

Provided for non-commercial research and education use.  
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



(This is a sample cover image for this issue. The actual cover is not yet available at this time.)

This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Clinical Psychology Review



## The emotional Stroop task and posttraumatic stress disorder: A meta-analysis

Josh M. Cisler<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Kate B. Wolitzky-Taylor<sup>c</sup>, Thomas G. Adams Jr.<sup>d</sup>, Kimberly A. Babson<sup>d</sup>,  
Christal L. Badour<sup>d</sup>, Jeffrey L. Willems<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Brain Imaging Research Center, United States

<sup>b</sup> Medical University of South Carolina, United States

<sup>c</sup> University of California, Los Angeles, United States

<sup>d</sup> University of Arkansas, Department of Psychology, United States

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 12 June 2010

Accepted 19 March 2011

Available online xxxx

#### Keywords:

PTSD

Trauma

Stroop

Attentional bias

### ABSTRACT

Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is associated with significant impairment and lowered quality of life. The emotional Stroop task (EST) has been one means of elucidating some of the core deficits in PTSD, but this literature has remained inconsistent. We conducted a meta-analysis of EST studies in PTSD populations in order to synthesize this body of research. Twenty-six studies were included with 538 PTSD participants, 254 non-trauma exposed control participants (NTC), and 276 trauma exposed control participants (TC). PTSD-relevant words impaired EST performance more among PTSD groups and TC groups compared to NTC groups. PTSD groups and TC groups did not differ. When examining within-subject effect sizes, PTSD-relevant words and generally threatening words impaired EST performance relative to neutral words among PTSD groups, and only PTSD-relevant words impaired performance among the TC groups. These patterns were not found among the NTC groups. Moderator analyses suggested that these effects were significantly greater in blocked designs compared to randomized designs, toward unmasked compared to masked stimuli, and among samples exposed to assaultive traumas compared to samples exposed to non-assaultive traumas. Theoretical and clinical implications are discussed.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### Contents

1.	The emotional Stroop task . . . . .	0
2.	PTSD and the emotional Stroop task . . . . .	0
3.	Methods . . . . .	0
3.1.	Selection of studies . . . . .	0
3.2.	Diagnosis of PTSD . . . . .	0
3.3.	Coding relevant variables . . . . .	0
3.4.	Statistical analysis . . . . .	0
3.4.1.	Database . . . . .	0
3.4.2.	Effect size calculation . . . . .	0
3.4.3.	Moderator analyses . . . . .	0
4.	Results . . . . .	0
4.1.	Basic study information . . . . .	0
4.2.	Differences between PTSD, trauma-exposed control, and no trauma control groups in overall word type comparisons . . . . .	0
4.2.1.	General threat vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.2.2.	General threat vs positive words . . . . .	0
4.2.3.	Positive vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.2.4.	PTSD-relevant vs general threat words . . . . .	0
4.2.5.	PTSD-relevant vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.2.6.	PTSD-relevant vs positive words . . . . .	0

\* Corresponding author at: 4301 W. Markham, #554, Brain Imaging Center, Psychiatric Research Institute, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, AR 72205, United States.

4.3.	Within-group effects and moderator findings: PTSD group . . . . .	0
4.3.1.	General threat vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.3.2.	General threat vs positive words . . . . .	0
4.3.3.	Positive vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.3.4.	PTSD-relevant words vs general threat words . . . . .	0
4.3.5.	PTSD-relevant words vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.3.6.	PTSD-relevant vs positive words . . . . .	0
4.4.	Within-group effects and moderator findings: Trauma control group . . . . .	0
4.4.1.	General threat vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.4.2.	General threat vs positive words . . . . .	0
4.4.3.	Positive vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.4.4.	PTSD-relevant words vs general threat words . . . . .	0
4.4.5.	PTSD-relevant vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.4.6.	PTSD-relevant words vs positive words . . . . .	0
4.5.	Within-group effects and moderator findings: No trauma control group . . . . .	0
4.5.1.	General threat words vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.5.2.	General vs positive words . . . . .	0
4.5.3.	Positive words vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.5.4.	PTSD-relevant words vs general threat words . . . . .	0
4.5.5.	PTSD-relevant vs neutral words . . . . .	0
4.5.6.	PTSD-relevant vs positive words . . . . .	0
5.	Discussion . . . . .	0
	References . . . . .	0

Traumatic events are common among adults in the general population, with prevalence rates of approximately 50% (Kessler, 2000; Resnick et al., 1993). Despite ubiquitous exposure to traumatic events, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) has an estimated prevalence of about 8% (Kessler et al., 1995, 2005; Kilpatrick et al., 2003). Though specific trauma types in specific populations have been linked with higher rates of PTSD (e.g., approximately 20% of women who have been sexually abused meet criteria for PTSD; Kessler et al., 1995; Resnick et al., 1993), even the highest prevalence estimates of PTSD represent a minority of the number of individuals exposed to traumatic events. Thus, mere exposure to a traumatic event is an insufficient explanation of PTSD (Rosen & Lilienfeld, 2008; Yehuda & LeDoux, 2007), which highlights the need for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms mediating PTSD in order to foster a better explanation of why PTSD develops and maintains. A better understanding of the mechanisms mediating PTSD may inform novel treatment techniques that may map more directly onto the psychopathology of PTSD and thus improve treatment efficacy.

The elucidation of key mechanisms in PTSD is accordingly important for the understanding of how PTSD develops and maintains, the identification of individuals likely to develop PTSD, and the treatment of individuals who have developed PTSD. One means of elucidating core deficits in PTSD has been through examination of cognitive processes and information processing biases (Brewin, Kleiner, Vasterling, & Field, 2007; Buckley, Blanchard, & Neill, 2000; McNally, Kaspi, Bradley, & Zeitlin, 1990). One of the most common tasks used in this line of research is the emotional Stroop task. The current paper presents a meta-analytic synthesis of the emotional Stroop effect in PTSD toward the larger goal of elucidating core dysfunctional processes mediating PTSD.

### 1. The emotional Stroop task

The classic Stroop task (Stroop, 1935) displays color words (e.g., blue) in varying colors of ink (e.g., red). The participant is asked to ignore the semantic content of the word and name the color in which the word is displayed. The critical trials are when the color is incongruent with the semantic word (e.g., the word 'blue' displayed in green ink). This manipulation induces conflict between task-relevant stimuli (the color) and distracting stimuli (the semantic content). The Stroop task can also be manipulated to examine how emotional

stimuli disrupt color-naming performance. The emotional Stroop task (EST) is similar to the original task, but the semantic content of the word is manipulated: the word is neutral in valence (e.g., 'pencil') on some trials, whereas the word is threatening in valence (e.g., 'attack') on other trials. Thus, the EST can detect the influence of emotional processes on the traditionally cognitively-based task by manipulating the emotional content of the to-be-ignored word and testing for any changes in performance. Numerous studies demonstrate that anxious individuals, including individuals with PTSD (Buckley et al., 2000; Foa, Feske, Murdock, Kozak, & McCarthy, 1991; Foa, Rothbaum, Riggs, & Murdock, 1991; McNally et al., 1990), have longer color naming times for emotional words compared to neutral words (Bar-Haim, Lamy, Pergamin, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, 2007; Williams, Mathews, & MacLeod, 1996).

The extent to which data from emotional Stroop studies inform a better understanding of the mechanisms underlying PTSD is dependent on the extent to which the mechanisms underlying the emotional Stroop task are understood. Thus, a discussion of the mechanisms mediating the emotional Stroop task is necessary prior to discussing findings among individuals with PTSD specifically. Previous models explaining the mechanisms mediating the EST are not entirely consistent (e.g., Algom, Chajut, & Lev, 2004; McKenna & Sharma, 2004; Williams et al., 1996; Wyble, Sharma, & Bowman, 2008), but the models can likely be integrated to suggest two key complementary mechanisms that govern performance in the EST. First, a heightened threat detection mechanism<sup>1</sup> that causes a greater 'bottom-up' disrupting influence in response to emotionally salient stimuli would explain the heightened EST effect in randomized designs (i.e., where neutral and threatening trials are intermixed randomly) found only among high-trait anxious individuals (cf., Bar-Haim et al., 2007). This threat detection mechanism is consistent with Williams et al. (1996) and Wyble et al. (2008) suggestion of heightened output tendencies

<sup>1</sup> Some researchers link enhanced threat detection with heightened fear responding (e.g., Ohman, 2005; Ohman & Mineka, 2001). Indeed, in the present manuscript, these two phrases could be used almost interchangeably. However, we chose the term enhanced threat detection because 1) it is more consistent with the broader attentional bias towards threat literature (Bar-Haim et al., 2007; Cisler & Koster, in press), 2) it specifies a more specific mechanism relative to broadly specifying an emotional response, and 3) it emphasizes that cognitive and emotional processes interact (Pessoa, 2008), which is not as clearly emphasized by referring to this process as heightened fear responding/reactivity.

associated with emotional stimuli among anxious individuals. It is also consistent with other lines of research suggesting a threat detection mechanism responsible for rapidly detecting potential sources of threat (Davis & Whalen, 2001; Ohman, 2005; Ohman & Mineka, 2001; Ohman & Soares, 1993; Whalen et al., 1998; Whalen et al., 2004), and that this threat detection mechanism is heightened among anxious individuals (Bishop, Duncan, Brett, & Lawrence, 2004; Etkin & Wager, 2007). Second, an attentional control mechanism responsible for orienting, maintaining, and shifting attention (Posner, 1980, 1990) may modulate the degree to which emotional stimuli withdraw attention from task demands (Derryberry & Reed, 2002; Eysenck, Derakshan, Santos, & Calvo, 2007; Reinholdt-Dunne, Mogg, & Bradley, 2009; Wyble et al., 2008). Disruption of this mechanism would explain the delayed EST effect (i.e., impaired performance on the neutral trial after the threat word) found by McKenna and Sharma (2004) as well as the heightened EST effect in blocked design (i.e., where neutral trials all occur together, then threatening trials all occur together) studies (Bar-Haim et al., 2007; Phaf & Kan, 2007). Consistent with this view, recent research suggests that heightened anxiety is associated with poor recruitment of neural networks involved in attentional control, including the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and dorsal lateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC) (Bishop et al., 2004; Bishop, 2008, 2009).

In tandem, these two mechanisms are consistent with each of the previous accounts of the EST effect (Algom et al., 2004; Williams et al., 1996; Wyble et al., 2008) and explain 1) the distracting influence of emotional stimuli, 2) the heightened EST effect in randomized Stroop formats among high anxious individuals, 3) the heightened EST effect in blocked designs found among all individuals, and 4) the exaggerated delayed EST effect found among high anxious individuals. The hypothesis of complementary threat detection and attentional control mechanisms is consistent with emerging research in the broader attentional bias toward threat literature (Bishop, 2007, 2008; Cisler & Koster, in press; Pessoa, 2009).

## 2. PTSD and the emotional Stroop task

Despite the wealth of research conducted on the EST effect in PTSD over the past 20 years, there remain two gaps in the literature. First, whether an EST effect exists at all in PTSD has recently been questioned (Kimble, Frueh, & Marks, 2009) due to the inconsistencies in demonstrating the general effect (i.e., slowed RTs for disorder-relevant words relative to neutral words; e.g., Devineni, Blanchard, Hickling, & Buckley, 2004). Kimble et al. (2009) argued that dissertations tend to produce less reliable EST effects in PTSD, which introduces a publication bias. When accounting for the possible publication bias, they concluded from their qualitative review: "our data suggest that the [EST effect] is not a reliable finding in persons with PTSD" (Kimble et al., 2009, pg. 653) and that "the [EST effect] in PTSD seems to be an issue that warrants reconsideration" (pg. 654). Given that this conclusion differs from prior qualitative reviews (Buckley et al., 2000; McNally, 1998), it seems that a quantitative review is necessary. Indeed, given that the EST effect in PTSD has been used to inform both cognitive (e.g., McNally, 2006) and neural (Rauch, Shin, & Phelps, 2006) models of the core deficits in PTSD, it seems essential to quantitatively clarify whether there is EST impairment in PTSD. Further, an important consideration when interpreting published articles vs dissertations is whether the groups were diagnosed with a structured interview or not, which presumably could influence results. Yet another difference across studies that might contribute to inconsistencies is the type of traumatic event to which participants were exposed. Emerging research suggests that assaultive events (i.e., physical assault, sexual assault) are a more potent risk factor for psychopathology relative to other types (e.g., motor vehicle accidents, natural disasters) (Breslau et al., 1999; Cougle et al., 2009; Resnick et al., 1993). To address these possibilities, the present meta-analysis included both published articles and dissertations, and also coded

method of diagnosis (structured interview vs self-report questionnaire) and trauma type (assaultive vs non-assaultive).

Second, assuming there may be a significant EST effect in PTSD, the extant research has not clearly elucidated whether the mechanism producing the EST in PTSD is a hypoactive attentional control mechanism, hyperactive threat detection mechanism, or both mechanisms operating in tandem. One manner to tease apart these competing possibilities is to examine the various procedural manipulations of the EST that may differentially isolate the candidate mechanisms mediating the EST effect. An enhanced EST effect in PTSD was first identified by McNally et al. (1990), who compared Stroop response times toward PTSD-related words, Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD)-related words, positive words, and neutral words between Vietnam combat veterans with and without PTSD. The results revealed that participants with PTSD had longer response times toward PTSD-related words relative to OCD-related, positive, and neutral words. Participants with PTSD had longer response times toward PTSD words compared to participants without PTSD, and the response times of participants without PTSD did not differ across word types. This initial study is an excellent point of departure from which to evaluate how the EST may inform the mechanisms underlying PTSD.

McNally et al. (1990) compared performance between several types of word types: positive, neutral, general threat (i.e., OCD-related words), and disorder-relevant words. Disorder-relevant words may differ from other word categories in either threat intensity or personal relevance. This is an important distinction, such that research has shown that personally-relevant words can also elicit longer RTs in a Stroop task (see Williams et al., 1996). As such, slower RTs toward disorder-relevant words could be due to an enhanced threat-detection mechanism or to mere personal relevance. Generally threatening words, which should be equally relevant to PTSD, trauma-control, and no-trauma control groups and only differ from neutral words in threat intensity, is one means of controlling personal relevance in order to study the EST effect. Another means of addressing the limitation of greater personal relevance of trauma-related words is to use a trauma-exposed control group without PTSD that is matched to the PTSD groups' trauma type (e.g., combat veterans with and without PTSD). This control procedure presumably equates the groups in personal relevance of the trauma-related words; however, it still remains possible that trauma-related words are more personally relevant to individuals with PTSD because of PTSD-related symptoms (e.g., re-experiencing symptoms). Accordingly, comparisons between generally-threatening words and neutral words may be the most stringent test of a threat-detection mechanism. Studies have yielded mixed results regarding an enhanced EST effect toward generally-threatening words among PTSD groups (Buckley, Blanchard, & Hickling, 2002; Foa, Feske, et al., 1991; Foa, Rothbaum, et al., 1991; McNally et al., 1990), though there appears to be a trend suggesting greater latencies toward generally-threatening words. A meta-analysis of existing studies may be a more powerful means of examining whether PTSD individuals display slower RTs toward general threat words compared to neutral words, which would allow for a test of whether PTSD is characterized by an enhanced threat detection mechanism.

McNally et al. (1990) also investigated RTs toward positive words and found no difference between groups. This comparison is also important because positive words may have higher emotionality (i.e., arousal) value than neutral words but not threat words, and positive words may only differ from threat words in valence. For example, previous research has found that the arousal value of a stimulus, and not the valence, may be more important in the disruption of attentional processes (Anderson, 2005; Vogt, De Houwer, Koster, Van Damme, & Crombez, 2008). As such, comparisons between positive words, threat words, and neutral words allow for a test of whether emotionality per se slows RTs, or whether *threat* specifically

slows RTs. As with general threat words, meta-analysis may be a more powerful means of ruling out the hypothesis that emotionality slows RTs instead of enhanced threat detection specifically.

McNally et al. (1990) used a card format of the Stroop task, in which word types occurred in blocked format printed on a poster. As noted by McNally and colleagues, this blocked format precludes a full assessment of automatic processing, in which case the degree to which the EST effect reflects automatic or strategic processing was unclear. Automatic processing generally refers to processing that is capacity-free and occurs without intent, control, or awareness, whereas strategic processing generally refers to processing that is intentional, controllable, capacity-limited, and dependent on awareness (McNally, 1995; 1996; Moors & De Houwer, 2006; Shiffrin & Schneider, 1977). One means of manipulating stage of processing is to mask the presentation of words in the EST. In masked presentations, the word is displayed briefly (e.g., 17 ms) followed by a mask (e.g., 'XXXX' displayed in orange), which precludes conscious identification of the initial word. Of the two candidate processes underlying the EST effect, it is likely threat detection that is able to operate automatically. For example, neuroimaging studies among non-clinical (Morris et al., 1998; Whalen et al., 2004, 1998) and PTSD samples (Bryant et al., 2008; Felmingham et al., 2010; Hendler et al., 2003; Rauch et al., 2000) have demonstrated that the amygdala responds to masked stimuli (Morris et al., 1998; Whalen et al., 2004, 1998). By contrast, attentional control is an executive function that may necessitate more time and processing resources to fully engage (Pessoa, 2009). Masked presentations may therefore be one means of teasing apart the influence of the threat detection and attentional control mechanisms. Research using masked presentations has yielded mixed results (Buckley et al., 2000, 2002; Harvey, Bryant, & Rapee, 1996; McNally, Amir, & Lipke, 1996; Paunovic, Lundh, & Ost, 2002). Meta-analysis may be a more powerful means of examining automaticity in the EST among individuals with PTSD that may help resolve the inconsistencies.

In a related vein, manipulating blocked vs randomized formats is another means of manipulating automaticity, such that if the effect is more dependent on effortful/controlled processing, then the effect should be larger in blocked compared to randomized formats (McKenna & Sharma, 2004; Phaf & Kan, 2007; see above discussion). Attentional control resources may deplete across repeated presentations of threat during blocked format, which would result in less ability to perform task demands and consequently a greater EST effect compared to randomized format. As such, greater effects in the blocked format may indicate greater disruptions in attentional control (Wyble et al., 2008). By contrast, a significant EST effect in randomized designs would be consistent with the 'fast' EST effect (Wyble et al., 2008) and suggest enhanced threat detection. Direct comparisons of blocked vs randomized presentations in a single study are rare (e.g., Dalgleish, 1995; Kindt, Bierman, & Brosschot, 1996). Meta-analysis seems like an appropriate way of testing this effect across studies. It is important to note, however, that blocked presentations may also be viewed as a mood induction procedure which could influence performance; thus, interpretation of blocked vs randomized comparisons is not unambiguous.

In sum, there are two main purposes of the present meta-analysis. Our first goal is to synthesize the EST research in PTSD over the past 20 years and quantitatively examine whether the EST effect exists in PTSD (Kimble et al., 2009). Second, many manipulations of the EST may shed light on the mechanisms underlying PTSD, but studies do not always provide consistent results. Thus, our second goal is to quantitatively synthesize this research paying careful attention to these manipulations in order to test whether PTSD is characterized by a hyperactive threat detection mechanism, a hypoactive attentional control mechanism, or both. Greater effect sizes in blocked vs randomized designs and unmasked vs masked designs would provide support for hypoactive attentional control mechanisms. Significant

effect sizes in masked designs, randomized designs, and toward generally threatening stimuli would provide support for hyperactive threat detection mechanisms.

### 3. Methods

#### 3.1. Selection of studies

We identified appropriate studies by conducting searches in the PsychINFO database and searching the reference sections of review articles on this topic (Bar-Haim et al., 2007; Buckley et al., 2000). To address the possible publication bias suggested by Kimble et al. (2009), we also included the dissertations pertaining to PTSD and the EST that these authors located as well as additional dissertations identified through searches of the PsychINFO database. We conducted searches using a PTSD term (e.g., 'PTSD' 'posttraumatic stress disorder' 'posttraumatic' 'trauma') and task term (e.g., 'Stroop' 'attention' 'attentional bias'). These searches identified 42 unique (i.e., articles that did not appear in multiple searches) articles for possible inclusion.

Articles were included if they met the following criteria: 1) report original results (i.e., not a literature review; not results from a previously published study), 2) used an EST, 3) included a PTSD group, and 4) reported relevant statistics for calculating effect sizes in the journal article.<sup>2</sup> Twenty-six articles met all of these criteria and were included in the present study (see Table 1 for description of studies). Articles were excluded for not providing relevant statistics ( $n=7$ ), not using an EST or not recording RT data ( $n=3$ ), not including a PTSD group ( $n=3$ ), using a left vs right fixation manipulation that could confound results ( $n=1$ ), and the data from three published articles were identical to data from three dissertations (total articles excluded  $n=16$ ).

#### 3.2. Diagnosis of PTSD

Seventeen articles used a structured diagnostic inventory (Clinical Administered PTSD Scale, Blake et al., 1995; Anxiety Disorder Interview Schedule, Brown, diNardo, & Barlow, 1994; Structured Clinical Interview for Axis I Disorders, First, Spitzer, Gibbon, & Williams, 1995), three articles used a non-specified clinical interview, two articles used a non-specified clinical interview and a self-report questionnaire, and four articles used only the cut score of a self-report questionnaire.

#### 3.3. Coding relevant variables

We coded articles for the following EST variables: 1) presentation (masked vs unmasked), 2) design (blocked vs randomized), 3) publication type (journal article vs dissertation), 4) word type (neutral, PTSD-relevant, general threat, positive), 5) assessment procedure (structured interview vs self-report questionnaire), and 6) trauma type of the sample (assaultive trauma vs non-assaultive trauma vs a mixed trauma sample). We also coded a study's PTSD, trauma-control, and no-trauma control  $N$ , age, and gender.

#### 3.4. Statistical analysis

##### 3.4.1. Database

A database was created using Comprehensive Meta-analysis Program (CMA) Version 2 (Biostat; Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2005). CMA has been used for the analyses of several published meta-analyses (e.g., Olatunji & Wolitzky-Taylor, 2009; Wolitzky, Horowitz, Powers, & Telch, 2008). For each study, means,

<sup>2</sup> Eleven authors were contacted to obtain relevant statistics to compute effect sizes. Of these, four were able to provide the relevant information.

**Table 1**  
Study characteristics.

Study name	Assessment procedure	Publication	PTSD N	Trauma control N	No trauma control N	% Female	Stimulus presentation	Trial design	Trauma type	Stimulus words
Beck, Freeman, Shipherd, Hamblen, and Lackner (2001)	Structured interview	J	28	26	–	75	U	n/a	MVA	PT, GT, P, N
Beckham et al. (1996)	Structured interview	J	25	–	–	0	U	B	Combat	PT, N
Bryant and Harvey (1995)	Questionnaire	J	15	15	–	47	U	R	MVA	PT, P, N
Buckley et al. (2002)	Structured interview	J	30	–	30	73	U, M	R	MVA	PT, GT, N
Cassiday (1991)	Structured interview	D	5	5	5	88	U	R	SA	PT, P, N
Cassiday (1991)	Structured interview	D	7	7	7	100	U	B	SA	PT, P, N
Constans, McCloskey, Vasterling, Brailey, and Mathews (2004)	Structured interview	J	15	–	–	0	U	R	Combat	PT, GT, N
Devineni et al. (2004)	Structured interview	J	23	–	–	95	U, M	R	MVA	PT, N
Foa, Feske, et al. (1991) and Foa, Rothbaum, et al. (1991)	Structured interview	J	15	13	16	100	U	R	Rape	PT, GT, N
Freeman and Beck (2000)	Structured interview	J	20	13	20	100	U	R	SA	PT, GT, P, N
Garcia (2007)	Questionnaire	D	13	24	21	100	U	R	SA	PT, GT, P, N
Harvey et al. (1996)	Questionnaire	J	20	20	20	73	U, M	R	MVA	PT, N
Kaspi, McNally, and Amir (1995)	Structured interview	J	30	30	–	0	U	B, R	Combat	PT, GT, P, N
Litz et al. (1996)	Structured interview	J	24	15	–	0	U	B	Combat	PT, GT, N
McNally et al. (1990) <sup>a</sup>	Structured interview	J	15	–	–	0	U	B	Combat	PT, GT, P, N
McNally, English, and Lipke (1993)	Structured interview	J	24	–	–	0	U	B	Combat	PT, GT, P, N
McNally et al. (1996)	Structured interview	J	14	14	–	0	U, M	B	Combat	PT, P, N
McNeil, Tucker, Miranda, Lewin, and Nordgren (1999)	Structured interview	J	17	–	–	47	U	R	Other	GT, N
Metzger, Orr, Lasko, McNally, and Pitman (1997)	Structured interview	J	9	–	10	40–67	U	B	Other	PT, P, N
Moradi, Taghavi, Neshat Doost, Yule, and Dalgleish (1999)	Structured interview	J	23	–	23	54	U	R	Other	PT, GT, P, N
Paunovic et al. (2002)	Structured interview	J	39	–	39	59	U, M	–	Mixed	PT, P, N
Rampersaud (2005)	Questionnaire	D	30	30	30	100	U	R	SA	PT, GT, P, N
Sawhney (2002)	Structured interview	D	23	21	21	100	U	B	Rape	PT, N
Shin et al. (2001)	Structured interview	J	8	8	–	0	U	B	Combat	PT, GT, N
Taylor et al. (2006)	Structured interview	J	11	–	–	73	U	B	Other	PT, GT, P, N
Thrasher, Dalgleish, and Yule (1994)	Structured interview	J	13	20	12	25–50	U	B	MVA	PT, GT, P, N
Vrana, Roodman, and Beckham (1995)	Structured interview	J	42	15	–	0	U	B	Combat	PT, GT, N

Note. J = journal article, D = dissertation. PT = PTSD-relevant threat, GT = general threat, P = positive, N = neutral, U = unmasked presentation, M = masked presentation, R = randomized design, and B = blocked design.

<sup>a</sup> This study included a combat-exposed group without PTSD, but the raw data relevant for the meta-analysis were only available for the PTSD group.

standard deviations, sample size, and pre–post correlations were entered into the database for the within-group effect analyses.

### 3.4.2. Effect size calculation

For each study, we computed effect sizes for one or more comparisons of interest. When studies included multiple groups that were suitable for comparison, multiple effect sizes were obtained. For example, for a study comparing Stroop RT between a PTSD group and trauma control group using PTSD-relevant, neutral, and positive words, within-group effect sizes were obtained for the PTSD group and then the trauma control group for “PTSD-relevant vs neutral,” “PTSD-relevant vs positive,” and “positive vs neutral,” thus yielding six total within-group effect sizes. Effect size estimates derived from repeated-measure designs must account for the correlation between measures or the resulting effect size will be inflated (Dunlap, Cortina, Vaslow, & Burke, 1996). The present study used the correlation between emotional and neutral words of .90 reported in the EST psychometric study by Eide et al. (2002). Between-group differences were assessed by examining whether group (PTSD vs non-trauma control vs trauma-exposed control) moderated the within-subject comparisons (e.g., does group moderate the difference between PTSD and neutral RTs?).

In order to ensure that the comparisons reported were based on a meaningful number of studies and that fail-safe N analyses could be conducted, comparisons were not made when only one or two studies

were available for a particular comparison. In addition, this commonly practiced, conservative approach (e.g., Bar-Haim et al., 2007) also limits the likelihood of a given ES being driven by a study that may be an outlier. For all comparisons, Cohen's *d* was selected as the index of effect size, with *d*-values of .2, .5, and .8 representing small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively. Average effect sizes for each outcome were weighted in each relevant comparison using the inverse variance estimate. Weighting of sample size was done in order to minimize the risk that a small, outlying sample would exert a disproportionate influence over the final effect size for a comparison (Rosenthal, 1991). The use of random-effects models also helped to weight the studies appropriately, and to increase the generalizability of findings beyond the studies that were able to be included in the meta-analysis. In addition, in order to account for the bias that may be present by including only published studies (i.e., file drawer effect), a fail-safe N (FSN) analysis was conducted for each comparison. Because meta-analyses are largely limited to published studies, the fail-safe N statistic accounts for the number of non-significant findings (that presumably may not have been published) needed to bring a significant effect size to non-significance. Thus, a large fail-safe N statistic indicates that the significant effect is not likely to be due to the bias of published studies having larger effects than non-published studies.

Given the large number of coded variables (3 groups × 6 word type comparisons × 5 moderators = 90 possible statistical tests), alpha

inflation needed to be addressed. To control for alpha inflation resulting from the large number of possible comparisons, we 1) set the alpha level to  $p < .01$ , 2) controlled for the number of comparisons by only testing for moderation when there was a significant overall effect size, and 3) only made group comparisons based on the initial omnibus word-type comparison effect sizes. Following between-group analyses of the omnibus word-type comparison effect sizes, moderator analyses were conducted separately within each group. Higher-order interactions (e.g., group  $\times$  word type  $\times$  moderator interactions) were not conducted because of the low number of studies for most of these comparisons and lack of power in detecting significant higher-order interactions. For each within-group comparison, we calculated the statistical significance ( $p$ -value) of the effect size, the within-comparison heterogeneity index ( $Q$ ), and the  $p$ -value for the heterogeneity index. We also calculated the: (a) standard error ( $Sed$ ), (b) variance, and (c) 95% confidence intervals ( $CI$ ) for the effect sizes. These statistics provide information on the stability, significance, and range of the true effect size.

### 3.4.3. Moderator analyses

Moderator analyses were also conducted within the CMA program using the moderator platform (mixed-effects models).  $Q$ -values (between-group heterogeneity) are reported with their  $p$ -values for categorical moderators. Studies were appropriately dummy coded for each putative moderator whenever the relevant data was available. Moderator analyses were conducted for comparisons in which the heterogeneity index was statistically significant. The moderators examined included: (a) Stroop presentation (dichotomized as masked vs unmasked); (b) use of blocked design (yes vs no); (c) publication status (published in journal vs dissertation); (d) trauma type (categorized as assault vs non-assault vs mixed samples), (e) group (PTSD vs no trauma control vs trauma-exposed control), and (f) assessment procedure (structured interview vs self-report questionnaire). Trauma type was not examined as a moderating variable for the within-groups effects in the no-trauma control group.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Basic study information

The meta-analysis included 26 studies. The studies were published between 1990 and 2007, and included a total of 538 PTSD participants, 254 no trauma control participants, and 276 trauma control participants. Mean age for the PTSD, no trauma control, and trauma control samples were 36.3 ( $SD = 10.8$ ), 28.1 ( $SD = 8.5$ ), and 35.4 ( $SD = 11.5$ ), respectively. The groups were predominantly female, with percentages of 51, 79, and 58, respectively, for PTSD, no trauma control, and trauma control groups. While the rates of women in the samples collectively appeared to be higher for no trauma control groups, among the individual studies there were no differences between groups in gender distributions (i.e., in samples with no trauma controls, the PTSD groups also had higher proportion of women), all  $t$ 's  $< .60$ . Table 1 reports basic study characteristics for all studies included in the meta-analysis. Tables 2 and 3 report all outcome data. Table 4 summarizes the within-group moderator findings.

### 4.2. Differences between PTSD, trauma-exposed control, and no trauma control groups in overall word type comparisons

Summaries of the relevant statistics are displayed in Tables 2 and 3.

#### 4.2.1. General threat vs neutral words

The effect sizes for this comparison did not differ between the PTSD ( $d = .28$ ,  $p < .01$ ), trauma control ( $d = .17$ , n.s.), or no trauma control ( $d = .14$ , n.s.) groups;  $Q(2) = 3.09$ , n.s.

**Table 2**  
Summary statistics of overall word type comparisons by group.

Group	Comparison	$K$	$d$	$Sed$	Var.	95% $CI$	$Q (df)$
PTSD	GT vs N	19	.28*	.05	.002	.18–.37	(18) 71.21*
	GT vs P	11	.13*	.05	.002	.04–.23	(10) 25.15*
	P vs N	19	.07	.07	.001	.01–.14	(18) 35.92*
	PT vs GT	18	.29*	.06	.003	.18–.40	(17) 83.89*
	PT vs N	32	.39*	.05	.003	.29–.49	(31) 217.40*
Trauma control	PT vs P	19	.29*	.06	.003	.19–.40	(18) 90.74*
	GT vs N	11	.17	.07	.005	.04–.30	(10) 48.80*
	GT vs P	7	.15*	.05	.002	.06–.25	(6) 11.23
	P vs N	12	.02	.05	.003	–.08–.13	(11) 31.42*
	PT vs GT	11	.22*	.07	.005	.08–.36	(10) 55.05*
No trauma control	PT vs N	18	.24*	.07	.005	.11–.38	(17) 117.55*
	PT vs P	12	.22*	.06	.003	.10–.33	(11) 39.18*
	GT vs N	6	.14	.08	.01	–.02–.29	(5) 19.13*
	GT vs P	5	.01	.09	.01	–.17–.18	(4) 15.77*
	P vs N	10	–.01	.03	.001	–.07–.06	(9) 5.25
	PT vs GT	7	.11	.09	.01	–.07–.29	(6) 29.64*
	PT vs N	15	.14	.07	.004	.01–.27	(14) 76.07*
	PT vs P	10	.04	.06	.004	–.09–.17	(9) 33.50*

Note. PT = PTSD-relevant threat, GT = general threat, P = positive, and N = neutral.  $Sed$  = standard error and Var = variance.

\* Indicates significance at  $p < .01$ .

#### 4.2.2. General threat vs positive words

The effect sizes for this comparison did not differ between the PTSD ( $d = .13$ ,  $p < .01$ ), trauma control ( $d = .15$ , n.s.), or no trauma control ( $d = .01$ , n.s.) groups;  $Q(2) = 2.73$ , n.s.

#### 4.2.3. Positive vs neutral words

The effect sizes for this comparison did not differ between the PTSD ( $d = .07$ , n.s.), trauma control ( $d = .02$ , n.s.), or no trauma control ( $d = -.03$ , n.s.) groups;  $Q(2) = 2.29$ , n.s.

#### 4.2.4. PTSD-relevant vs general threat words

The effect sizes for this comparison did not differ between the PTSD ( $d = .29$ ,  $p < .01$ ), trauma control ( $d = .22$ ,  $p < .01$ ), or no trauma control ( $d = .11$ , n.s.) groups;  $Q(2) = 2.93$ , n.s.

#### 4.2.5. PTSD-relevant vs neutral words

The effect sizes for this comparison significantly differed between the three groups,  $Q(2) = 9.08$ ,  $p < .01$ . The PTSD ( $d = .39$ ,  $p < .01$ ) group demonstrated significantly greater effect sizes compared to the no trauma control group ( $d = .14$ , n.s.);  $Q(1) = 9.1$ ,  $p < .01$ . The trauma control group ( $d = .24$ ,  $p < .01$ ) also demonstrated significantly greater effect sizes compared to the no trauma control group;  $Q(1) = 4.08$ ,  $p < .01$ . There was no difference between the PTSD and trauma control groups;  $Q(1) = .92$ , n.s.

#### 4.2.6. PTSD-relevant vs positive words

The effect sizes for this comparison significantly differed between the three groups,  $Q(2) = 9.18$ ,  $p < .01$ . The PTSD ( $d = .29$ ,  $p < .01$ ) group demonstrated significantly greater effect sizes compared to the no trauma control group ( $d = .04$ , n.s.);  $Q(1) = 8.7$ ,  $p < .01$ . The trauma control group ( $d = .22$ ,  $p < .01$ ) did not differ from the no trauma control group;  $Q(1) = 1.15$ , n.s. There was no difference between the PTSD and trauma control groups;  $Q(1) = 2.85$ , n.s.

### 4.3. Within-group effects and moderator findings: PTSD group

Summaries of these effects are displayed in Tables 2 and 4.

#### 4.3.1. General threat vs neutral words

Nineteen outcomes were included in this comparison. A small but statistically significant effect was observed,  $d = .28$ ,  $p < .001$ , favoring general threat words. The FSN analysis indicated that the findings were robust with regard to publication bias ( $FSN = 600$ ). The heterogeneity

**Table 3**  
Group moderator analyses of overall comparisons.

Comparison	PTSD <i>d</i>	Trauma control <i>d</i>	No trauma control <i>d</i>	Group moderator effect	PTSD vs NTC	PTSD vs TC	TC vs NTC
GT vs N	.28 <sup>a</sup>	.17	.14	Q = 3.09	–	–	–
GT vs P	.13 <sup>a</sup>	.15 <sup>a</sup>	.01	Q = 2.29	–	–	–
P vs N	.07	.02	–.03	Q = 2.73	–	–	–
PT vs GT	.29 <sup>a</sup>	.22 <sup>a</sup>	.11	Q = 2.93	–	–	–
PT vs N	.39 <sup>a</sup>	.24 <sup>a</sup>	.14	Q = 9.08 <sup>a</sup>	Q = 9.01 <sup>a</sup>	Q = .92	Q = 4.08 <sup>a</sup>
PT vs P	.29 <sup>a</sup>	.22 <sup>a</sup>	.04	Q = 9.18 <sup>a</sup>	Q = 8.7 <sup>a</sup>	Q = 2.85	Q = 1.15

Note. Specific comparisons were made between the three groups only when there was evidence that the 'group' variable significantly moderated the effect. NTC = no trauma control. TC = trauma control.

<sup>a</sup> Indicates a significant effect.

index was statistically significant,  $Q(18) = 71.21, p < .001$ , suggesting that the studies varied with respect to the magnitude of this effect. None of the candidate moderators was significant.

**4.3.2. General threat vs positive words**

Eleven outcomes were included in this comparison, yielding a small but statistically significant effect size favoring general threat words  $d = .13, p > .01$ . FSN analysis indicated that the effect was not robust with regard to publication bias (FSN = 58). The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(10) = 25.15, p < .05$ . However, none of the putative moderators significantly impacted the difference between reaction times for general threat and positive words in the PTSD group.

**4.3.3. Positive vs neutral words**

Nineteen outcomes were included in this comparison, yielding a very small and non-significant effect size favoring positive words,  $d = .07, p > .05$ . The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(18) = 35.92, p < .05$ . Given the null overall effect, moderator analyses were not conducted.

**4.3.4. PTSD-relevant words vs general threat words**

Eighteen outcomes were included in this comparison. A small, statistically significant effect size favoring PTSD-relevant words was observed,  $d = .29, p < .001$ . FSN analysis indicated that the effect was robust (FSN = 588). The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(17) = 83.89, p < .001$ . Assault-exposed ( $d = .34$ ) and mixed trauma ( $d = .38$ ) samples had larger effects sizes relative to non-assault trauma-exposed samples ( $d = -.04$ ). Task design moderated

the findings, with blocked designs ( $d = .40$ ) demonstrating greater effects than randomized designs ( $d = .21$ ).

**4.3.5. PTSD-relevant words vs neutral words**

Thirty-two outcomes were included in this comparison, yielding a moderate effect favoring PTSD words,  $d = .39, p < .001$ . This finding was robust with regard to publication bias (FSN = 2628) and the heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(31) = 217.40, p < .001$ . Studies with blocked designs had significantly larger effects than studies with randomized designs ( $d = .57$  vs  $d = .26$ ),  $Q(1) = 8.64, p < .01$ . Trauma type moderated the effects,  $Q(2) = 7.53, p < .05$ , with larger effects observed for assault samples ( $d = .48$ ) compared to non-assault ( $d = .23$ ) and mixed trauma ( $d = .34$ ) samples. Studies using unmasked Stroop tasks showed larger differences in reaction time between word types compared to masked tasks ( $d = .44$  vs  $d = .09$ ),  $Q(1) = 12.91, p < .001$ .

**4.3.6. PTSD-relevant vs positive words**

Nineteen outcomes were included in this comparison and yielded a small effect size favoring PTSD-relevant words,  $d = .29, p < .001$ . This finding was robust with regard to publication bias (FSN = 611) and the heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(18) = 90.74, p < .001$ , suggesting that the studies in this comparison significantly varied with respect to the magnitude of the effects. Moderator analyses revealed that studies using blocked designs had larger effects than those using randomized designs ( $d = .44$  vs  $d = .24$ ),  $Q(1) = 4.2, p < .05$ . In addition, the magnitude of the difference in reaction time between PTSD-relevant words and positive words was significantly impacted by the type of Stroop task (unmasked vs masked), with

**Table 4**  
Summary of moderator findings for the PTSD and trauma-exposed control groups.

Group	Comparison	Stroop type		Publication type		Trial design		Assessment		Trauma type		
		Unmasked	Masked	Journal	Dissertation	Blocked	Random	Structured interview	Self-report	Assault	Non-assault	Mixed
PTSD	GT vs N	n/a	n/a	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	GT vs P	n/a	n/a	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	P vs N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	PT vs GT	n/a	n/a	–	–	.40	.21	–	–	.34	–.04	.38
	PT vs N	.44	.09	–	–	.57	.26	.42	.25	.48	.23	.34
TC	PT vs P	.33	–.03	–	–	.44	.24	–	–	–	–	–
	GT vs P	n/a	n/a	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	PT vs GT	n/a	n/a	–	–	–	–	–	–	.28	–.01	n/a
	PT vs N	–	–	–	–	.39	.11	.34	.02	–	–	–
	PT vs P	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. PT = PTSD-relevant threat, GT = general threat, P = positive, and N = neutral. Moderator analyses were only computed when there was evidence of a significant overall effect within a group. Effect sizes are only displayed where there was evidence of a significant moderator. n/a = analysis not computed due to low number of studies available. TC = trauma control. No effect sizes displayed for no trauma control group, as there was no evidence of significant overall effect sizes.



significantly larger effects for studies using unmasked paradigms ( $d = .33$ ) compared to masked ( $d = -.03$ ),  $Q(1) = 18.83$ ,  $p < .001$ .

#### 4.4. Within-group effects and moderator findings: Trauma control group

##### 4.4.1. General threat vs neutral words

Eleven outcomes were included in this comparison. A small and non-significant effect size was observed favoring general threat words,  $d = .17$ ,  $p > .01$ . This effect was significantly heterogeneous,  $Q(10) = 48.80$ ,  $p < .001$ , but given the null overall effect moderator analyses were not conducted.

##### 4.4.2. General threat vs positive words

Seven outcomes were included in this comparison. The effect size was small and statistically significant,  $d = .15$ ,  $p < .01$ . The effect was not, however, robust ( $FSN = 29$ ). The heterogeneity index was not statistically significant,  $Q(6) = 11.23$ ,  $p = .09$ .

##### 4.4.3. Positive vs neutral words

Twelve outcomes were included in this comparison. The effect size was small and not statistically significant,  $d = .02$ ,  $p > .01$ . The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(11) = 31.42$ ,  $p < .001$ , but given the null overall effect moderator analyses were not conducted.

##### 4.4.4. PTSD-relevant words vs general threat words

Eleven outcomes were included in this comparison and yielded a small, statistically significant effect favoring PTSD-relevant words,  $d = .22$ ,  $p = .002$ . The heterogeneity index was significant,  $Q(10) = 55.05$ ,  $p < .001$  and the effect was robust ( $FSN = 136$ ). Only trauma type moderated the effect,  $Q(1) = 3.87$ ,  $p < .05$ , with assaultive trauma-exposed samples ( $d = .28$ ) demonstrating a greater effect than non-assault trauma-exposed samples ( $d = -.01$ ).

##### 4.4.5. PTSD-relevant vs neutral words

Eighteen outcomes were included in the comparison. A small, statistically significant effect was observed favoring PTSD-relevant words,  $d = .24$ ,  $p < .001$ . The heterogeneity index was significant,  $Q(17) = 117.55$ ,  $p < .001$  and the effect was robust ( $FSN = 333$ ). Studies using blocked designs showed significantly greater differences in reaction time between PTSD-relevant and neutral words in the trauma control group (i.e., larger effects) than those using randomized designs ( $d = .39$  vs  $d = .11$ ),  $Q(1) = 3.87$ ,  $p < .05$ .

##### 4.4.6. PTSD-relevant words vs positive words

Twelve outcomes were included in this comparison, yielding a small, statistically significant effect size favoring PTSD-relevant words,  $d = .22$ ,  $p < .001$ . The heterogeneity index was significant,  $Q(11) = 39.18$ ,  $p < .001$  and the effect was robust ( $FSN = 134$ ), but no putative moderators were significant.

#### 4.5. Within-group effects and moderator findings: No trauma control group

##### 4.5.1. General threat words vs neutral words

Six outcomes were included in this comparison. The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(5) = 19.13$ ,  $p < .01$ , but because the overall effect was non-significant,  $d = .14$ ,  $p > .05$ , moderator analyses were not conducted.

##### 4.5.2. General vs positive words

Five outcomes were included in this comparison and produced a small, non-significant effect size,  $d = .01$ ,  $p > .05$ . The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(4) = 15.77$ ,  $p < .01$ . As there is a non-significant effect, no moderator analyses were conducted.

##### 4.5.3. Positive words vs neutral words

Ten outcomes were included in this comparison, yielding a non-significant effect size of  $d = -.01$ . The heterogeneity index was not statistically significant,  $Q(9) = 5.25$ ,  $p = .81$ .

##### 4.5.4. PTSD-relevant words vs general threat words

Seven outcomes were included for this comparison, yielding a non-significant effect size of  $d = .11$ . The heterogeneity index was significant,  $Q(6) = 29.64$ ,  $p < .001$ .

##### 4.5.5. PTSD-relevant vs neutral words

Fifteen outcomes were included in this comparison, yielding a small and statistically non-significant effect size favoring PTSD-relevant words,  $d = .14$ ,  $p > .01$ . This finding was not robust to publication bias,  $FSN = 55$ . The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(14) = 76.07$ ,  $p < .001$ .

##### 4.5.6. PTSD-relevant vs positive words

Ten outcomes were included in this comparison. No significant effect was observed,  $d = .04$ ,  $p > .01$ . The heterogeneity index was statistically significant,  $Q(9) = 33.50$ ,  $p < .001$ .

## 5. Discussion

PTSD is associated with low quality of life (Olatunji, Cisler, & Tolin, 2007) and significant psychosocial impairment (Amaya-Jackson et al., 1999; Breslau, 2001; Kessler, 2000). Research has used the EST as one means of elucidating some of the core deficits associated with PTSD (Buckley et al., 2000; McNally et al., 1990). Whether an EST effect exists at all in PTSD has been questioned (Kimble et al., 2009), necessitating a quantitative review to examine the EST effect in PTSD. Further, two complimentary mechanisms are theorized to mediate performance on the EST, a threat detection mechanism and attentional control mechanism, but key EST manipulations that facilitate insights into the mechanisms mediating PTSD have yielded inconsistent results. The present study synthesized this body of literature via meta-analysis as a means of better understanding the core deficits in PTSD.

In regards to the first goal, our quantitative results suggest significantly impaired EST performance in the PTSD group toward PTSD-relevant and generally threatening stimuli, and the EST impairment in the PTSD group is significantly greater than the NTC group. The TC group demonstrated impaired performance toward only PTSD-relevant words, and this impairment was also significantly greater compared to the NTC group. The PTSD and TC groups did not significantly differ in the direct comparisons, though effect sizes consistently favored the PTSD group. On the one hand, the results suggesting that groups only differed in comparisons involving PTSD-relevant words when compared to the NTC group could be interpreted to suggest a lack of an EST effect. That is, trauma-related words are personally relevant to the trauma exposed groups (both TC and PTSD groups) and not the NTC group, so the finding that between group differences are only found toward these words may reflect either an artifact (i.e., personal relevance) or the more general negative consequences of trauma exposure per se (i.e., not PTSD specifically). On the other hand, if it were the case that the observed effects were an artifact of personal relevance, then there should not have been a significant difference between generally threatening words and neutral words (and positive words) found within the PTSD and TC groups. While these effect sizes did not differ significantly between the groups, if it were the case that the observed effects were only due to personal relevance, then there should not have been effects toward non-personally relevant words found only among the clinical groups. Accordingly, the negative consequence of trauma exposure is the most likely interpretation of the present results.

On the one hand, the pattern of results suggesting the negative consequences of trauma exposure generally, and not PTSD specifically, may contradict the hypothesis of an enhanced EST effect in PTSD. That is, if it were the case that PTSD specifically is associated with a pronounced EST effect, then it would be expected that the effects should be greater in PTSD relative to trauma control groups. On the other hand, it is important to consider why comparisons to a trauma control group are important. One factor this comparison controls is personal relevance of the PTSD-words (though not in studies using mixed trauma samples). If personal relevance is held constant between the groups, then differences in performance disruption are likely due to other factors (e.g., attentional control, threat detection). From this perspective, the current results are not consistent with hypotheses of disrupted attentional control or threat detection mechanisms in PTSD. The more obvious factor that a trauma control group comparison controls is trauma exposure, which presumably can address issues of specificity. For example, is psychopathology following trauma exposure uniquely associated with impaired EST performance? From this perspective, the results are again not consistent with the hypothesis that PTSD is uniquely associated with impaired EST performance. However, it is interesting to note that the trauma control group, but not the no trauma control group, had similar within-subject evidence for impaired EST performance. The pattern of within-subject effects and between-group differences suggests that individuals exposed to traumatic events, regardless of PTSD, display impaired EST performance. These findings raise the possibility that the EST effect in PTSD does not necessarily reflect specific characteristics of PTSD; rather, it reflects the consequences of exposure to traumatic events. In a related vein, a growing body of research suggests that assaultive traumas (e.g., combat, physical assault, sexual assault) are a more potent risk factor for PTSD relative to other traumatic event types (e.g., motor vehicle accidents, natural disasters) (Cougle et al., 2009; Resnick et al., 1993). Consistent with the view of impaired EST performance resulting from trauma exposure per se, the present results found that trauma type moderated some of the EST effects in both PTSD and TC groups, such that samples exposed to assault had greater effect sizes relative to other trauma types.

There is a growing body of evidence indicating the negative consequences of traumatic event exposure on both physical health (Sledjeski, Speisman, & Dierker, 2008) and mental health outcomes (Breslau, Davis, Andreski, & Peterson, 1991; Kilpatrick et al., 2003; Resnick et al., 1993). Relevant to the present topic, emerging research suggests that traumatic event exposure has a cumulative 'allostatic' (McEwen, 2004) effect (Kolassa, Kolassa, Ertl, Papassotiropoulos, & De Quervain, 2010; Neuner et al., 2004; Steel et al., 2009). One study conducted among a sample of over 3000 refugees found that the rate of PTSD was about 23% among individuals exposed to 1–3 traumatic events, and this rate increased up to 100% among individuals exposed to 28 or more traumatic events (Neuner et al., 2004). Neurobiological research is clarifying the mechanisms by which this allostatic effect may occur (Arnsten, 2009; Izquierdo, Wellman, & Holmes, 2006; Liston et al., 2006; Mitra, Jadhav, McEwen, Vyas, & Chattarji, 2005; Radley et al., 2006; Vyas, Mitra, Shankaranarayana Rao, & Chattarji, 2002; Vyas, Pillai, & Chattarji, 2004). This research suggests that chronic stress increases dendritic branching in the amygdala and increases reactivity toward motivationally salient cues (e.g., threat cues), and also decreases dendritic spine density and length in key structures of the prefrontal cortex necessary for cognitive, emotional, and behavioral control. Thus, emotional reactivity increases while the ability to regulate emotion simultaneously decreases. Behavioral genetic studies have demonstrated that genes affecting dopamine and serotonin transmission moderate the dose–response relationship between cumulative traumatic event exposure and PTSD vulnerability (Grabe et al., 2009; Kolassa, Kolassa et al., 2010; Kolassa et al., in press; Xie et al., 2009), and these same genes also affect emotion processing

(Hariri et al., 2002, 2005), cognitive flexibility (Krugel, Biele, Mohr, Li, & Heekeren, 2009), and cognitive control of attention to threat (Beevers, Gibb, McGeary, & Miller, 2007; Beevers, Wells, Ellis, & McGeary, 2009; Bishop, Cohen, Fossella, Casey, & Farah, 2006). This body of research implicates the key roles that cumulative traumatic event exposure and its neurobiological consequences play in the development of PTSD. From this perspective, it would be expected that individuals exposed to traumatic events, regardless of PTSD, would display disrupted attention toward threat. Further, a dose–response relationship between traumatic event exposure frequency and disrupted attentional control of threat would be expected. There is only limited evidence testing a relationship between trauma exposure frequency/severity and EST performance (McNally et al., 1990). Future research along these lines will help clarify the source of impaired EST performance in PTSD, which will help clarify the dysfunctional processes characterizing PTSD.

If this interpretation were valid and these results do suggest that traumatic event exposure, regardless of PTSD, impairs attentional control and enhances threat processing, then the results are also inconsistent with the view that these processes are specifically linked with psychopathology. Instead, it may be the case that these processes are risk factors that confer vulnerability for psychopathology, or that they are correlated with some other processes that confer vulnerability for psychopathology. This may be consistent with research showing that 1) genes affecting serotonin transmission confer vulnerability to psychopathology following stressful events (Caspi et al., 2003; Grabe et al., 2009; Xie et al., 2009), 2) these same genes modulate difficulty disengaging attention from threat among samples screened to be free from psychopathology (Beevers et al., 2009), and 3) impaired performance in the EST has been found to predict distress to subsequent stressors (MacLeod & Hagan, 1992). The fact that attentional biases toward threat are found in vulnerable, but psychopathology free, individuals is consistent with the view of these processes as risk factors for psychopathology instead of the view of these processes as markers of current psychopathology. One means of testing this conceptualization as it relates to PTSD specifically would be to measure prospectively EST performance, exposure to traumatic events, and symptoms of PTSD, which would allow for delineation of the temporal relationships between these processes.

In regards to the second purpose of the meta-analysis, the overall pattern of results provide support for hypoactive attentional control mechanisms in PTSD, but only weak support for a hyperactive threat detection mechanism in PTSD. When examining moderators of within-subjects effects, two key observations provide support for deficits in attentional control: 1) threat words only impaired performance in unmasked, but not masked, Stroop presentations, and 2) threat words impaired performance in blocked designs significantly more so than in randomized designs. The former effect demonstrates that performance impairment is only observed when some degree of elaborate and/or effortful processing is possible, which is consistent with the hypothesis of impaired attentional control. The latter effect demonstrates that the 'slow' (i.e., inter-trial) EST effect, which is dependent on attentional control (McKenna & Sharma, 2004; Wyble et al., 2008), is particularly pronounced among PTSD groups. Again, however, the larger effect in blocked designs may result from mood induction stemming from repeated presentations of threat words; thus, conclusions based solely on the block design manipulation must be tempered.

There were two key pieces of evidence for a hyperactive threat detection mechanism when examining within-subject comparisons. First, both PTSD-relevant and generally threatening words, but not positive words, significantly slowed RTs relative to neutral words among PTSD groups. Given that PTSD-relevant words may be more personally relevant for PTSD groups, performance disruptions from these words may not necessarily reflect threat processing. The finding that generally threatening words, but not positive words, also impair

performance is consistent with the view that individuals with PTSD are more reactive to threat stimuli and not emotionality per se. Second, the EST effect size for PTSD-relevant and generally threatening words remained in the small range in randomized designs. As discussed above, randomized designs should reflect the 'immediate' (i.e., intra-trial) EST effect, hypothesized to be more dependent on emotional reactivity and less so on attentional control (Wyble et al., 2008); thus, meaningful effect sizes in these designs provides some support for enhanced threat detection. However, the key prediction from the hypothesis of enhanced threat detection was not supported: EST effect sizes in masked Stroop designs were generally of a trivial magnitude. Given that masking is a procedure commonly used to assess enhanced threat detection (Ohman & Soares, 1993, 1994), the present failure to find strong evidence of an EST effect toward masked words notably tempers conclusions about enhanced threat detection in PTSD.

The only evidence from between-group comparisons for enhanced threat detection in PTSD is the fact that PTSD groups (and TC groups) differed from the NTC groups in attention toward threat above and beyond attention toward neutral stimuli. The fact that threat disrupted attentional performance above and beyond general attentional control impairment (i.e., longer reaction times toward threat words compared to neutral words) implicates some degree of enhanced threat processing. However, the fact that PTSD was not associated with greater EST effect sizes in masked or randomized designs is inconsistent with the enhanced threat detection hypothesis and qualifies strength of support for enhanced threat detection. The pattern of findings regarding hyperactive threat detection, then, suggests that enhanced threat detection may potentiate general attentional control deficits (i.e., an interacting system hypothesis). Enhanced threat detection may heighten prepotent responses toward threat stimuli (Williams et al., 1996; Wyble et al., 2008), which creates even greater demands on an already weakened attentional control system in PTSD. The key prediction from this hypothesis is that enhanced threat detection will only affect performance when attentional control demands are high and resources are low. By contrast, threat detection does not appear to be enhanced in PTSD to the degree that it impairs performance independent of attentional control functioning (i.e., does not facilitate detection of masked stimuli).

While the present data cannot directly speak to clinical implications, some tentative speculation might be warranted. There has been growing recent interest in attention training as an intervention for anxiety disorders, with preliminary reports suggesting significant reductions in anxiety symptoms (Amir et al., 2008, 2009; Hazen et al., 2009; Schmidt et al., 2009). Attention training procedures generally present two stimuli, one threatening and one neutral, on a computer screen, and the participant's task is to detect a subsequent probe that appears in a location previously occupied by either the threat or neutral stimulus. In the training condition, the probe appears most frequently in the location opposite to the threat stimuli; thus, participants are trained to disengage attention from threat stimuli. Indeed, the only study that has investigated which attentional bias components are affected by attention retraining (Amir et al., 2009) found improvements in disengagement from threat on a separate task. The current finding that enhanced threat processing disrupts attentional control in PTSD may implicate the need for such training procedures. Given that a sizeable percentage of PTSD patients receiving cognitive-behavioral treatments continue to exhibit significant symptoms post-treatment (Foa et al., 1999; Foa, Feske, et al., 1991; Foa, Rothbaum, et al., 1991; Schnurr et al., 2007), it will be interesting to test whether adding attention retraining procedures can improve the efficacy of these treatments. Also, if impaired EST performance is indeed a risk factor for the subsequent development of PTSD, then attention retraining following traumatic event exposure regardless of PTSD could operate as a preventative intervention.

Future research along these lines is necessary for both clinical and theoretical reasons.

It will also be important for future research to investigate how processes presumably measured by the EST (attentional control, threat detection) relate to the other mechanisms implicated in PTSD, such as memory dysfunction (Brewin et al., 2007; McNally, Lasko, Macklin, & Pitman, 1995), anxiety sensitivity (Marshall, Miles, & Stewart, 2010), and emotion regulation difficulty (Tull, Barrett, McMillan, & Roemer, 2007). The current conceptualization of these processes is that they represent relatively basic cognitive and emotional functions, which presumably makes them superordinate to some of the other processes implicated in PTSD (e.g., emotion regulation, anxiety sensitivity, avoidance). For example, given the developmental link between attentional control and self-regulation (Posner & Rothbart, 2000), it might be expected that emotion regulation difficulties observed in PTSD are due to causally prior attentional control disruptions. Similarly, preoccupation with unpleasant interoceptive sensations could be due to enhanced detection of these danger signals and decreased ability to disengage attention from them. However, future research is clearly necessary to test this conceptualization. It will also be interesting to test how impaired attentional control and threat processing relate to memory dysfunction implicated in PTSD (Brewin et al., 2007; McNally et al., 1995). It could be the case that memory dysfunction and the current processes are either overlapping or distinct impairments. For example, perhaps overgeneral autobiographical memories (McNally et al., 1995) and poor attentional control in the context of threat both reflect deficits in a shared higher-order cognitive control process. Future research is necessary to clarify the relationships between different cognitive dysfunctions identified in PTSD.

Several limitations must qualify conclusions from this study. First, the only mechanisms the current data address are those presumably measured by the EST. Discussion was accordingly focused on threat processing and attentional control, but it is important to note that the current results cannot speak to the relative centrality of attentional control and threat detection to understanding PTSD. Second, most of the studies using a blocked design also used a card format, as opposed to computerized format. This means that design is somewhat confounded with other experimental procedures and conclusions based on this manipulation must be tempered accordingly. Third, the EST is just one of many tasks used to assess attentional and emotional processes. It will be important for future research to continue to examine these processes using novel methodological approaches. Fourth, it is uncommon for emotional words in EST research to be matched in arousal, and emerging research suggests that arousal, not valence, is more important for disrupting attentional processes (Anderson, 2005). As such, it remains possible that any differences observed between emotional words (PTSD-threat vs general-threat vs positive) are due to differences in arousal and not due to valence or semantic category. While conclusions from this meta-analysis must accordingly be tempered, this meta-analysis represents the first attempt to quantitatively synthesize results from the EST research in PTSD and provides initial evidence for the negative consequences of trauma exposure on attention toward threat and for disrupted attentional control and enhanced threat detection.

## References\*

- Algom, D., Chajut, E., & Lev, S. (2004). A rational look at the emotional Stroop paradigm: A generic slowdown, not a Stroop effect. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *133*, 323–338.
- Amaya-Jackson, L., Davidson, J. R., Hughes, D. C., Swartz, M., Reynolds, V., George, L. K., et al. (1999). Functional impairment and utilization of services associated with posttraumatic stress in the community. *J Trauma Stress*, *12*(4), 709–724.

\* indicates an article included in the meta-analysis.

- Amir, N., Beard, C., Taylor, C. T., Klumpp, H., Elias, J., Burns, M., et al. (2009). Attention training in individuals with generalized social phobia: A randomized controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 77(5), 961–973.
- Amir, N., Weber, G., Beard, C., Bomyea, J., & Taylor, C. T. (2008). The effect of a single-session attention modification program on response to a public-speaking challenge in socially anxious individuals. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 117(4), 860–868.
- Anderson, A. K. (2005). Affective influences on the attentional dynamics supporting awareness. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 134, 258–281.
- Arnsten, A. F. (2009). Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience*, 10, 410–422.
- Bar-Haim, Y., Lamy, D., Pergamin, L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2007). Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and non-anxious individuals: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133, 1–24.
- \*Beck, J. G., Freeman, J. B., Shipperd, J. C., Hamblen, J. L., & Lackner, J. M. (2001). Specificity of Stroop interference in patients with pain and PTSD. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 110, 536–543.
- \*Beckham, J. C., Lytle, B. L., Vrana, S. R., Hertzberg, M. A., Feldman, M. E., & Shipley, R. H. (1996). Smoking withdrawal symptoms in response to a trauma-related stressor among Vietnam combat veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Addictive Behaviors*, 21, 92–101.
- Beevers, C. G., Gibb, B. E., McGeary, J. E., & Miller, I. W. (2007). Serotonin transporter genetic variation and biased attention for emotional word stimuli among psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116, 208–212.
- Beevers, C. G., Wells, T. T., Ellis, A. J., & McGeary, J. E. (2009). Association of the serotonin transporter gene promoter region (5-HTTLPR) polymorphism with biased attention for emotional stimuli. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 118, 670–681.
- Bishop, S. J. (2007). Neurocognitive mechanisms of anxiety: An integrative account. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 307–316.
- Bishop, S. J. (2008). Neural mechanisms underlying selective attention to threat. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*, 1129, 141–152.
- Bishop, S. J. (2009). Trait anxiety and impoverished prefrontal control of attention. *Nature Neuroscience*, 12, 92–98.
- Bishop, S. J., Cohen, J. D., Fossella, J., Casey, B. J., & Farah, M. J. (2006). COMT genotype influences prefrontal response to emotional distraction. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 6, 62–70.
- Bishop, S., Duncan, J., Brett, M., & Lawrence, A. D. (2004). Prefrontal cortical function and anxiety: Controlling attention to threat-related stimuli. *Nature Neuroscience*, 7, 184–188.
- Blake, D. D., Weathers, F. W., Nagy, L. M., Kaloupek, D. G., Gusman, F. D., Charney, D. S., et al. (1995). The development of a clinician-administered PTSD scale. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 8, 75–90.
- Breslau, N. (2001). Outcomes of posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*, 62 (Suppl 17), 55–59.
- Breslau, N., Chilcoat, H. D., Kessler, R. C., & Davis, G. C. (1999). Previous exposure to trauma and PTSD effects of subsequent trauma: Results from the Detroit area survey of trauma. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156(6), 902–907.
- Breslau, N., Davis, G. C., Andreski, P., & Peterson, E. (1991). Traumatic events and posttraumatic stress disorder in an urban population of young adults. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 48, 216–222.
- Brewin, C. R., Kleiner, J. S., Vasterling, J. J., & Field, A. P. (2007). Memory for emotionally neutral information in posttraumatic stress disorder: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116, 448–463.
- Brown, T. A., diNardo, P. A., & Barlow, D. H. (1994). *Anxiety disorders interview schedule for DSM-IV*. Albany, NY: Center for Stress and Anxiety Disorders, University of Albany.
- \*Bryant, R. A., & Harvey, A. G. (1995). Processing threatening information in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104, 537–541.
- Bryant, R. A., Kemp, A. H., Felmingham, K. L., Liddell, B., Olivieri, G., Peduto, A., et al. (2008). Enhanced amygdala and medial prefrontal activation during nonconscious processing of fear in posttraumatic stress disorder: an fMRI study. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 29(5), 517–523.
- \*Buckley, T. C., Blanchard, E. B., & Hickling, E. J. (2002). Automatic and strategic processing of threat stimuli: A comparison between PTSD, panic disorder, and non-anxiety controls. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 26, 97–115.
- Buckley, T. C., Blanchard, E. B., & Neill, W. T. (2000). Information processing and PTSD: A review of the empirical literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 20, 1041–1065.
- Caspi, A., Sugden, K., Moffitt, T. E., Taylor, A., Craig, I., Harrington, H., et al. (2003). Influence of life stress on depression: Moderation by a polymorphism in the 5-HTT gene. *Science*, 301, 386–389.
- Cassiday, K. L. (1991). Cognitive processing of trauma-related stimuli in survivors of sexual assault. *Dissertation*.
- Cisler, J. M., & Koster, E. W. H. (2010). Mechanisms of attentional biases towards threat in the anxiety disorders: An integrative review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 203–216.
- \*Constans, J. I., McCloskey, M. S., Vasterling, J. J., Brailey, K., & Mathews, A. (2004). Suppression of attentional bias in PTSD. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 113, 315–323.
- Cogle, J. R., Resnick, H., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2009). Does prior exposure to interpersonal violence increase risk of PTSD following subsequent exposure? *Behav Res Ther*, 47 (12), 1012–1017.
- Dalgleish, T. (1995). Performance on the emotional Stroop task in groups of anxious, expert, and control subjects: A comparison of computer and card presentation formats. *Cognition and Emotion*, 9, 341–362.
- Davis, M., & Whalen, P. J. (2001). The amygdala: Vigilance and emotion. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 6, 13–34.
- Derryberry, D., & Reed, M. A. (2002). Anxiety-related attentional biases and their regulation by attentional control. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 111(2), 225–236.
- \*Devineni, T., Blanchard, E. B., Hickling, E. J., & Buckley, T. C. (2004). Effect of psychological treatment on cognitive bias in motor vehicle accident-related Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 18, 211–231.
- Dunlap, W. P., Cortina, J. M., Vaslow, J. B., & Burke, M. J. (1996). Meta-analysis of experiments with matched groups or repeated measures designs. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 170–177.
- Eide, P., Kemp, A., Silberstein, R. B., Nathan, P. J., & Stough, C. (2002). Test-retest reliability of the emotional stroop task: examining the paradox of measurement change. *J Psychol*, 136(5), 514–520.
- Etkin, A., & Wager, T. D. (2007). Functional neuroimaging of anxiety: A meta-analysis of emotional processing in PTSD, social anxiety disorder, and specific phobia. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164, 1476–1478.
- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7, 336–353.
- Felmingham, K., Williams, L. M., Kemp, A. H., Liddell, B., Falconer, E., Peduto, A., et al. (2010). Neural responses to masked fear faces: sex differences and trauma exposure in posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 119(1), 241–247.
- First, B. M., Spitzer, R. L., Gibbon, M., & Williams, J. B. W. (1995). *User's guide for the structured clinical interview for DSM-IV axis 1 disorders: SCID-1 clinician version*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Foa, E. B., Dancu, C. V., Hembree, E. A., Jaycox, L. H., Meadows, E. A., & Street, G. P. (1999). A comparison of exposure therapy, stress inoculation training, and their combination for reducing posttraumatic stress disorder in female assault victims. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 194–200.
- \*Foa, E. B., Feske, U., Murdock, T. B., Kozak, M. J., & McCarthy, P. R. (1991). Processing of threat-related information in rape victims. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 156–162.
- Foa, E. B., Rothbaum, B. O., Riggs, D. S., & Murdock, T. B. (1991). Treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder in rape victims: A comparison between cognitive-behavioral procedures and counseling. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 715–723.
- \*Freeman, J. B., & Beck, J. G. (2000). Cognitive interference for trauma cues in sexually abused adolescent girls with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 29, 245–256.
- \*Garcia, M. (2007). Automatic processing of guilt stimuli in sexual assault survivors with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Dissertation*.
- Grabe, H. J., Spitzer, C., Schwahn, C., Marcinek, A., Frahnow, A., Barnow, S., et al. (2009). Serotonin transporter gene (SLC6A4) promoter polymorphisms and the susceptibility to posttraumatic stress disorder in the general population. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 166, 926–933.
- Hariri, A. R., Drabant, E. M., Munoz, K. E., Kolachana, B. S., Mattay, V. S., Egan, M. F., et al. (2005). A susceptibility gene for affective disorders and the response of the human amygdala. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62, 146–152.
- Hariri, A. R., Mattay, V. S., Tessitore, A., Kolachana, B., Fera, F., Goldman, D., et al. (2002). Serotonin transporter genetic variation and the response of the human amygdala. *Science*, 297, 400–403.
- \*Harvey, A. G., Bryant, R. A., & Rapee, R. M. (1996). Preconscious processing of threat in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 20, 613–623.
- Hazen, R. A., Vasey, M. W., & Schmidt, N. B. (2009). Attentional retraining: a randomized clinical trial for pathological worry. *J Psychiatr Res*, 43(6), 627–633.
- Hendler, T., Rotshtein, P., Yeshurun, Y., Weizmann, T., Kahn, I., Ben-Bashat, D., et al. (2003). Sensing the invisible: differential sensitivity of visual cortex and amygdala to traumatic context. *Neuroimage*, 19(3), 587–600.
- Izquierdo, A., Wellman, C. L., & Holmes, A. (2006). Brief uncontrollable stress causes dendritic retraction in infralimbic cortex and resistance to fear extinction in mice. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 26, 5733–5738.
- \*Kaspi, S. P., McNally, R. J., & Amir, N. (1995). Cognitive processing of emotional information in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 19, 433–444.
- Kessler, R. C. (2000). Posttraumatic stress disorder: the burden to the individual and to society. *J Clin Psychiatry*, 61 Suppl 5, 4-12; discussion 13–14.
- Kessler, R. C., Chiu, W. T., Demler, O., Merikangas, K. R., & Walters, E. E. (2005). Prevalence, severity, and comorbidity of 12-month DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 62(6), 617–627.
- Kessler, R. C., Sonnega, A., Bromet, E., Hughes, M., & Nelson, C. B. (1995). Posttraumatic stress disorder in the National Comorbidity Survey. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 52(12), 1048–1060.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Ruggiero, K. J., Acierno, R., Saunders, B. E., Resnick, H. S., & Best, C. L. (2003). Violence and risk of PTSD, major depression, substance abuse/dependence, and comorbidity: results from the National Survey of Adolescents. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 71(4), 692–700.
- Kimble, M. O., Frueh, B. C., & Marks, L. (2009). Does the modified Stroop effect exist in PTSD? Evidence from dissertation abstracts and the peer reviewed literature. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 23, 650–655.
- Kindt, M., Bierman, D., & Brosschot, J. F. (1996). Stroop versus Stroop: Comparison of a card format and a single-trial format of the standard color-word Stroop task and the emotional Stroop task. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 653–661.
- Kolassa, I. T., Ertl, V., Eckart, C., Glockner, F., Kolassa, S., Papassotiropoulos, A., et al. (2010). Association study of trauma load and SLC6A4 promoter polymorphism in posttraumatic stress disorder: evidence from survivors of the Rwandan genocide. *J Clin Psychiatry*, 71(5), 543–547.
- Kolassa, I. T., Kolassa, S., Ertl, V., Papassotiropoulos, A., & De Quervain, D. J. (2010). The risk of posttraumatic stress disorder after trauma depends on traumatic load and the catechol-o-methyltransferase Val(158)Met polymorphism. *Biol Psychiatry*, 67 (4), 304–308.
- Krugel, L. K., Biele, G., Mohr, P. N., Li, S. C., & Heekeren, H. R. (2009). Genetic variation in dopaminergic neuromodulation influences the ability to rapidly and flexibly adapt decisions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106, 17951–17956.
- Liston, C., Miller, M. M., Goldwater, D. S., Radley, J. J., Rocher, A. B., Hof, P. R., et al. (2006). Stress-induced alterations in prefrontal cortical dendritic morphology predict

- selective impairments in perceptual attentional set-shifting. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 26, 7870–7874.
- \*Litz, B. T., Weathers, F. W., Monaco, V., Herman, D. S., et al. (1996). Attention, arousal, and memory in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 9, 497–520.
- MacLeod, C., & Hagan, R. (1992). Individual differences in the selective processing of threatening information, and emotional responses to a stressful life event. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 30, 151–161.
- Marshall, G. N., Miles, J. N., & Stewart, S. H. (2010). Anxiety sensitivity and PTSD symptom severity are reciprocally related: Evidence from a longitudinal study of physical trauma survivors. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 119, 143–150.
- McEwen, B. S. (2004). Protection and damage from acute and chronic stress: Allostatic and allostatic overload and relevance to the pathophysiology of psychiatric disorders. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1032, 1–7.
- McKenna, F. P., & Sharma, D. (2004). Reversing the emotional Stroop effect reveals that it is not what it seems: The role of fast and slow components. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 30, 382–392.
- McNally, R. J. (1995). Automaticity and the anxiety disorders. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33, 747–754.
- McNally, R. J. (1996). Cognitive bias in the anxiety disorders. In D. A. Hope (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1995: Perspectives on anxiety, panic, and fear* (pp. 211–250). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- McNally, R. J. (1998). Experimental approaches to cognitive abnormality in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 18, 971–982.
- McNally, R. J. (2006). Cognitive abnormalities in post-traumatic stress disorder. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 271–277.
- \*McNally, R. J., Amir, N., & Lipke, H. J. (1996). Subliminal processing of threat cues in posttraumatic stress disorder? *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 10, 115–128.
- \*McNally, R. J., English, G. E., & Lipke, H. J. (1993). Assessment of intrusive cognition in PTSD: Use of the modified Stroop paradigm. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 6, 33–41.
- \*McNally, R. J., Kaspi, S. P., Bradley, C. R., & Zeitlin, S. B. (1990). Selective processing of threat cues in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 99, 398–402.
- McNally, R. J., Lasko, N. B., Macklin, M. L., & Pitman, R. K. (1995). Autobiographical memory disturbance in combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33, 619–630.
- \*McNeil, D. W., Tucker, P., Miranda, R., Lewin, M. R., & Nordgren, J. C. (1999). Response to depression and anxiety Stroop stimuli in posttraumatic stress disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and major depression. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 187, 512–516.
- \*Metzger, L. J., Orr, S. T., Lasko, N. B., McNally, R. J., & Pitman, R. K. (1997). Seeking the source of the emotional Stroop interference effects in PTSD: A study of P3s to traumatic words. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science*, 32, 43–51.
- Mitra, R., Jadhav, S., McEwen, B. S., Vyas, A., & Chattarji, S. (2005). Stress duration modulates the spatiotemporal patterns of spine formation in the basolateral amygdala. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102, 9371–9376.
- Moors, A., & De Houwer, J. (2006). Automaticity: A theoretical and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 297–326.
- \*Moradi, A. R., Taghavi, M. R., Neshat Doost, H. T., Yule, W., & Dalgleish, T. (1999). Performance of children and adolescents with PTSD on the Stroop colour-naming task. *Psychological Medicine*, 29, 415–419.
- Morris, J. S., Ohman, A., & Dolan, R. J. (1998). Conscious and unconscious emotional learning in the human amygdala. *Nature*, 393(6684), 467–470.
- Neuner, F., Schauer, M., Karunakara, U., Klaschik, C., Robert, C., & Elbert, T. (2004). Psychological trauma and evidence for enhanced vulnerability for posttraumatic stress disorder through previous trauma among West Nile refugees. *BMC Psychiatry*, 4, 34.
- Ohman, A., & Soares, J. J. (1993). On the automatic nature of phobic fear: Conditioned electrodermal responses to masked fear-relevant stimuli. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 121–132.
- Ohman, A. (2005). The role of the amygdala in human fear: automatic detection of threat. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 30(10), 953–958.
- Ohman, A., & Mineka, S. (2001). Fears, phobias, and preparedness: toward an evolved module of fear and fear learning. *Psychol Rev*, 108(3), 483–522.
- Ohman, A., & Soares, J. J. (1994). "Unconscious anxiety": Phobic responses to masked stimuli. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 231–240.
- Olatunji, B. O., Cisler, J. M., & Tolin, D. F. (2007). Quality of life in the anxiety disorders: a meta-analytic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*, 27(5), 572–581.
- Olatunji, B. O., & Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B. (2009). Anxiety sensitivity and the anxiety disorders: a meta-analytic review and synthesis. *Psychol Bull*, 135(6), 974–999.
- \*Paunovic, N., Lundh, L. -G., & Ost, L. -G. (2002). Attentional and memory bias for emotional information in crime victims with acute posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 16, 675–692.
- Pessoa, L. (2009). How do emotion and motivation direct executive control? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13, 160–166.
- Phaf, R. H., & Kan, K. J. (2007). The automaticity of emotional Stroop: a meta-analysis. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry*, 38(2), 184–199.
- Posner, M. I. (1980). Orienting of attention. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 32, 3–25.
- Posner, M. I. (1990). The attention system of the human brain. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 13, 25–42.
- Posner, M. R., & Rothbart, M. K. (2000). Developing mechanisms of self-regulation. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 427–441.
- Radley, J. J., Rocher, A. B., Miller, M., Janssen, W. G., Liston, C., Hof, P. R., et al. (2006). Repeated stress induces dendritic spine loss in the rat medial prefrontal cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, 16, 313–320.
- \*Rampersaud, U. L. (2005). The impact of posttraumatic stress disorder on physical health in women with histories of childhood sexual abuse. *Dissertation*.
- Rauch, S. L., Shin, L. M., & Phelps, E. A. (2006). Neurocircuitry models of posttraumatic stress disorder and extinction: Human neuroimaging research – Past, present, and future. *Biological Psychiatry*, 60, 376–382.
- Rauch, S. L., Whalen, P. J., Shin, L. M., McInerney, S. C., Macklin, M. L., Lasko, N. B., et al. (2000). Exaggerated amygdala response to masked facial stimuli in posttraumatic stress disorder: a functional MRI study. *Biol Psychiatry*, 47(9), 769–776.
- Reinholdt-Dunne, M. L., Mogg, K., & Bradley, B. P. (2009). Effects of anxiety and attention control on processing pictorial and linguistic emotional information. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 47, 410–417.
- Resnick, H. S., Kilpatrick, D. G., Dansky, B. S., Saunders, B. E., & Best, C. L. (1993). Prevalence of civilian trauma and posttraumatic stress disorder in a representative national sample of women. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 61(6), 984–991.
- Rosen, G. M., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2008). Posttraumatic stress disorder: An empirical evaluation of core assumptions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 837–868.
- Rosenthal, R. (1991). Meta-analysis: a review. *Psychosom Med*, 53(3), 247–271.
- \*Sawhney, D. K. (2002). The effects of fear arousal and repressor status on the attentional processes of rape victims with PTSD. *Dissertation*.
- Schmidt, N. B., Richey, J. A., Buckner, J. D., & Timpano, K. R. (2009). Attention training for generalized social anxiety disorder. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 118(1), 5–14.
- Schnurr, P. P., Friedman, M. J., Engel, C. C., Foa, E. B., Shea, M. T., Chow, B. K., et al. (2007). Cognitive behavioral therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder in women: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 297, 820–830.
- Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84, 127–190.
- \*Shin, L. M., Whalen, P. J., Pitman, R. K., Bush, G., Macklin, M. L., Lasko, N. B., et al. (2001). An fMRI study of anterior cingulate function of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, 50, 932–942.
- Sledjeski, E. M., Speisman, B., & Dierker, L. C. (2008). Does number of lifetime traumas explain the relationship between PTSD and chronic medical conditions? Answers from the National Comorbidity Survey-Replication (NCS-R). *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 31, 341–349.
- Steel, Z., Chey, T., Silove, D., Marnane, C., Bryant, R. A., & van Ommeren, M. (2009). Association of torture and other potentially traumatic events with mental health outcomes among populations exposed to mass conflict and displacement: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 302(5), 537–549.
- Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 18, 643–662 (Reprinted in 1992 in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 121, 15–23).
- \*Taylor, F. B., Lowe, K., Thompson, C., McFall, M. M., Peskind, E. R., Kanter, E. D., et al. (2006). Daytime prazosin reduces psychological distress to trauma specific cues in civilian trauma posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, 59, 577–581.
- \*Thrasher, S. M., Dalgleish, T., & Yule, W. (1994). Information processing in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 32, 247–254.
- Tull, M. T., Barrett, H. M., McMillan, E. S., & Roemer, L. (2007). A preliminary investigation of the relationship between emotion regulation difficulties and posttraumatic stress symptoms. *Behavior Therapy*, 38, 303–313.
- Vogt, J., De Houwer, J., Koster, E. H. W., Van Damme, S., & Crombez, G. (2008). Allocation of spatial attention to emotional stimuli depends upon arousal and not valence. *Emotion*, 8, 880–885.
- \*Vrana, Roodman, A., & Beckham, J. C. (1995). Selective processing of trauma-related words in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 9, 515–530.
- Vyas, A., Mitra, R., Shankaranarayana Rao, B. S., & Chattarji, S. (2002). Chronic stress induces contrasting patterns of dendritic remodeling in hippocampal and amygdaloid neurons. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 22, 6810–6818.
- Vyas, A., Pillai, A. G., & Chattarji, S. (2004). Recovery after chronic stress fails to reverse amygdaloid neuronal hypertrophy and enhanced anxiety-like behavior. *Neuroscience*, 128, 667–673.
- Whalen, P. J., Kagan, J., Cook, R. G., Davis, F. C., Kim, H., Polis, S., et al. (2004). Human amygdala responsivity to masked fearful eye whites. *Science*, 306, 2061.
- Whalen, P. J., Rauch, S. L., Etcoff, N. L., McInerney, S. C., Lee, M. B., & Jenike, M. A. (1998). Masked presentations of emotional facial expressions modulate amygdala activity without explicit knowledge. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 18, 411–418.
- Williams, J. M. G., Mathews, A., & MacLeod, C. (1996). The emotional Stroop task and psychopathology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 3–24.
- Wyble, B., Sharma, D., & Bowman, H. (2008). Strategic regulation of cognitive control by emotional salience: A neural network model. *Cognition and Emotion*, 22, 1019–1051.
- Xie, P., Kranzler, H. R., Poling, J., Stein, M. B., Anton, R. F., Brady, K., et al. (2009). Interactive effect of stressful life events and the serotonin transporter 5-HTTLPR genotype on posttraumatic stress disorder diagnosis in 2 independent populations. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 66, 1201–1209.
- Yehuda, R., & LeDoux, J. (2007). Response variation following trauma: A translational neuroscience approach to understanding PTSD. *Neuron*, 56, 19–32.