



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Tapper, K., Pothos, E. M. and Lawrence, A. D. (2010). Feast your eyes: hunger and trait reward drive predict attentional bias for food cues. *Emotion*, 10(6), pp. 949-954. doi: 10.1037/a0020305

This is the unspecified version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/1916/>

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020305>

Copyright and reuse: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Running head: ATTENTIONAL BIAS FOR FOOD CUES

Feast your eyes: hunger and trait reward drive predict attentional bias for food cues

Katy Tapper¹, Emmanuel M. Pothos¹ & Andrew D. Lawrence²
¹Department of Psychology, Swansea University, United Kingdom
²School of Psychology, Cardiff University, United Kingdom

Word count: 3,571

Corresponding authors:

Dr Katy Tapper
Department of Psychology
Swansea University
SA2 8PP
UK
Tel. +44 (0)2920 569103
Fax. +44 (0)1792 295679
Email: k.tapper@swansea.ac.uk

Professor Andrew Laurence
School of Psychology
Cardiff University
Tower Building
Park Place
CF10 3AT
Tel. +44 (0)2920 870712
Email: lawrencead@cardiff.ac.uk

Running head: ATTENTIONAL BIAS FOR FOOD CUES

Feast your eyes: hunger and trait reward drive predict attentional bias for food cues

Word count: 3,571

Abstract

Appraisal theories of emotion predict that the relevance of a stimulus to a person's needs and goals influences attentional allocation. We employed a modified visual probe task to examine the influence of hunger and trait reward drive on food-related attentional bias. Both hunger and trait reward drive predicted degree of attentional 'disengagement' from food images at short (100ms), but not long (500ms, 2000ms) stimulus durations. Effects of hunger were found for both bland and appetising foods, whilst effects of reward drive were restricted to appetising foods. Our findings extend previous research showing delayed 'disengagement' from threat-related stimuli, suggesting that both organismic- and goal-relevance are key biasing factors in attentional competition.

Keywords: appraisal theory of emotion; attention; biased competition; reward; value.

Feast your eyes: hunger and trait reward drive predict attentional bias for food cues

Given capacity limitations, a critical function shared by both attentional and emotional processes is to enhance the processing of pertinent events. Appraisal theories of emotion suggest that an early ‘relevance appraisal’ determines the extent to which a stimulus is relevant to the individual’s goals or well-being, which in turn dictates subsequent attention allocation (Sander, Grandjean & Scherer, 2005).

Threat-related stimuli can bias attention allocation, such that their processing is enhanced (Vuilleumier, 2005). Some claim a ‘privileged’ status for threat-related stimuli (Öhman & Wiens, 2004). One source of evidence comes from studies using the visual probe task. In this task, threat stimuli are task-irrelevant, and participants must detect a neutral visual target (probe), that can appear at one of two possible locations, replacing either a threat stimulus (‘congruent’ trials) or a neutral stimulus (‘incongruent’ trials). Attentional allocation is measured by probe detection time. If threat cues influence attentional allocation, this results in facilitation of target processing in congruent trials or distraction from target processing in incongruent trials. Such influences on performance are found using various threat cues (Bar-Haim, Lamy, Pergamin, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJendoorn, 2007). However, findings from the visual probe task are ambiguous. The traditional attentional bias index is calculated by subtracting mean reaction times (RTs) to probes replacing threat stimuli, from mean RTs to probes replacing neutral stimuli. A positive score may result from either fast responses to probes replacing threat stimuli (‘orienting’) and/or slow responses to probes replacing neutral stimuli (‘disengagement’).

Koster, Crombez, Verschuere & De Houwer (2004, 2006) adapted the visual probe task to differentiate these two possibilities, by adding trials with two neutral

cues. 'Heightened orienting' toward threat results in faster responses to probes replacing the location of the threat stimuli (in threat-neutral pairs) compared to probes replacing neutral stimuli (in neutral-neutral pairs). Difficulties in 'disengaging' from threat results in slower responses to probes replacing neutral stimuli, in threat-neutral pairs, compared to probes replacing neutral stimuli in neutral-neutral pairs. Koster et al., using 500ms stimulus presentations, found evidence of delayed disengagement from threat. These and similar findings (e.g. Fox, Russo, Bowles & Dutton, 2001; Yiend & Mathews, 2001; Georgiou et al., 2005; Salemink, van der Hout & Kindt, 2007; but see Mogg, Holmes, Garner & Bradley, 2008) have been interpreted within a serial model of attention postulating subsequent stages of disengagement, shifting and engagement of attention (Posner, Walker, Friedrich & Rafal, 1984), with anxiety impacting a distinct disengage mechanism.

Rather than being threat-specific, appraisal theory predicts that motivationally relevant stimuli *per se* bias attention. Important support for this suggestion may come from studies of attentional bias for food stimuli. If attentional bias (AB) reflects the biological value attached to stimuli, food-related AB should be pronounced in hungry individuals. Mogg, Bradley, Hyare & Lee (1998), using the dot-probe task, found that hungry (compared to sated) individuals were more likely to show an AB for food words. However, their study did not differentiate between faster orienting or delayed disengagement, and also utilised a median-split design to define hunger, an approach that can be problematic (MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher & Rucker, 2002, see discussion). Further, they employed a stimulus duration of 500ms which is at the upper limit of estimates of both the dwell time of attention (Bundesen & Habekost, 2008), and the relevance appraisal process (Sander, Grandjean & Scherer, 2005).

Here, we extend the work of Mogg et al. (1998) in several ways. First, we assess AB at three stimulus durations (100ms, 500ms, 2000ms). Second, rather than words, we use more salient pictures. Third, we include pairs of neutral pictures, allowing us to distinguish between bias resulting from delayed disengagement versus enhanced orienting (Koster et al., 2004). Fourth, we utilized a regression, rather than median-split design. And fifth, we examine AB to appetizing and bland foods separately (e.g., potato chips versus rice cakes). Additionally, we examine the impact of trait reward drive, a facet of reward sensitivity (Carver & White, 1994), linked to anticipation of reward from eating (Franken & Muris, 2005), a preference for sweet and fatty foods, and a higher body mass index (BMI; Davis et al., 2007).

If both biological- and goal-relevance determine AB, we would expect (1) hunger to predict AB to food stimuli, especially at short cue durations (500ms or less) within attentional dwell time; (2) reward drive to predict AB for appetizing foods, especially at short cue presentations. Given that anxiety primarily delays attentional disengagement, such biases may be particularly linked to delayed disengagement.

Method

Participants

One hundred and five participants (69 females, mean age 23 years) were recruited from Swansea University. All were native English speakers, were not vegetarian and had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Participants received a small remuneration for participation. Ethical approval was provided by the local University Psychology Department Research Ethics Committee.

Stimuli and materials

The stimuli for the visual probe task consisted of 70 different color photographs, 10 of which were of appetizing foods (e.g., cookies, potato chips), 10 of which were of bland foods (e.g., rice cakes, lettuce), and 50 of which were household (neutral) items. Pictures had previously been rated by a separate group of participants as falling into these categories. Each food picture was matched for approximate shape and jpeg size to a neutral picture (e.g., hamburger was paired with a CD player, Brussels sprouts with cotton wool balls). Thus there were 10 appetizing-neutral pairs and 10 bland-neutral pairs. An additional 10 neutral pictures, matched to five of the appetizing pictures, formed five appetizing-matched neutral-neutral pairs and a further 10 neutral pictures, matched to five of the bland pictures, formed five bland-matched neutral-neutral pairs. The remaining 20 neutral pictures made up 10 neutral pairs for use as practice and buffer trials.

Hunger was assessed by asking participants, 'How hungry are you at the moment?' (Scored on a 100mm visual analogue scale, anchored by 'Not hungry at all' and 'Extremely hungry'; Mogg et al., 1998). Reward drive was assessed using the Behavioural Activation Scale (BAS) drive subscale (BAS-d; Carver & White, 1994). This consists of four statements (e.g., 'I go out of my way to get things I want') that participants rate on a 4-point scale as true or false for them. Relative to the other BAS subscales, BAS-d is a clearer measure of generalized reward expectancies (Caseras, Avila & Torrubia, 2003), and uniquely predicts neural activity to appetizing food images (Beaver et al., 2006).

Procedure

Participants took part in the study between 9am and 7pm. Those who took part between 9am and 3pm were asked to fast after 9am. Those who took part from 3pm were asked to fast after 2pm.

After completing the hunger scale, participants completed the visual probe task. This was presented using SuperLabTM on a fast PC. Participants were seated at a desk, 100cm away from a 45cm monitor. Each trial began with a central fixation cross displayed for 500ms. This was replaced by one of the picture pairs, displayed side by side. The pictures were ~ 50mm in height and width, depending on their shape. There was a distance of 60mm between the fixation cross and the centre of each image. The pictures were displayed for either 100ms, 500ms or 2000ms and were replaced by a probe (a square measuring 2mm x 2mm) which was displayed in the location of one of the pictures. Participants were instructed to fixate the central cross at the start of each trial and identify the location of the probe (either left or right), as quickly and as accurately as possible, by pressing either the far left-hand key or far right-hand key on a Cedrus RB-730 response box. The probe was displayed until the participant made a response. There was an inter-trial interval of 500ms.

The task began with 10 practice trials. These were followed by instructions informing participants that the real trials were about to commence, four buffer trials (i.e. 'warm-up' trials, the data for which were not analyzed), 120 critical trials at 100ms exposure duration, 120 critical trials at 500ms and 120 critical trials at 2000ms. The 30 picture pairs (10 appetizing, 10 bland, 10 neutral) were presented four times at each of these durations. Picture and probe location were counterbalanced for each pair. For the food-neutral pairs, congruent trials were those in which the probe replaced the food picture and incongruent trials were those in which the probe replaced the neutral picture. Critical trial pairs were presented in a new random order

for each participant. Following the task participants completed other measures including BAS-d and reported whether they were currently dieting to lose weight.

Results

Thirteen participants (all females) reported currently dieting to lose weight. Given potential differences in food-related AB among dieters (Tapper, Pothos, Fadardi & Ziori, 2008) they were excluded. Our treatment of outliers followed a two-stage process. First we examined and excluded errors and outliers at the individual trial level (i.e. for individual RT scores) (Ratcliff, 1993). To achieve this trials with errors (1.85% of data, $SD=1.98$) or with RTs $< 100ms$ or $> 4000ms$ were removed. Means and standard deviations (SDs) were then calculated for each participant, for each of the 18 trial types (bland congruent, bland incongruent, appetizing congruent, appetizing incongruent, bland-matched neutral, appetizing-matched neutral, at each of the three exposures). RTs greater than 3.5 standard deviations from the participant's relevant trial type mean were discarded. A total of 2.39% ($SD=2.58$) of data were removed in this way.

Second we examined and excluded outliers in relation to trial types and AB scores. Outliers here are likely to reflect atypical influences at the participant level (e.g., poor concentration). Such scores violate assumptions of parametric statistical tests (Osborne & Overbay, 2004). Since we examine means from both trial types and attentional bias scores in our analyses, it is important that we exclude outliers for both these sets of data. As such means and SDs were first calculated across all participants for each of the 18 trial types. Outliers were defined as data > 3.5 SDs from the mean. Data from two participants were outliers in a majority of the 18 trial types (15 and 17). To avoid biasing subsequent outlier calculations, both these participants were

removed prior to further calculations. Means and SDs were then recalculated and two scores removed as outliers (from bland incongruent trials at 100ms and from appetizing incongruent trials at 100ms). This reduced the sample to 90 participants for 500ms and 2000ms exposures and 89 participants for 100ms exposures.

For each participant, AB for bland and for appetizing foods at each of the three exposures was then calculated by subtracting mean RT for congruent trials from mean RT for incongruent trials. Five outliers were removed resulting in sample sizes for AB scores of 88 for 'appetizing 100' (appetizing foods at 100ms), 'bland 100' and 'appetizing 2000', 89 for 'bland 500', and 90 for 'appetizing 500' and 'bland 2000'. Orienting scores were calculated for each of these bias scores by subtracting relevant congruent trials from relevant neutral trials (e.g., subtracting appetizing 100 incongruent from palatable-matched neutral 100) and disengagement scores by subtracting relevant incongruent trials from relevant neutral trials.

To examine AB for appetizing foods across the whole sample, three paired t-tests were employed to compare congruent trials with relevant incongruent trials. As predicted there was a significant difference (i.e. an AB) for appetizing foods at 100ms, $t(88)=2.83$, $p<.01$ ($M=395$, $SD=60$ versus $M=386$, $SD=62$ for incongruent and congruent trials respectively, Cohen's $d=0.30$). There were also significant differences at 500ms, $t(89)=5.24$, $p<.001$, ($M=401$, $SD=54$ versus $M=387$, $SD=56$, Cohen's $d=0.56$), and at 2000ms, $t(89)=5.35$, $p<.001$, ($M=393$, $SD=60$ versus $M=377$, $SD=50$, Cohen's $d=0.57$). Mean RTs for appetizing matched neutral trials were 384 ($SD=53$), 393 ($SD=60$), and 382 ($SD=54$) for 100, 500 and 2000ms respectively. Paired t-tests comparing these RTs with relevant congruent and incongruent RTs indicated that the bias at 100ms resulted from delayed disengagement ($t(88)=4.31$, $p<.001$, Cohen's $d=0.46$) rather than enhanced orienting ($t(88)=0.91$, NS). This was also the case at

500ms ($t(89)=3.26$, $p<.005$, Cohen's $d=0.35$ for disengagement, $t(89)=1.57$, NS for orienting). However, at 2000ms there was evidence of both delayed disengagement ($t(89)=3.98$, $p<.001$, Cohen's $d=0.42$) and enhanced orienting ($t(89)=2.03$, $p<.05$, Cohen's $d=0.22$)¹.

Hunger was scored from 0-100 by measuring mm from the left-hand side of the scale and, across the whole sample, showed a mean of 40.31 (SD=26.34). BAS-d was scored from 4-16 by computing the sum of the four items and showed an overall mean of 10.73 (SD=2.12). To examine associations between these two predictors and AB scores, correlation coefficients were calculated. These showed significant correlations between hunger and appetizing 100 ($r=.22$, $p<.05$), and between BAS-d and appetizing 100 ($r=.23$, $p<.05$). There was also a trend-significant correlation between hunger and bland 100 ($r=.20$, $p=.058$). These correlations are of a similar magnitude to those reported by Salemink et al. (2007) for the effects of anxiety on disengagement from threat-related stimuli.

Further exploration of the two significant correlations was conducted by substituting the overall bias scores with relevant scores for orienting and disengagement. For hunger, the correlation with appetizing 100 orienting, ($r=.08$) was significantly less than with appetizing 100 disengagement ($r=-.15$) (Hotelling-Williams test, $t(89)=.97$, $p=0.052$).

For BAS-d, there was a significant negative correlation with appetizing 100 disengagement, ($r=-.28$, $p<.01$), indicating that at 100ms participants with higher reward drive were taking longer to disengage their attention from the appetizing food stimuli. There was no correlation between BAS-d and appetizing 100 orienting ($r=-.01$). There was a significant difference between these two correlations, $t(89)=2.36$, $p<.05$.

In order to determine whether these results were specific to 100ms and to appetizing foods, the significant correlations described above were compared with correlations at other exposures and with bland foods at 100ms (see Table 1). As shown in Table 1, the correlation between BAS-d and disengagement from appetizing foods at 100ms was significantly different from the correlation between BAS-d and disengagement from appetizing foods at 500ms and at 2000ms. It was also significantly different from the correlation between BAS-d and disengagement from bland foods at 100ms. These results suggest that the association between BAS-d and delayed disengagement was specific to appetizing foods at 100ms. In contrast, the correlation between hunger and overall bias for appetizing foods at 100ms was not significantly different from correlations at 500ms, 2000ms, or bland foods at 100ms. Given the absence of difference between bland and appetizing foods, overall food bias, orienting and disengagement scores were computed by taking the mean of the bland and appetizing scores (one outlier was excluded for overall bias at 100ms, one for orienting at 100ms, one for disengagement at 100ms, and one for disengagement at 2000ms). Hunger showed a significant correlation with attentional bias for food at 100ms ($r=.26, p<.05$), but not at 500ms ($r=-.07, NS$) or 2000ms ($r=.15, NS$). Further examination of the 100ms duration revealed a significant negative correlation between hunger and speed of disengagement from food stimuli, ($r=-.25, p<.05$), but no significant correlation between hunger and orienting, ($r=.15, NS$). Comparison of correlations (see Table 1) showed that the former was significantly different from the correlation between hunger and disengagement at 500ms but not at 2000ms.

Finally, there was no correlation between BAS-d and hunger, ($r=-0.1, NS$). Further, there were no interactions between BAS-d and hunger in predicting AB.

Discussion

We used a modified visual probe task with food-cues to examine whether stimulus relevance, both in terms of current biological value and chronic hedonic/motivational goals, biases attention. This appears to be the case.

Hunger predicted AB to food-cues (appetizing and bland) at 100ms cue-duration, but not 500ms or 2000ms duration. Using a neutral-neutral pair control (Koster et al., 2004), we found that hunger impaired disengagement from food-cues. That this effect was not confined to appetizing foods is consistent with the increased organismic relevance of food per se when hungry.

Mogg et al. (1998) reported that hungry individuals showed an AB to food words at 500ms exposure. However, they (also Placanica, Faunce & Job, 2002) used a median-split design to designate 'hungry' and 'sated' individuals. Such designs can be statistically problematic since, for normally distributed scores, a substantial proportion that were once adjacent to one another will be assigned to different categories. This can lead to a number of problems including loss of measurement reliability, mis-estimation of effect size and the occurrence of spurious statistical significance (MacCallum et al., 2002). As such it is difficult to directly compare our results with those of Mogg et al. (1998). Additionally their study did not distinguish between faster orienting and delayed disengagement. Thus our study is the first demonstration of an influence of hunger on attentional disengagement from food. Studies of AB for smoking-cues using visual probe methodology have not consistently seen influences of smoking deprivation (Field, Mogg & Bradley, 2004; also Stafford & Yeomans, 2005), so our results provide novel evidence that the value of stimuli, resulting from changes in physiological state, can influence allocation of attention to stimuli relevant to those needs. These findings support the Component Process Model (CPM; Sander,

Grandjean & Scherer, 2005), in which an early appraisal check (occurring ~ 90-300ms post stimulus onset) determines whether a stimulus is relevant to current well-being, which in turn determines subsequent resource allocation. The amygdala may compute relevance (Sander, Grandjean & Scherer, 2005), so it is notable that hunger increases amygdala response to food images (LaBar et al., 2001; Mohanty et al., 2008)

We also found an overall AB for appetizing foods. Notably, trait reward-drive predicted delayed disengagement from appetizing foods at 100ms stimulus-durations. Unlike hunger, the influence of reward-drive was specific to appetizing foods, and was independent of hunger. Reward drive predicts anticipation of reward from eating (Franken & Muris, 2005), and sweet and fatty food preferences (Davis et al., 2007). The results again support the CPM model, in that chronic hedonic goals bias attentional allocation to relevant stimuli (appetizing foods; also Papies, Stroebe & Aarts, 2008). A recent study (Brignell, Griffiths, Bradley & Mogg, 2009) found that trait external eating, which is correlated with reward drive (Davis et al., 2007) significantly predicted AB to food images in a visual probe task, at 500ms and 2000ms stimulus-durations. However, they did not examine shorter stimulus durations, and did not look specifically at appetizing versus bland foods. Nor did they examine whether bias resulted from faster orienting or delayed disengagement. Our study is thus the first to demonstrate that reward drive, rather than external eating² per se, influences attentional disengagement from appetizing food cues, and that this occurs at short stimulus exposures. Reward-drive also predicts amygdala reactivity to appetizing, not bland foods (Beaver et al., 2006), again consistent with CPM.

Reward sensitivity predicts increased BMI (Davis et al., 2007). Some research suggests that selective attention to drug-cues plays a role in mediating their impact on

drug-seeking (e.g., Cox, Pothos & Hosier, 2007). It is possible that AB mediates the link between reward sensitivity and increased BMI (Calitri, Pothos, Tapper, Brunstrom & Rogers, in press; Castellanos et al., 2009)³. Alternatively, AB may be driven by the appetitive value of the reward expectancy evoked by appetizing food images, and may not causally relate to the influence of food-cues on food intake (Hogarth, Dickinson & Duka, 2009). Future research could fruitfully test between these hypotheses.

A few recent dot-probe studies also suggest that appetitive stimuli can bias attention. Kemps & Tiggerman (2009) found difficulties in disengaging attention from chocolate images in chocolate cravers. However, only one stimulus duration (500ms) was assessed and the motivational state underpinning chocolate craving has both appetitive and aversive components (Rodríguez, Fernández, Cepeda-Benito & Vila, 2005). Brosch, Sander & Scherer (2007) found a greater AB to images of infants, relative to adults. The magnitude of the bias correlated with arousal ratings of the pictures; consistent with the notion (Lang, Bradley & Cuthbert, 1997) that arousal is an indicator of relevance. However, personally relevant (own children) stimuli were not used. Maner, Gailliot & DeWall (2007) found an AB to attractive female faces, which was more pronounced in sexually unrestricted men, but the design could not disentangle orienting from disengagement. Vogt, De Houwer, Koster, Van Damme & Crombez, (2008) found delayed disengagement from highly arousing, pleasant images (erotica, exciting sports). However, this effect was significant when erotic images were removed, so it is possible that potential danger cues present in the sports pictures (sky diving, etc), rather than appetitive arousal lead to increased attentional allocation⁴. Hence, our results provide some of the strongest support for the notion

that relevance to *both* homeostatic needs *and* hedonic goals, regardless of valence, is a key determinant of attentional allocation.

Notably, hunger and reward drive led to delayed disengagement, not faster orienting at 100ms, but not 500ms or 2000ms stimulus durations. Anxiety research has found stronger effects on disengagement, suggested to result from alterations to specific subsystems within a serial model of attention (Fox, Russo, Bowles & Dutton, 2001; Derryberry & Reed, 2002). Our results are however consistent with a relatively short-lived attentional process. Neurophysiological data reveal that, in contrast to serial models, attention is allocated to a new object before it disengages from the previously attended object (Khayat, Spekrijse & Roelfsema, 2006): switching attention occurs via a fast target facilitation followed after ~ 60ms by a suppression of responses to the object from which attention is removed. Delayed ‘disengagement’ may thus result from such competitive interactions over a short temporal window of attention (Bundesen & Habekost, 2008), suggesting an integration of biased competition models of attention and appraisal models of emotion.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Welsh Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience. We thank Raff Calitri for constructing the dot probe task and both Raff Calitri and Louise Cleobury for help with data collection.

References

- Bar-Haim, Y., Lamy, D., Pergamin, L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., & van Ijendoorn, M.H. (2007). Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and nonanxious individuals: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*, 1-24.
- Beaver, J.D., Lawrence, A.D., van Ditzhuijzen, J., Davis, M.H., Woods, A., & Calder, A.J. (2006). Individual differences in reward drive predict neural responses to images of food. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *26*, 5160-5166.
- Brosch, T., Sander, D., & Scherer, K.R. (2007). That baby caught my eye...attention capture by infant faces. *Emotion*, *7*, 685-689.
- Brignell, C., Griffiths, T., Bradley, B.P., & Mogg, K. (2009). Attentional and approach biases for pictorial food cues. Influence of external eating. *Appetite*, *52*, 299-306.
- Bundesen, C. & Habekost, T. (2008). *Principles of visual attention: linking mind and brain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calitri, R., Pothos, E.M., Tapper, K., Brunstrom, J.M. & Rogers, P.J. (in press). Attentional biases to healthy and unhealthy foods predict change in BMI. *Obesity*.
- Caseras, X., Avila, C., & Torrubia, R. (2003). The measurement of individual differences in behavioural inhibition and behavioural activation systems: a comparison of personality scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *34*, 999-1013.
- Carver, C.S., & White, T.L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioural activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 319-333.

Castellanos, E.H., Charboneau, E., Dietrich, M.S., Park, S., Bradley, B.P., Mogg, K., & Cowan, R.L. (2009). Obese adults have visual attention bias for food cue images: evidence for altered reward system function. *International Journal of Obesity*, *33*, 1063-1073.

Cox, W.M., Pothos, E.M., & Hosier, S.G. (2007). Cognitive-motivational predictors of excessive drinkers' success in changing. *Psychopharmacology*, *192*, 499-510.

Davis, C., Patte, K., Levitan, R., Reid, C., Tweed, S., & Curtis, C. (2007). From motivation to behaviour: a model of reward sensitivity, overeating, and food preferences in the risk profile for obesity. *Appetite*, *48*, 12-19.

Derryberry, D., & Reed, M.A. (2002). Anxiety-related attentional biases and their regulation by attentional control. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *111*, 225-236.

Field, M., Mogg, K., & Bradley, B.P. (2004). Eye movements to smoking-related cues: effects of nicotine deprivation. *Psychopharmacology*, *173*, 116-123.

Fox, E., Russo, R., Bowles, R.J., & Dutton, K. (2001). Do threatening stimuli draw or hold visual attention in sub-clinical anxiety? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *130*, 681-700.

Franken, I.H.A., & Muris, P. (2005). Individual differences in reward sensitivity are related to food craving and relative body weight in healthy women. *Appetite*, *45*, 198-201.

Georgiou, G.A., Bleakley, C., Hayward, J., Russo, R., Dutton, K., Eltiti, S., & Fox, E. (2005). Focusing on fear: attentional disengagement from emotional faces. *Visual Cognition*, *12*, 145-158.

Hogarth, L., Dickinson, A., & Duka, T. (2009). Detection versus sustained attention to drug cues have dissociable roles in mediating drug seeking behaviour. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *17*, 21-30.

Kemps, E., & Tiggemann, M. (2009). Attentional bias for craving-related (chocolate) food cues. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *17*, 425-433.

Khayat, P.S., Spekreijse, H., & Roelfsema, P.R. (2006). Attention lights up new object representations before the old ones fade away. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *26*, 138-142.

Koster, E.H.W., Crombez, G., Verschuere, B., & De Houwer, J. (2004). Selective attention to threat in the dot probe paradigm: differentiating vigilance and difficulty to disengage. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *42*, 1183-1192.

Koster, E.H.W., Crombez, G., Verschuere, B., & De Houwer, J. (2006). Attention to threat in anxiety-prone individuals: mechanisms underlying attentional bias. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *30*, 635-643.

LaBar, K.S., Gitelman, D.R., Parrish, T.B., Yun-Hee, K., Nobre, A.C., & Mesulam, M.M. (2001). Hunger selectively modulates corticolimbic activation to food stimuli in humans. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *115*, 493-500.

Lang, P.J., Bradley, M.M., & Cuthbert, B.N. (1997). Motivated attention: Affect, activation, and action. In P.J. Lang, R.F. Simons, & M.T. Balaban (Eds.), *Attention and Orienting: Sensory and Motivational Processes* (pp. 97-135). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods*, *7*, 19-40.

Mogg, K., Bradley, B.P., Hyare, H., & Lee, S. (1998). Selective attention to food-related stimuli in hunger: are attentional biases specific to emotional and psychopathological states, or are they also found in normal drive states? *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *36*, 227-237.

Maner, J.K., Gailliot, M.T., & DeWall, C.N. (2007). Adaptive attentional attunement: evidence for mating-related perceptual bias. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *28*, 28-36.

Mogg, K., Holmes, A., Garner, M., & Bradley, B.P. (2008). Effects of threat cues on attentional shifting, disengagement and response slowing in anxious individuals. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *46*, 656-667.

Mohanty, A., Gitelman, D.R., Small, D.M., & Mesulam, M.M. (2008). The spatial attention network interacts with limbic and monoaminergic systems to modulate motivation-induced attention shifts. *Cerebral Cortex*, *18*, 2604-2613.

Öhman, A. & Wiens, S (2004). The concept of an evolved fear module and cognitive theories of anxiety. In A.S.R. Manstead, N. Frijda, & A. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: the Amsterdam symposium*. (pp. 58-80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osborne J.W., & Overbay, A. (2004). The power of outliers (and why researchers should ALWAYS check for them). *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *9* (6). Retrieved from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=9&n=6>.

Papies E.K., Stroebe, W., & Aarts, H. (2008). The allure of forbidden food: on the role of attention in self-regulation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 1283-1292.

Placanica, J.L., Faunce, G.J., & Job, R.F. (2002). The effect of attentional biases for food and body shape/weight words in high and low eating disorder inventory scorers. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 32, 79-90.

Ratcliff, R. (1993). Methods for dealing with reaction time outliers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 510-532.

Rodríguez, S., Fernández, M.C., Cepada-Benito, A., & Vila, J. (2005). Subjective and physiological reactivity to chocolate images in high and low chocolate cravers. *Biological Psychology*, 70, 9-18.

Salemink, E., van der Hout, M.A., & Kindt, M. (2007). Selective attention and threat: quick orienting versus slow disengagement and two versions of the dot probe task. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 45, 607-615.

Sander, D., Grandjean, D., & Scherer, K. (2005). A systems approach to appraisal mechanisms in emotion. *Neural Networks*, 18, 317-352.

Stafford, L.D., & Yeomans, M.R. (2005). Caffeine deprivation state modulates coffee consumption but not attentional bias for caffeine-related stimuli. *Behavioral Pharmacology*, 16, 559-571.

Tapper, K., Pothos, E.M., Fadardi, J.S., & Ziori, E. (2008). Restraint, disinhibition and food-related processing bias. *Appetite*, 51, 335-338.

Van Strien, T., Frijters, J.E.R., Bergers, G.P.A., & Defares, P.B. (1986). The Dutch Eating Behavior Questionnaire (DEBQ) for assessment of restrained, emotional and external eating behaviour. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 5, 295-315.

Vuilleumier, P. (2005). How brains beware: neural mechanisms of emotional attention. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 9, 585-594.

Vogt, J., De Houwer, J., Koster, E.H.W., Van Damme, S., & Crombez, G. (2008). Allocation of spatial attention to emotional stimuli depends on upon arousal and not valence. *Emotion*, 8, 880-885.

Yiend, J., & Mathews, A. (2001). Anxiety and attention to threatening pictures. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 54A, 665-681.

Footnotes

¹ Due to the presence of neutral and buffer trials, food stimuli were presented somewhat less frequently than neutral stimuli. If differences in frequency were responsible for the increased AB to foods, we should see an overall bias for bland foods, which we did not. Also, differences in frequency cannot explain relations between hunger and BAS-d and AB for food stimuli.

² In the present study level of external eating, as assessed by the DEBQ (Van Strien, Frijters, Bergers & Defares, 1986), showed no significant correlations with bias for appetizing foods at 100ms, 500ms or 2000ms ($r=.05$, $.04$, $.06$ respectively).

³ In the current study the range of BMI scores was restricted and there were small, but non-significant correlations, between BMI and reward drive ($r=.11$) and between BMI and attentional bias for appetizing foods at 100ms ($r=.11$), 500ms ($r=.10$) and at 2000ms ($r=.11$).

⁴ In the present study, arousal ratings were collected for each of the food pictures used in the dot probe task. Although hunger showed a significant correlation with arousal for appetising foods ($r=.24$, $p<.05$) there was no significant correlation between BAS-d and arousal for appetizing foods ($r=.02$), or between arousal and attentional bias for appetizing foods at 100 and 500ms ($r=.14$ and $.13$ respectively). However, there was a significant correlation at 2000ms ($r=.21$, $p<.05$).

Table 1. Correlations between the two predictor variables (BAS drive and hunger) and two types of attentional bias (overall bias and disengagement) for bland and appetizing foods at different exposures, together with the difference between these correlations and the comparison correlations displayed on the far left.

Comparison correlation	BAS drive and disengagement		
	Appetizing 500ms	Appetizing 2000ms	Bland 100ms
BAS drive and disengagement, appetizing 100ms $r=-.28, p<.01, n=90$	$r=.09, NS$ $t(89)=2.32, p<.05$	$r=.06, NS$ $t(89)=2.19, p<.05$	$r=.06, NS$ $t(88)=2.48, p<.05$
	Hunger and overall bias		
Hunger and overall bias, appetizing 100ms $r=.22, p<.05, n=88$	$r=.08, NS$ $t(87)=0.91, NS$	$r=.09$ $t(85)=0.90, NS$	$r=.24^*, p<.05$ $t(85)=0.61, NS$
	Hunger and disengagement		
Hunger and disengagement, food 100ms $r=-.25, p<.05, n=89$	Food 500ms $r=.18, NS$ $t(88)=2.79, p<.01$	Food 2000ms $-.09, NS$ $t(87)=1.46, NS$	-

*Differs from coefficient reported in the text due to reduced sample size.