	74%	62%	3.87*
Race (% White)	51%	53%	0.13
DRD4 genotype (% any 7)	36%	37%	0.85
DISC ADHD symptoms Wave 1	12.28 (3.20)	3.11 (2.87)	522.39***
DBD ADHD symptoms Wave 1	30.56 (10.00)	10.42 (8.91)	250.22***
DISC ADHD symptoms Wave 2	10.34 (4.57)	2.95 (3.60)	158.83***
DBD ADHD symptoms Wave 2	25.57 (11.97)	9.30 (9.73)	105.69***
Positive-social AE	18.64 (8.02)	20.38 (8.35)	1.63
Negative-arousal AE	12.78 (5.38)	11.94 (4.28)	1.04
Sedated/impaired AE	11.96 (4.50)	11.89 (3.41)	0.01
Wild/crazy AE	10.65 (2.94)	10.02 (2.98)	1.62

Note. Mean (SD). AE = alcohol expectancies.

* $p < .05$.***
 $p < .001$

Table 2*DRD4* genotype by ADHD diagnosis at Wave 1.

	<i>DRD4</i> 7+ (n = 66)	<i>DRD4</i> 7- (n = 124)	χ^2
ADHD (n = 94)	47% (n = 31)	51% (n = 63)	0.25 ^{ns}
No ADHD (n = 96)	53% (n = 35)	49% (n = 61)	