

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Psychology Faculty Publications

Department of Psychology

2008

Attention Bias Towards Threat in Pediatric Anxiety Disorders

Amy K. Roy

New York University School of Medicine

Roma A. Vasa

Johns Hopkins University

Maggie Bruck

Johns Hopkins University

Karin Mogg

University of Southampton

Brendan P. Bradley

University of Southampton

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/psych_facpub



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Roy, Amy K.; Vasa, Roma A.; Bruck, Maggie; Mogg, Karin; Bradley, Brendan P.; Sweeney, Michael; Bergman, Lindsey; McClure-Tone, Erin B.; and Pine, Daniel S., "Attention Bias Towards Threat in Pediatric Anxiety Disorders" (2008). *Psychology Faculty Publications*. 140.

https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/psych_facpub/140

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Psychology at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Authors

Amy K. Roy, Roma A. Vasa, Maggie Bruck, Karin Mogg, Brendan P. Bradley, Michael Sweeney, Lindsey Bergman, Erin B. McClure-Tone, and Daniel S. Pine

Attention Bias Towards Threat in Pediatric Anxiety Disorders

Amy Krain Roy, Ph.D., Roma A. Vasa, M.D., Maggie Bruck, Ph.D., Karin Mogg, Ph.D.,
Brendan P. Bradley, Ph.D., Michael Sweeney, Ph.D., R. Lindsey Bergman, Ph.D., Erin
B. McClure-Tone, Ph.D., Daniel S. Pine, M.D. and the CAMS Team

Dr. Roy is at the NYU Child Study Center at the New York University School of Medicine; Drs. Vasa and Bruck are at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine; Drs. Mogg and Bradley are in the School of Psychology at the University of Southampton; Dr. Sweeney is at the New York State Psychiatric Institute; Dr. Bergman is in the Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science at the University of California Los Angeles; Dr. McClure-Tone is in the Department of Psychology at Georgia State University; and Dr. Pine is Chief, Section on Development and Affective Neuroscience at the National Institute of Mental Health.

We gratefully acknowledge the Child/Adolescent Anxiety Multimodal Study (CAMS) Team: Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions (PI: John T. Walkup, MD; Co-I: Golda S. Ginsburg, PhD); New York State Psychiatric Institute (PI: Anne Marie Albano, PhD; Co-I: Bruce Waslick, MD); Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic (PI: Boris Birmaher, MD; Co-I: Dara Sakolsky, MD, PhD; Statistician: Satish Iyengar, PhD); Temple University (PI: Philip C. Kendall, PhD; Co-I: Moira Rynn, MD); Duke University Medical Center (PI: John S. March, MD; Co-I: Scott N. Compton, PhD); University of California at Los Angeles (PI: John Piacentini, PhD; Co-I: Jim McCracken, MD); Data Center, Duke University Medical Center (PI: Scott N. Compton, PhD); NIMH Scientific Collaborator: Joel Sherrill, PhD.

For reprint requests and/or correspondence, please contact Dr. Roy at the New York University Child Study Center, 215 Lexington Avenue, #1307; New York, NY, 10016 or by email at amy.roy@nyumc.org.

This study was funded by the National Institute of Mental Health: New York State Psychiatric Institute (PI: Albano; U01 MH64092); Duke University Medical Center (PI: March; U01 MH64107); Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions (PI: Walkup; U01 MH064089); Temple University (PI: Kendall; U01 MH63747-04); University of California at Los Angeles (PI: Piacentini; U01 MH64088); Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic (PI: Birmaher; U01 MH64003); and Data Center, Duke University Medical Center (PI: Compton; U01 MH064003).

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine attention bias towards threat faces in a large sample of anxiety-disordered youths using a well-established visual probe task. **Method:** Study participants included 101 children and adolescents (ages 7- 18 years) with generalized anxiety disorder, social phobia and/or separation anxiety disorder enrolled in a multi-site anxiety treatment study. Non-anxious youths ($n = 51$; ages 9 – 18 years) were recruited separately. Participants were administered a computerized visual probe task that presents pairs of faces portraying threat (angry), positive (happy) and neutral expressions. They pressed a response-key to indicate the spatial location of a probe that replaced one of the faces on each trial. Attention bias scores were calculated from response times to probes for each emotional face type. **Results:** Compared to healthy youths, anxious participants demonstrated a greater attention bias towards threat faces. This threat bias in anxious patients did not significantly vary across the anxiety disorders. There was no group difference in attention bias towards happy faces. **Conclusions:** These results suggest that pediatric anxiety disorders are associated with an attention bias towards threat. Future research might examine the manner in which cognitive bias in anxious youth changes with treatment.

Keywords: anxiety disorders, children, adolescents, attention bias, threat

INTRODUCTION

Pediatric anxiety disorders affect approximately 10-15% of children and adolescents^{1,2} and are associated with significant, enduring impairment^{3,4} Although research on pediatric anxiety disorders is rapidly growing, knowledge of pathophysiology remains limited. Cognitive models suggest that biased processing of threats cause or maintain anxiety.⁵⁻⁷ These models are supported by data demonstrating that anxious individuals preferentially allocate attention (i.e., show an attention bias) towards threatening, as compared to positive or neutral, stimuli. Further support is provided by neuroimaging findings of anxiety-related differences in the structure and function of brain regions implicated in the detection and processing of threatening stimuli.⁸⁻¹²

Two experimental attention-bias paradigms have been widely used to study the relationship between anxiety and attention bias: the emotional Stroop and visual probe tasks. The emotional Stroop¹³ is based on principles of cognitive interference; attention bias is manifested by longer response times for color naming of threat vs. positive or neutral words. While extensively used, this task is criticized because performance may reflect processes beyond attention, such as interference in response selection or execution.^{14,15} The visual probe task provides a more direct measure of attention by requiring responses to neutral probes that replace threat and non-threat stimuli.¹⁴ In this task, two stimuli, one threatening and one neutral, are briefly presented side-by-side. The stimuli then disappear and one is replaced by a target probe. Participants must indicate on which side the probe appears using a button press. Attention bias towards threat is defined as faster reaction times to probes replacing threat stimuli compared with neutral stimuli.

Numerous adult studies report an attention bias towards threat in clinical and non-clinical samples.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Research using the Stroop and visual probe tasks has demonstrated

1
2
3
4 greater attention towards threat stimuli across various disorders, namely generalized anxiety
5
6 disorder (GAD),^{16,19} social phobia (SP),²⁰ post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD),²¹ obsessive-
7
8 compulsive disorder (OCD),²² and panic disorder.^{23,24} Orienting towards threat typically
9
10 occurs with brief stimulus presentations, suggesting that this bias manifests early in
11
12 information processing.^{20,25}
13
14

15 Studies of threat bias in pediatric anxiety disorders have been limited and most have
16
17 used small, heterogeneous samples. Earlier studies using a visual probe task with word
18
19 stimuli or an emotional Stroop task report findings similar to adult studies, i.e., an enhanced
20
21 attention bias towards threat in anxious participants.²⁶⁻²⁹ This result was replicated recently in
22
23 a study of clinically anxious and non-anxious children using a visual probe task with threat-
24
25 related, neutral, and pleasant pictures.³⁰ A previous study using this task found the same
26
27 attention bias towards threat in a clinically anxious pediatric sample; however a similar bias
28
29 was also observed in healthy non-anxious children and adults.³¹ Another recent study found
30
31 no bias towards threat faces in children with GAD or healthy controls (Waters et al., in
32
33 press). However, when the GAD group was divided by parent-reported anxiety severity, the
34
35 more severe group showed a bias towards both happy and threat faces. Monk et al.,¹¹ in
36
37 contrast, found a bias *away* from threat faces in pediatric GAD, possibly due to the testing
38
39 environment, which was an MR scanner rather than a laboratory setting.
40
41
42
43
44

45 In summary, data in adults document consistent associations between anxiety and
46
47 vigilance for threat on a visual probe task. Similar associations have been demonstrated in
48
49 children and adolescents, although there has been greater inconsistency, possibly due to small
50
51 samples, restricted age ranges, and/or different testing contexts. This suggests the need for
52
53 studies in larger pediatric anxiety samples across a broader age range tested with consistent
54
55 visual probe methods similar to those used in adults.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The current study uses the same emotional face visual probe paradigm employed in
5
6 previous pediatric^{11,32} and adult studies,^{16,20,25} to examine attention bias in 101 children and
7
8 adolescents with three specific childhood anxiety disorders: separation anxiety disorder
9
10 (SAD), generalized anxiety disorder (GAD), and social phobia (SP). Participants were
11
12 recruited through a multi-site anxiety treatment study and were administered the visual probe
13
14 task prior to treatment and at several time points during the treatment course. This study
15
16 reports on the results of the pre-treatment assessment. Data from this large cohort allow us to
17
18 test specific hypotheses and investigate exploratory questions not previously examined. First,
19
20 based on the adult literature¹⁶⁻²⁰ and most studies of youth,²⁶⁻³⁰ we predict that children and
21
22 adolescents with anxiety disorders, but not healthy youths, will show a selective attention
23
24 bias towards threat faces. Similarly, we predict that this attention bias will correlate with
25
26 anxiety severity, suggesting a greater bias in patients who are more anxious. Exploratory
27
28 analyses examine whether bias is specific to particular disorders and face types (e.g. threat vs.
29
30 happy).

31 32 33 34 35 36 **METHOD**

37 38 **Participants**

39
40 The visual probe task was completed by 125 children and adolescents with anxiety disorders
41
42 participating in a multi-site treatment study, the Child/Adolescent Anxiety Multimodal Study
43
44 (CAMS) (Study sites include: Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, New York State
45
46 Psychiatric Institute, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, Temple University, Duke
47
48 University Medical Center, University of California at Los Angeles). This randomized
49
50 controlled trial examined the efficacy of cognitive-behavioral and pharmacological
51
52 interventions for SAD, GAD, and SP. Participants were included in the overall CAMS study
53
54 if they received a principal diagnosis of at least one of these disorders based on the Anxiety
55
56 Disorder Interview Schedule for Children (ADIS-IV-C).³³ CAMS exclusion criteria included
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 a current diagnosis of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) or Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
5
6 (PTSD), and current use of psychotropic medication (stable treatment with a psychostimulant
7
8 was permitted).
9

10
11 Of the 125 CAMS participants who completed the visual probe task, 24 were
12
13 excluded from further analyses. Six were excluded because more than 50% of their reaction
14
15 time (RT) data were missing (e.g. due to errors or outliers), which suggests they did not
16
17 engage appropriately in the task. Additionally, 18 participants with comorbid Attention-
18
19 Deficit/ Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) were excluded because of the possible influence of
20
21 these symptoms or associated medications on task performance.³⁴ This resulted in a final
22
23 count of 101 clinically anxious participants (49% female; mean age = 11.5 years, *SD* = 2.8,
24
25 range 7.1 – 17.5 years).
26
27
28

29
30 Healthy non-anxious participants were recruited using advertisements and through
31
32 ongoing studies at the National Institutes of Mental Health and the NYU Child Study Center.
33
34 Briefly, all participants were free of current psychopathology, any medication, or medical
35
36 illness. Consistent with the clinical sample, all healthy participants met the selection criterion
37
38 of no more than 50% of missing RT data on the visual probe task. This resulted in a healthy
39
40 control sample of fifty-one children (45% female; mean age = 13.6 years; *SD* = 2.7; range 9 –
41
42 17.6 years).
43
44

45 **Clinical Assessment**

46
47 Anxious and healthy participants were assessed using slightly different semi-
48
49 structured diagnostic interviews and abbreviated intelligence measures. All measures are
50
51 validated for use with children and adolescents.
52
53

54 CAMS Participants: While the baseline evaluation of the CAMS study included
55
56 multiple measures of anxiety, only select measures utilized in the current study are described
57
58 here. To evaluate past and current psychiatric diagnoses, trained independent evaluators
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 interviewed parents and children separately using the ADIS-IV-C³³. The ADIS-IV-C
2
3
4 evaluates the presence of anxiety disorders, as well as the full range of psychiatric disorders
5
6
7 assessed by other semi-structured interviews. Following this, the independent evaluator
8
9
10 completed the Pediatric Anxiety Rating Scale for Children (PARS),³⁵ resulting in child,
11
12
13 parent, and evaluator ratings of specific anxiety symptoms and overall distress. Parents and
14
15
16 children also completed the Screen for Anxiety and Related Disorders (SCARED)³⁶ and the
17
18
19 children completed the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC)³⁷. The
20
21
22 vocabulary and block design subtests of the WISC-III³⁸ were administered as an estimate of
23
24
25 intellectual ability.

26
27 Healthy Control Participants: Participants from NIMH were evaluated using the
28
29 Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Aged Children- Present and
30
31 Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL)³⁹ and participants from NYU were evaluated using the
32
33 ADIS-IV-C.³³ Different diagnostic instruments were used because each site had existing
34
35 well-established procedures for specific interviews. The availability of well-trained, reliable
36
37 clinicians ($\kappa > 0.70$) was felt to outweigh any disadvantages associated with the minimal
38
39 differences between the interviews.

40
41 Only participants free of current or past psychiatric diagnosis were included in the
42
43 study. Participants completed either the four subtest version (NIMH) or two subtest version
44
45 (NYU) of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI).⁴⁰ A subset of healthy
46
47 controls also completed the SCARED-Parent and Child versions (70.6% of parents and
48
49 74.5% of children).

50 51 **Visual Probe Task**

52
53 This task has been used extensively in prior studies investigating the relationship
54
55 between anxiety and attention bias.^{11,16,25,32} Face stimuli include photographs of positive
56
57 (happy), threat (angry), and neutral expressions portrayed by 64 different actors (50% male).
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 A single trial consists of a pair of photographs of the same actor presented side by side on a
5
6 computer screen; one photograph displays a neutral expression and the other expresses either
7
8 an angry or happy expression. A total of 32 angry-neutral trials and 32 happy-neutral trials
9
10 were presented. Half of the trials displayed the emotional expression on the right, and the
11
12 other half displayed the emotional expression on the left. Additionally, sixteen trials of
13
14 neutral-neutral face pairs were presented. The task was presented using EPrime software
15
16 (Psychology Software Tools, Pittsburgh). Participants sat approximately 50 cm from the
17
18 computer. The task began with 32 practice trials followed by 80 trials presented in random
19
20 order, during which reaction time (RT) data were collected.
21
22
23

24 Each trial began with a 500-msec centrally presented fixation cross, which was
25
26 followed by a face-pair presented for 500 msec. Immediately after the display of the face-
27
28 pair, a single-asterisk “probe” was displayed for 1100 msec on the left or right side of the
29
30 screen in the location of one of the faces. Participants were instructed to indicate, as quickly
31
32 and accurately as possible, whether the probe appeared on the right or the left using the
33
34 keyboard. The inter-trial interval varied randomly between 750 and 1250 msec.
35
36
37

38 **Data Analysis**

39
40 As in previous studies,^{20,32} data from trials with errors were excluded, as were RTs
41
42 that were less than 200 msec or more than two standard deviations above each subject’s mean
43
44 RT. Nine participants (6 anxious patients, 3 healthy controls) were excluded because more
45
46 than 50% of their RT data were missing due to errors or outliers. For the remaining
47
48 participants ($N = 152$ across groups), the mean amount of RT data that were missing was
49
50 10.2% ($SD = 8.0$), and there was no significant difference between the groups on this variable
51
52 ($t[150] = 1.11, p = .27$). Chi square tests and independent sample t-tests were used to examine
53
54 group differences in age, gender, race, socioeconomic status (SES) as measured by the
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Hollingshead Four Factor Index,⁴¹ estimated full scale IQ, and RTs on neutral face trials, an
5
6 unbiased estimate of overall response speed.
7

8
9 To test primary study hypotheses, attention bias scores were derived from a standard
10
11 formula used in prior research.^{11,25,32} For each subject, attention bias scores for angry faces
12
13 were calculated by subtracting the mean RT on trials where the angry face and probe
14
15 appeared on the same side of the display from the mean RT on trials where the angry face and
16
17 probe appeared on opposite sides of the display. Positive values reflect a bias toward the
18
19 angry relative to the neutral face, whereas negative values reflect a bias away from threat.
20
21 Bias was calculated in a similar fashion for happy faces. T-tests were used to examine group
22
23 differences in bias scores and absolute differences from zero. Due to group differences in age,
24
25 race, IQ and mean RT, analyses of covariance were also conducted. For these subsequent
26
27 analyses, only participants with complete data were included (99 anxious and 46 healthy
28
29 youths). Given that each statistical analysis was conducted to answer a specific independent
30
31 research question and involved a unique set of dependent variables (i.e., threat bias, happy
32
33 bias), correction for multiple comparisons was not deemed necessary.
34
35
36
37

38
39 Associations between attention bias and clinical anxiety variables were examined
40
41 using Pearson correlations and linear regression. To examine associations with specific
42
43 anxiety disorders, three dichotomous variables were created indicating presence or absence of
44
45 each of the three primary anxiety disorders. Attention bias was then regressed on these three
46
47 variables. While it would have been preferable to compare participants with single diagnoses,
48
49 this was not feasible due to comorbidity (see Table).
50
51
52
53

54 **RESULTS**

55 **Group Characteristics**

56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Within the anxious group, 78 (77%) met criteria for SP, 82 (81%) for GAD, and 59
5
6 (58%) for SAD with a high level of comorbidity (see Table).
7

8
9 The anxious and healthy groups did not differ in gender ratio (X^2 [continuity
10 correction] = .16, $df = 1$, $N = 152$, $p = .69$) or SES ($t[138] = 0.87$, $p = .39$) (see Table). The
11
12 anxious group ($M = 11.5$ years, $SD = 2.8$) was significantly younger than the healthy group
13
14 ($M = 13.6$ years, $SD = 2.7$) ($t[150] = 4.25$, $p < .001$) and had a greater ratio of white to non-
15
16 white participants (X^2 [continuity correction] = 11.17, $df = 1$, $N = 147$, $p = .001$). Mean
17
18 estimated full scale IQ scores were significantly lower in the anxious ($M = 102.8$; $SD = 16.9$;
19
20 data missing on 3 participants) than healthy ($M = 110.7$; $SD = 14.8$; data missing on 1
21
22 subject) ($t[146] = 2.82$, $p = .006$) group. Also, the anxious group showed slower
23
24 psychomotor performance than the healthy group, as reflected by the mean RT on neutral
25
26 trials (Anxious: $M = 572$ ms; $SD = 130$; Healthy: $M = 488$ ms; $SD = 94$; $t[150] = 4.55$, $p <$
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
61
62
63
64
65
.001).

----- Insert Table Here -----

36 As the groups differed on several descriptive variables, we examined the association
37
38 between these measures and both happy and threat bias. No significant relationships emerged
39
40 between threat bias and age (Anxious: $r = -.004$, $p = .97$; Healthy: $r = .11$, $p = .45$; Overall: r
41
42 = $-.05$, $p = .47$), estimated IQ scores (Anxious: $r = -.06$, $p = .54$; Healthy: $r = .08$, $p = .57$;
43
44 Overall: $r = -.05$, $p = .53$), race (Anxious: $r_{pb} = .02$, $p = .87$; Healthy: $r_{pb} = .24$, $p = .11$;
45
46 Overall: $r_{pb} = .14$, $p = .10$), or mean RT on neutral trials (Anxious: $r = .15$, $p = .15$; Healthy:
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
 $r = -.23$, $p = .11$; Overall: $r = .13$, $p = .11$). Similarly, no significant relationships emerged
between happy bias and age (Anxious: $r = -.14$, $p = .17$; Healthy: $r = -.08$, $p = .60$; Overall: r
= $-.11$, $p = .17$), estimated IQ scores (Anxious: $r = -.004$, $p = .97$; Healthy: $r = -.07$, $p = .63$;
Overall: $r = -.02$, $p = .82$), race (Anxious: $r_{pb} = -.01$, $p = .90$; Healthy: $r_{pb} = -.21$, $p = .15$;

Overall: $r_{pb} = -.09, p = .30$) and mean RT on neutral trials (Anxious: $r = -.07, p = .51$;
Healthy: $r = -.18, p = .22$; Overall: $r = -.09, p = .27$).

Bias Scores for Threat Faces

Group Differences. Group comparison showed significantly greater threat bias scores in anxious ($M = 10.7$ ms, $SD = 38.6$), relative to healthy youths ($M = -7.96$ ms, $SD = 31.4$) ($t[150] = 2.98, p = .003$; Cohen's $d = 0.53$, see Figure). The mean threat bias score in anxious patients differed from zero ($t[97] = 2.52, p = .01$), indicating bias towards threat, while the mean in healthy youths did not differ from zero ($t[50] = 1.53, p = .13$). This group difference persisted in the ANCOVA controlling for age, race, IQ, and mean RT during neutral trials (Anxious: $M = 10.0$ ms, $SD = 37.8$; Healthy: $M = -4.8$ ms, $SD = 29.8$; $F[1, 145] = 3.96, p = .049$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$).

-----Insert Figure Here-----

Clinical Measures. There were no associations between threat bias and anxiety severity in the anxious group alone (MASC: $r = -.01$; PARS-Clinician: $r = -.10$; PARS-Child: $r = .05$; PARS-Parent: $r = -.12$, all *NS*) or across groups (SCARED-Parent: $r = .14$; SCARED-Child: $r = .02$).

Individual Anxiety Disorders. No evidence of a relationship between threat bias and specific anxiety diagnoses emerged. A regression of threat bias on individual anxiety diagnoses showed no significant results ($R^2 = .01$; $F < 1$), suggesting that threat bias relates to the presence of any anxiety disorder, as opposed to one or another specific diagnosis. Additionally, the correlation between threat bias and number of anxiety diagnoses was not significant ($r = -.02, p = .87$).

Bias Scores for Happy Faces

Group Differences. Anxious and healthy groups did not differ in their happy bias scores ($t[150] = 0.19, p = .99$). Mean bias scores were 2.1 ms ($SD = 34.9$) for patients, and 2.2

ms ($SD = 33.1$) for healthy youths, with no difference in bias from zero for either the anxious ($t[100] = .60, p = .55$) or healthy group ($t[50] = 0.48, p = .63$). No group differences emerged after controlling for age, race, IQ, and mean RT on neutral trials ($F[1,145] = .31, p = .58$).

Clinical Measures: Happy bias scores did not correlate with self-reported anxiety in the anxious group (MASC: $r = -.08$; PARS- Clinician: $r = .13$; PARS-Child: $r = .05$; PARS-Parent: $r = .12$, all *NS*) or across groups (SCARED-Parent: $r = -.04$; SCARED-Child: $r = -.004$).

Individual Anxiety Disorders: Within the anxious group, a regression analysis of happy bias scores as the dependent variable, and anxiety diagnosis as dichotomous predictor variables, showed no significant results ($R^2 = .01; F < 1$). Correlational analysis of happy bias scores and number of anxiety diagnoses was not significant suggesting no relationship between happy bias severity and anxiety comorbidity ($r = -.04, p = .67$).

DISCUSSION

Children and adolescents with SP, GAD, or SAD, but not healthy youths, demonstrated an attention bias towards angry faces on a visual probe task. These results are consistent with several prior studies in anxious youth.²⁶⁻³⁰ The present results are also consistent with work in anxious adults, which reveals consistent evidence of attention biases towards threat words and angry faces.^{16,19,20} These findings support theories suggesting that anxious individuals manifest a selective processing bias towards threat^{5,6} due to a perturbation in neural mechanisms controlling vigilance.⁴²

Of note, the current data differ from some other recent studies of anxious youth.^{11,31,32} For example, in the present study, healthy youths showed no attention bias towards angry faces, whereas this bias has been observed for other types of threat stimuli in healthy children (e.g., pictures of dogs, snakes, guns).³¹ Angry faces differ from threat pictures in several ways including emotional valence, subjective threat value, novelty, and complexity, all of

1
2
3
4 which may impact attention processes.⁶ Moreover, two other studies, using the same visual
5
6 probe paradigm employed in the current study, report an attention bias *away* from angry faces
7
8 in children and adolescents with either PTSD or GAD.^{11,32} Differences between the current
9
10 results and these prior studies may reflect the differing circumstances across the three studies.
11
12 For example, in Pine et al.³², the children experienced severe maltreatment and subsequent
13
14 PTSD. One might expect that severely maltreated children might develop strong automatic
15
16 tendencies to avoid angry faces, contributing to an attention bias away from threat. As such,
17
18 the current data provide some support for distinctions between PTSD and other anxiety
19
20 disorders based on information-processing profiles that may reflect differences in
21
22 pathophysiology.^{43,44} Similarly, a recent functional magnetic resonance imaging study
23
24 demonstrated an attention bias away from threat in adolescents with GAD.¹¹ The anxiogenic
25
26 environment of the MR scanner may have influenced the direction of the bias, leading to
27
28 different results from those studies conducted in a laboratory or clinic. Research with anxious
29
30 adults suggests that, under certain conditions, high levels of state anxiety may elicit cognitive
31
32 suppression or avoidance responses that oppose attention biases towards threat.^{13,45}
33
34 Therefore, the current results do not contradict these data, but rather highlight the sensitivity
35
36 and variability in attention biases in pediatric samples under varying contexts. Additional
37
38 research is needed specifically evaluating the effect of emotional and environmental factors
39
40 on attention biases.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The findings from this study highlight the interactions between cognitive and
48
49 emotional brain systems in the pathophysiology of anxiety disorders. An attention bias
50
51 towards threat suggests that brain circuits mediating threat detection in anxious children may
52
53 be hypersensitive.⁴² Consistent with this, neuroimaging studies of anxious children have
54
55 demonstrated structural and functional abnormalities in regions implicated in emotion
56
57 processing, including the amygdala and prefrontal cortex.⁹⁻¹² It is still unknown whether these
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 anxiety-related differences in brain anatomy and function precede or follow the development
5
6 of anxiety disorders in youth. Further studies of attentional processes and associated neural
7
8 activity using longitudinal and high-risk developmental designs are needed to answer these
9
10 important etiological questions.

11
12
13 Continuous measures of anxiety did not correlate with attention bias, which contrasts
14
15 the findings of Waters et al. (in press), who found positive relationships between parental
16
17 report of child anxiety severity and attention bias for happy and angry faces in children with
18
19 GAD. While these studies used the same attention task, the sample in Waters et al. was
20
21 younger (ages 7 – 12 years) than the present one, and the studies used different measures of
22
23 anxiety symptoms, limiting direct comparison of results. In the present study, attention bias
24
25 measures did not differ among the three anxiety disorders. However, high comorbidity
26
27 complicated efforts to isolate associations with one or another anxiety disorder. Studies of
28
29 children with single anxiety disorder diagnoses might reveal specific associations, though the
30
31 generalizability of such studies would be limited given the high rates at which anxiety
32
33 disorders co-occur in clinical samples.⁴⁶

34
35
36
37
38 The current findings should be evaluated in light of study limitations. First, while the
39
40 multi-site design of the CAMS study allowed us to recruit a very large sample of anxiety-
41
42 disordered youth, it may also have increased the variability of the data because environmental
43
44 conditions could not be precisely controlled across the seven study sites. However, no site
45
46 differences (all F -values <1) were found for the primary dependent measures of threat or
47
48 happy bias in either the anxious or healthy youths. Second, the anxious and healthy groups
49
50 were not matched on age, race, IQ, or mean RT during neutral trials. After controlling for
51
52 these variables, the group difference in threat bias remained, albeit at a lower statistical
53
54 threshold. This likely reflects reduced statistical power caused by the inclusion of multiple
55
56 covariates that were not associated with the dependent variable. Replication with more
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 closely matched samples is needed to test the reliability of the group differences we observed.

5
6 Third, the magnitude of between-group differences was not large, in terms of absolute
7
8 milliseconds or effect size. Nevertheless, the magnitude found here replicates that in prior
9
10 studies, suggesting that differences are reliably detectable with appropriately-powered
11
12 studies.
13
14

15 Overall, the present study provides support for the relationship between pediatric
16
17 anxiety and attention bias towards threat. Further research is needed to evaluate the
18
19 robustness of this association and the specific circumstances that influence it. Additionally,
20
21 unanswered questions remain regarding the role of this bias in the etiology or maintenance of
22
23 these disorders, as well as how it may relate to treatment response. Analysis of the visual
24
25 probe data collected during the treatment and outcome phases of the CAMS study will
26
27 provide an opportunity to examine the latter question. However, longitudinal studies are
28
29 needed to examine the specificity of these attentional processes and their role in the
30
31 development of pediatric anxiety disorders and subsequent mood and anxiety disorders in
32
33 adulthood.
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
61
62
63
64
65

Reference List

1. Costello EJ, Mustillo S, Erkanli A, Keeler G, Angold A: Prevalence and development of psychiatric disorders in childhood and adolescence. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2003; 60:837-844.
2. Marmorstein NR: Generalized versus performance-focused social phobia: patterns of comorbidity among youth. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2006; 20:778-793.
3. Klein RG, Last CG: *Anxiety Disorders in Children*, Vol. 20 Newbury Park, CA: Sage; 1989.
4. Pine DS, Cohen P, Gurley D, Brook J, Ma Y: The risk for early-adulthood anxiety and depressive disorders in adolescents with anxiety and depressive disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1998; 55:56-64.
5. Beck AT, Emery G: *Anxiety disorders and phobias: A cognitive perspective* New York: Basic Books; 1985.
6. Mogg K, Bradley BP: A cognitive-motivational analysis of anxiety. *Behav Res Ther*. 1998; 36:809-848.
7. Lonigan CJ, Vasey MW, Phillips BM, Hazen RA: Temperament, anxiety, and the processing of threat-relevant stimuli. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*. 2004; 33:8-20.
8. Stein MB, Goldin PR, Sareen J, Zorrilla LT, Brown GG: Increased amygdala activation to angry and contemptuous faces in generalized social phobia. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2002; 59:1027-1034.

- 1
2
3
4 9. McClure EB, Monk CS, Nelson EE, Parrish JM, Adler A, Blair RJR, Fromm S,
5
6 Charney DS, Leibenluft E, Ernst M, Pine DS: Abnormal attention modulation of fear
7
8 circuit function in pediatric generalized anxiety disorder. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;
9
10 64:97-106.
11
- 12
13
14 10. Milham MP, Nugent AC, Drevets WC, Dickstein DP, Leibenluft E, Ernst M, Charney
15
16 D, Pine DS: Selective reduction in amygdala volume in pediatric anxiety disorders: a
17
18 voxel-based morphometry investigation. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2005; 57:961-966.
19
- 20
21
22 11. Monk CS, Nelson EE, McClure EB, Mogg K, Bradley BP, Leibenluft E, Blair RJR,
23
24 Chen G, Charney DS, Ernst M, Pine DS: Ventrolateral prefrontal cortex activation and
25
26 attentional bias in response to angry faces in adolescents with generalized anxiety
27
28 disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2006; 163:1091-1097.
29
- 30
31
32 12. Thomas KM, Drevets WC, Dahl RE, Ryan ND, Birmaher B, Eccard CH, Axelson D,
33
34 Whalen PJ, Casey BJ: Amygdala response to fearful faces in anxious and depressed
35
36 children. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2001; 58:1057-1063.
37
- 38
39
40 13. Williams JM, Mathews A, MacLeod C: The emotional Stroop task and
41
42 psychopathology. *Psychol Bull*. 1996; 120:3-24.
43
- 44
45
46 14. MacLeod C, Mathews A, Tata P: Attentional bias in emotional disorders. *J Abnorm*
47
48 *Psychol*. 1986; 95:15-20.
49
- 50
51
52 15. Algom D, Chajut E, Lev S: A rational look at the emotional stroop phenomenon: a
53
54 generic slowdown, not a stroop effect. *J Exp Psychol Gen*. 2004; 133:323-338.
55
- 56
57
58 16. Bradley BP, Mogg K, White J, Groom C, de Bono J: Attentional bias for emotional
59
60 faces in generalized anxiety disorder. *Br J Clin Psychol*. 1999; 38 (Pt 3):267-278.
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 17. Mogg K, Bradley BP, Williams R: Attentional bias in anxiety and depression: the role
5
6 of awareness. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 1995; 34 (Pt 1):17-36.
7
8
- 9
10 18. Bar-Haim Y, Lamy D, Pergamin L, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, van IJzendoorn MH:
11
12 Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and nonanxious individuals: a meta-analytic
13
14 study. *Psychol Bull.* 2007; 133:1-24.
15
16
- 17 19. Mogg K, Bradley BP: Attentional bias in generalized anxiety disorder versus depressive
18
19 disorder. *Cognitive Therapy and Research.* 2005; 29:29-45.
20
21
- 22 20. Mogg K, Philippot P, Bradley BP: Selective attention to angry faces in clinical social
23
24 phobia. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 2004; 113:160-165.
25
26
- 27 21. McNally RJ, Kaspi SP, Riemann BC, Zeitlin SB: Selective processing of threat cues in
28
29 posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 1990; 99:398-402.
30
31
32
- 33 22. Tata PR, Leibowitz JA, Prunty MJ, Cameron M, Pickering AD: Attentional bias in
34
35 obsessional compulsive disorder. *Behav Res Ther.* 1996; 34:53-60.
36
37
38
- 39 23. McNally RJ, Riemann BC, Kim E: Selective processing of threat cues in panic disorder.
40
41
42 *Behav Res Ther.* 1990; 28:407-412.
43
44
- 45 24. McNally RJ, Amir N, Louro CE, Lukach BM, Riemann BC, Calamari JE: Cognitive
46
47 processing of idiographic emotional information in panic disorder. *Behav Res Ther.*
48
49 1994; 32:119-122.
50
51
52
- 53 25. Mogg K, Bradley BP: Some methodological issues in assessing attentional biases for
54
55 threatening faces in anxiety: a replication study using a modified version of the probe
56
57 detection task. *Behav Res Ther.* 1999; 37:595-604.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 26. Vasey MW, Daleiden EL, Williams LL, Brown LM: Biased attention in childhood
5
6 anxiety disorders: a preliminary study. *J Abnorm Child Psychol.* 1995; 23:267-279.
7
8
- 9
10 27. Taghavi MR, Neshat-Doost HT, Moradi AR, Yule W, Dalgleish T: Biases in visual
11
12 attention in children and adolescents with clinical anxiety and mixed anxiety-
13
14 depression. *J Abnorm Child Psychol.* 1999; 27:215-223.
15
16
- 17 28. Taghavi MR, Dalgleish T, Moradi AR, Neshat-Doost HT, Yule W: Selective processing
18
19 of negative emotional information in children and adolescents with Generalized
20
21 Anxiety Disorder. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2003; 42:221-230.
22
23
- 24
25 29. Dalgleish T, Taghavi R, Neshat-Doost H, Moradi A, Canterbury R, Yule W: Patterns of
26
27 Processing Bias for Emotional Information Across Clinical Disorders: A Comparison of
28
29 Attention, Memory, and Prospective Cognition in Children and Adolescents With
30
31 Depression, Generalized Anxiety, and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *J Clin Child*
32
33 *Adolesc Psychol.* 2003; 32:10-21.
34
35
- 36
37 30. Waters AM, Wharton TA, Zimmer-Gembeck MJ, Craske MG: Threat-based cognitive
38
39 biases in anxious children: Comparison with non-anxious children before and after
40
41 cognitive behavioural treatment. *Behav Res Ther.* 2008; 46:358-374.
42
43
44
- 45 31. Waters AM, Lipp OV, Spence SH: Attentional bias toward fear-related stimuli: an
46
47 investigation with nonselected children and adults and children with anxiety disorders. *J*
48
49 *Exp Child Psychol.* 2004; 89:320-337.
50
51
52
- 53 32. Pine DS, Mogg K, Bradley BP, Montgomery L, Monk CS, McClure E, Guyer AE,
54
55 Ernst M, Charney DS, Kaufman J: Attention bias to threat in maltreated children:
56
57 implications for vulnerability to stress-related psychopathology. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2005;
58
59 162:291-296.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 33. Silverman WK, Albano AM: *The Anxiety Disorders Interview Schedule for Children*
5
6 *for DSM-IV, Child and Parent Versions* San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation;
7
8 1996.
9
10
11 34. Sonuga-Barke EJ, De Houwer J, De Ruiter K, Ajzenstzen M, Holland S: AD/HD and
12 the capture of attention by briefly exposed delay-related cues: evidence from a
13 conditioning paradigm. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2004; 45:274-283.
14
15
16 35. The Research Unit on Pediatric Psychopharmacology Anxiety Study Group: The
17 Pediatric Anxiety Rating Scale (PARS): Development and Psychometric Properties. *J*
18 *Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2002; 41:1061-1069.
19
20
21 36. Birmaher B, Khetarpal S, Brent D, Cully M, Balach L, Kaufman J, Neer SM: The
22 Screen for Child Anxiety Related Emotional Disorders (SCARED): scale construction
23 and psychometric characteristics. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1997; 36:545-
24 553.
25
26
27 37. March JS: *Multidimensional anxiety scale for children*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-
28 Health Systems; 1998.
29
30
31 38. Wechsler D: *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Third Edition* 1991.
32
33
34 39. Kaufman J, Birmaher B, Brent D, Rao U, Flynn C, Moreci P, Williamson D, Ryan N:
35 Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children-Present
36 and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL): initial reliability and validity data. *J Am Acad*
37 *Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1997; 36:980-988.
38
39
40 40. Wechsler D: *Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)* San Antonio, TX:
41 Psychological Corporation; 1999.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 41. Hollingshead AB. Four Factor Index of Social Status. 1975. New Haven, Yale
5
6 University Press.
7
8
- 9
10 42. Davis M, Whalen PJ: The amygdala: vigilance and emotion. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2001;
11 6:13-34.
12
13
- 14
15 43. Cannistraro PA, Rauch SL: Neural circuitry of anxiety: evidence from structural and
16
17 functional neuroimaging studies. *Psychopharmacol Bull*. 2003; 37:8-25.
18
19
- 20
21 44. Etkin A, Wager TD: Functional neuroimaging of anxiety: a meta-analysis of emotional
22
23 processing in PTSD, social anxiety disorder, and specific phobia. *Am J Psychiatry*.
24 2007; 164:1476-1488.
25
26
- 27
28 45. Mogg K, Bradley BP, Miles F, Dixon R: Time course of attentional bias for threat
29
30 scenes: Testing the vigilance-avoidance hypothesis. *Cognition and Emotion*. 2004;
31 18:689-700.
32
33
- 34
35 46. Kendall PC, Brady EU, Verduin TL: Comorbidity in childhood anxiety disorders and
36
37 treatment outcome. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2001; 40:787-794.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table: Characteristics of Anxious and Healthy Control Participants

Characteristic	Anxious (n = 101) Mean (SD)	Healthy (n = 51) Mean (SD)	Statistic	p
Gender	52% male	55% male	$X^2 = .16$	ns
Age	11.53 (2.83)	13.56 (2.66)	t (150) = -4.25 d = 0.73	< .001
Hollingshead SES	3.73 (1.11)	3.49 (1.61) (n = 41)	t (140) = 1.04 d = 0.19	ns
Race	82% White	54.3% White (n = 46)	$X^2 = 12.56$	< .001
Full Scale IQ	102.8 (16.90) (n = 98)	110.74 (14.58) (n = 50)	t (146) = -2.818 d = 0.49	.006
SCARED				
Child Report	23.1 (14.0) (n = 84)	13.9 (9.7) (n = 38)	t (120) = 4.23 d = 0.72	< .001
Parent Report	30.9 (15.4) (n = 85)	6.3 (4.6) (n = 36)	t (119) = 13.37 d = 1.86	< .001
Mean RT on neutral trials	571.97 (129.94)	488.02 (93.98)	t (150) = 4.550 d = 0.70	< .001
Anxiety Comorbidity	Number (%)			
<u>Single Diagnosis</u>				
- SP	7 (6.9%)	---		
- GAD	8 (7.9%)			
- SAD	5 (5.0%)			

<u>Two Diagnoses</u>				
- SP + GAD	27 (26.7%)	---		
- GAD + SAD	10 (9.9%)			
- SP + SAD	7 (6.9%)			
<u>Three Diagnoses</u>				
- SP + GAD + SAD	37 (36.6%)	---		

SCARED = Screen for Anxiety and Related Disorders; SP= Social Phobia, GAD=

Generalized Anxiety Disorder, SAD= Separation Anxiety Disorder.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
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
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
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
61
62
63
64
65

Figure Caption:

Mean attention bias scores (in msec, with standard error bars) for threat faces in anxious patients and normal controls.

Disclosure

The authors have no financial relationships to disclose.

Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

