Acta Social Science & Humanities
An International Journal

OPEN ACCESS

ISSN 3117-860X
Narrative Article

Cognitive Mechanisms of Anxiety: The role of biases in Decision-Making Processes

Pavithra Sankara Subramanian*, and Deloitte

Clinical Psychology, CMR University, India

Corresponding author: **Pavithra Sankara Subramanian** | E-mail: **pavithrassubramanian@gmail.com**

Citation: Pavithra Sankara Subramanian, and Deloitte (2026). Cognitive Mechanisms of Anxiety: The role of biases in Decision-Making Processes. *Acta Social Science & Humanities: An International Journal.* **DOI: https://doi.org/10.51470/SSH.2026.5.1.73**

Received 07 November 2025 | Revised 10 December 2025 | Accepted 08 January 2026 | Available Online 05 February 2026

Abstract

Anxiety Disorders are associated with systematic distortions in cognitive processing that significantly influence behavioural outcomes, mainly decision-making. Cognitive biases such as attentional, interpretational, and memory biases etc play a central role in shaping how individuals perceive, evaluate, and respond to environmental stimuli. The current narrative review synthesises contemporary literature of the past 5 years to examine the interaction between cognitive biases and decision-making under anxiety, with a focus on young adult populations. A structured literature search was conducted using Scopus, Google Scholar, PubMed, and PsycINFO Database, focusing on publications between 2020 and 2026 using the keywords of Anxiety, Cognitive Biases, Decision-Making, and Computational Models of Anxiety. This literature review synthesizes empirical findings across cognitive neuroscience, addiction research and clinical psychology to examine how these concepts contribute towards decision making and the empirical findings to propose a conceptual framework linking anxiety, biased cognition and maladaptive decision-making. The synthesis highlights that cognitive biases interact dynamically across multiple stages of information processing, leading to altered risk perception, heightened threat sensitivity, and maladaptive decision-making patterns such as avoidance, indecisiveness and risk aversion. The review also proposes a conceptual framework linking anxiety, biased cognition and behavioural outcomes, emphasising the mediating role of distorted risk evaluation.

Keywords: *Anxiety, Decision Making, Cognitive Biases, Behavioural Outcomes, Attentional Biases.*

1. Introduction

Anxiety is defined as an emotion characterised by apprehension and somatic symptoms of tension in which an individual anticipates impending danger, catastrophe, or misfortune. It represents a persuasive psychological condition that is characterised by heightened physiological arousal, excessive worry, and maladaptive cognitive patters. Anxiety is among the most prevalent mental health concerns globally, affecting particularly young adults who are navigating complex developmental, academic, and social transitions [2]. Recent epidemiological trends suggest that anxiety levels have increased significantly in the said population, partly due to academic stress, uncertainty about the future, wars, career trajectories, and increased exposure to digital environments that amplify social comparison and cognitive overload.

Traditionally anxiety has been conceptualised as affective disorders, but contemporary psychological research increasingly emphasizes its cognitive underpinning. Cognitive theories propose that anxiety is not merely a response to external stressors but is fundamentally shaped by internal information-processing biases that distort perception, judgement, and behavioural response, and these distortions manifest as systematic cognitive biases that influence how individuals attend to, interpret and remember information [24].

Cognitive biases have been defined as systematic deviations from rational judgement which are central to the maintenance and exacerbation of anxiety[15]. These biases operate at multiple stages if information processing. The attentional biases lead individuals to selectively focus on threat-related stimuli, the interpretation biases cause ambiguous situations to be perceived as threatening and then memory biases reinforce those negative schemas through preferential recall of adverse experiences [7]. These altogether create a self-reinforcing cycle that sustains anxious cognitive behaviour.

Decision-Making is a higher-order cognitive function involving the evaluation of alternatives, prediction of outcomes, and selection of appropriate actions and is particularly vulnerable to such distortions [19]. When individual is anxious, they often exhibit maladaptive decision-making patterns, including avoidance behaviour, aggression, risk aversion, indecisiveness, and overestimation of negative outcomes[30]. These are not just behavioural impairments but rooted in altered cognitive processing mechanisms driven by anxiety-related biases.

This narrative review aims to address the interaction between cognitive biases and decision-making by synthesizing existing literature.

By integrating theoretical frameworks from cognitive and clinical psychology with empirical findings, this review seeks to provide a comprehensive and critically evaluated understanding of the cognitive-emotional mechanisms underlying maladaptive decision-making.

2. Theoretical Frameworks

2.1 Cognitive Model of Anxiety:

Beck's cognitive theory remains one of the most influential frameworks for understanding the developmental and maintenance of anxiety. Aaron T. Beck said that anxiety arises from maladaptive cognitive schemas which are deeply embedded mental structures that shape how individuals perceive, interpret and respond to their environment [4]. These schemas bias information processing toward threat-related stimuli, leading individuals to overestimate danger and underestimate their coping abilities, i.e., anxious individuals are more likely to engage in automatic negative thinking patterns that reinforce emotional distress and avoidance behaviours [1].

The concept of "Primal threat mode" is one of the key features of the model which refers to a rapid automatic processing system activated in response to perceived danger. This model prioritises survival by directing attention toward potential dangers but in individuals with anxiety, it becomes hypersensitive and disproportionately activated even in non-threatening situations [21]. Empirical evidence shows that studies demonstrating that anxious individuals exhibit heightened vigilance toward threat-related cues and difficulty disengaging from stimuli [25]. These biases collectively shape how information is encoded and retrieved, reinforcing negative schemas and sustaining emotional dysregulation. Hence, Buck's model provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how anxiety is maintained through dysfunctional information processing patterns.

2.2 Dual Process Theory:

Dual Process Theories of cognition offers a complementary perspective on how anxiety influences decision-making by distinguishing between two distinct systems of information processing. System 1 is characterised by fast, automatic, and emotionally driven responses, where System 2 involves slower, deliberate, and analytical reasoning [10]. Under the normal circumstances, effective decision-making involves a dynamic interplay between these two systems; however, in the presence of anxiety, there is a disruption in this balance.

Literature shows that anxiety tends to increase on System 1 processing, leading to decisions that are more guided more by emotional salience than by rational evaluation. This shift occurs because anxiety consumes cognitive resources, thereby impairing the functioning of System 2 process such as working memory, attention control, and logical reasoning which in result affects individually experiencing anxiety to be more likely to rely on heuristics which are mental shortcuts that simplify decision-making but often lead to biased or suboptimal outcomes [3],[8].

This tendency to reply on heuristics contributes to risk-aversive behaviour, avoidance of uncertainty, and difficulty making confident choices. Thus, this theory provides valuable feedback for understanding how anxiety alters the cognitive mechanisms underlying decision-making.

3. Cognitive Biases in Anxiety

Cognitive biases represent systematic distortions in information processing that play a central role in the onset and maintenance of anxiety disorders. These biases operate across multiple stages of cognition, such as attention, interpretation, and memory and interact dynamically to reinforce maladaptive schemas and emotional distress [22]. Rather than functioning independently, these biases collectively contribute to a cognitive system that is hypersensitive to perceived threat, thereby shaping how individuals engage with their environment and make decisions.

3.1 Attentional Bias

Attentional bias refers to the preferential allocation of attentional resources toward threat-related stimuli, often at the expense of neutral or positive information. In individuals with anxiety, this bias manifests as hypervigilance, where attention is rapidly and automatically drawn to potentially threatening cues in the environment [29]. Experimental paradigms such as the dot-probe task and eye-tracking methodologies have consistently demonstrated that anxious individuals exhibit faster detection and prolonged fixation on negative stimuli compared to non-anxious controls [5].

This attentional prioritization of threat has significant cognitive consequences. By allocating disproportionate resources to negative information, individuals experience a narrowed attentional scope, limiting their ability to process alternative, non-threatening cues [10]. This results in a distorted perception of reality in which the threat appears more prevalent than it objectively is. Furthermore, difficulties in disengaging attention from threat-related stimuli exacerbate rumination and worry, both of which are hallmark features of anxiety.

Importantly, attentional bias is not merely a passive phenomenon but actively shapes subsequent cognitive processes. By selectively encoding threat-related information, it influences interpretation and memory systems, thereby contributing to a cascading effect across cognitive domains. This highlights its foundational role in the broader cognitive architecture of anxiety.

3.2 Interpretation Bias

Interpretation bias involves the tendency to assign negative or threatening meanings to ambiguous stimuli. This bias is particularly pronounced in anxiety disorders, where individuals consistently interpret neutral or uncertain situations as indicative of danger or negative evaluation [12]. For instance, ambiguous social interactions may be perceived as critical or rejecting, even in the absence of explicit negative cues.

This bias is closely linked to anticipatory anxiety, as individuals begin to expect negative outcomes based on distorted interpretations of prior experiences. Cognitive models suggest that interpretation bias operates through schema-driven processing, wherein existing maladaptive beliefs guide the interpretation of incoming information [10]. As a result, even objectively neutral stimuli are filtered through a threat-oriented cognitive lens.

Empirical studies have demonstrated that interpretation bias is a strong predictor of anxiety severity and plays a mediating role between cognitive vulnerability and emotional distress. Moreover, experimental manipulations that modify interpretation bias have been shown to reduce anxiety symptoms, suggesting a causal relationship between biased interpretation and emotional outcomes [25].

Critically, interpretation bias contributes to the escalation of perceived risk by amplifying uncertainty. When individuals consistently interpret ambiguity as a threat, they develop a heightened sensitivity to uncertain situations, which further impairs decision-making and increases avoidance behavior.

3.3 Memory Bias

Memory bias refers to the preferential encoding, storage, and retrieval of threat-related information. Individuals with anxiety are more likely to recall negative experiences and underestimate positive or neutral events, leading to a skewed representation of past experiences [16]. This selective recall reinforces maladaptive schemas and contributes to the persistence of anxiety over time.

The role of memory bias in anxiety is particularly significant because it shapes expectations about future events. When past experiences are disproportionately remembered as negative, individuals are more likely to anticipate adverse outcomes, thereby increasing anxiety and influencing subsequent decision-making. This process aligns with the concept of cognitive congruence, where memory retrieval is biased toward information that is consistent with current emotional states [12].

Additionally, memory bias interacts with attentional and interpretation biases to create a self-reinforcing cognitive cycle. Threat-related information that is attended to and negatively interpreted is more likely to be encoded and later retrieved, further strengthening anxious beliefs. This cyclical interaction underscores the importance of considering cognitive biases as an integrated system rather than isolated processes.

4. Decision-Making Under Anxiety

Decision-making is a complex cognitive process that involves evaluating probabilities, weighing potential outcomes, and selecting actions under conditions of uncertainty. In individuals with anxiety, this process is significantly disrupted due to alterations in cognitive and emotional functioning. Rather than relying on objective evaluation, anxious individuals tend to base decisions on perceived threats and anticipated negative outcomes [17].

One of the primary mechanisms through which anxiety affects decision-making is the overestimation of threat likelihood. Anxious individuals are more likely to perceive potential risks as highly probable, even when objective evidence suggests otherwise [14],[18]. This cognitive distortion is accompanied by an underestimation of personal coping abilities, leading to reduced confidence in decision-making and increased reliance on avoidance strategies.

Anxiety also impairs cognitive flexibility, which is essential for adapting to changing information and considering multiple perspectives. Reduced flexibility results in rigid thinking patterns, where individuals struggle to update beliefs or consider alternative outcomes. This rigidity is further compounded by an increased intolerance of uncertainty, a core feature of anxiety that drives individuals to avoid situations with unpredictable outcomes [20].

Experimental research provides substantial evidence for these effects. Studies using paradigms such as the Iowa Gambling Task have shown that anxious individuals tend to favour options that offer immediate safety or reduced risk, even when these choices lead to poorer long-term outcomes. This pattern reflects a shift toward short-term threat avoidance at the expense of long-term reward optimization.

Moreover, anxiety influences not only the outcomes of decision-making but also the process itself. Individuals with high anxiety often exhibit prolonged decision times, increased indecisiveness, and a tendency to seek excessive reassurance before making choices [13]. These behaviours reflect an underlying lack of confidence in cognitive evaluations and a heightened sensitivity to potential errors.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings align with dual-process models, where anxiety shifts cognitive processing toward fast, emotion-driven mechanisms (System 1) while impairing slower, analytical processes (System 2). As a result, decision-making becomes more reactive and less deliberative, increasing the likelihood of biased and maladaptive outcomes [30].

In summary, anxiety exerts a profound influence on decision-making by altering risk perception, reducing cognitive flexibility, and increasing reliance on avoidance-based strategies. These effects are mediated by underlying cognitive biases, highlighting the interconnected nature of cognitive and emotional processes in shaping behavior.

5. Current Literature Synthesis

A substantial body of empirical research over the past two decades provides robust support for the relationship between cognitive biases and decision-making in anxiety. Studies employing experimental paradigms, behavioural tasks, and advanced statistical techniques such as regression and mediation analyses consistently demonstrate that cognitive biases are significant predictors of decision-making outcomes in anxious populations [9].

In particular, interpretation bias has been identified as a key mediating mechanism linking anxiety to altered risk perception and subsequent decision-making behavior.

Research indicates that individuals with heightened anxiety are more likely to interpret ambiguous situations as threatening, which in turn increases their likelihood of making avoidance-based or risk-averse decisions [27]. Mediation models have further shown that this bias partially explains the relationship between anxiety severity and decision-making impairments, highlighting its central role in the cognitive architecture of anxiety.

Intervention studies provide additional evidence for the causal role of cognitive biases. Techniques such as attention bias modification (ABM) and cognitive bias modification for interpretation (CBM-I) have been shown to reduce anxiety symptoms and improve decision-making performance by targeting maladaptive cognitive processes [24]. These findings suggest that cognitive biases are not merely correlational factors but active mechanisms that can be modified to produce meaningful behavioural change.

However, despite these advances, the literature remains fragmented. Most studies focus on individual cognitive biases in isolation, limiting the ability to understand their combined effects. Furthermore, variability in methodologies, sample characteristics, and measurement tools contributes to inconsistencies in findings, underscoring the need for more integrative and standardized research approaches.

6. Research Gaps

Despite considerable progress in understanding cognitive biases in anxiety, several critical gaps remain that warrant further investigation. First, there is a notable lack of studies that integrate multiple cognitive biases within a single research framework. Most existing research examines attentional, interpretation, and memory biases independently, thereby overlooking their interactive and cumulative effects on decision-making.

Second, the predominance of cross-sectional designs limits the ability to draw causal inferences. Longitudinal and experimental studies are needed to examine how cognitive biases develop over time and how they influence decision-making trajectories in anxious individuals. Such approaches would provide deeper insights into the mechanisms underlying anxiety and its behavioural manifestations.

Third, the role of digital environments in shaping cognitive biases remains underexplored. With increasing exposure to digital media, individuals are subjected to continuous streams of information that may amplify attentional biases, social comparison, and cognitive overload. Understanding how these factors interact with anxiety and decision-making represents an important and timely area of research.

Finally, there is a need for more mixed-method approaches that combine quantitative and qualitative data. While quantitative methods provide statistical rigor, qualitative insights can offer a deeper understanding of subjective experiences and contextual factors influencing cognitive processes.

7. Proposed Conceptual Model:

Building on the cognitive model of anxiety and dual process theory, this review proposes an integrative conceptual framework to explain the relationship between anxiety, cognitive biases, and decision-making.

Anxiety Cognitive Biases Altered Risk Perception Maladaptive Decision-Making

In this framework, anxiety functions as an initiating variable that activates a range of cognitive biases across multiple domains. These biases distort the individual's perception by amplifying the salience of potential threats while simultaneously diminishing perceived coping capacity. Consequently, individuals are more likely to interpret ambiguous situations as dangerous, recall negative experiences more readily, and attend selectively to threatening stimuli.

Altered risk perceptions serves as a critical mediating mechanism in this process. When risk is perceived as disproportionate high, individuals are more likely to engage in maladaptive decision-making patterns, including initially protective, which often lead to long-term negative outcomes, such as missed opportunity and reduced psychological well-being.

Importantly, this relationship is not unidirectional. Maladaptive decision-making can reinforce cognitive biases and sustain anxiety overtime, creating a cyclical feedback loop. For instance, avoidance of perceived threats may prevent individuals from confronting their negative beliefs, thereby strengthening their cognitive domains. This recursive process aligns with contemporary cognitive behavioural models, which emphasises the dynamic interaction between cognition, emotion and behaviour.

Overall, this conceptual model provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how cognitive biases mediate the relationship between anxiety and decision-making. It also highlights the importance of targeting these biases in both research and clinical interventions, particularly through cognitive behavioural approaches aimed at modifying maladaptive patterns for improving decision-making outcomes.

8. Clinical Implications

The findings of this review have significant implications for clinical practice, particularly in the context of cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT). Given the central role of cognitive biases in anxiety, interventions that target maladaptive thought patterns are essential for improving both emotional and behavioural outcomes. Cognitive restructuring techniques, which aim to identify and challenge distorted beliefs, can help reduce interpretation bias and promote more balanced thinking.

Attention-based interventions, such as attention bias modification, have also shown promise in reducing hypervigilance toward threat-related stimuli. By training individuals to redirect their attention away from negative cues, these interventions can disrupt the cognitive processes that sustain anxiety. Additionally, incorporating decision-making training into therapeutic frameworks may enhance functional outcomes by improving cognitive flexibility, risk evaluation, and tolerance of uncertainty.

Importantly, addressing cognitive biases not only alleviates anxiety symptoms but also improves overall decision-making competence, thereby enhancing quality of life. This highlights the importance of integrating cognitive and behavioural approaches in clinical interventions.

9. Conclusion

Cognitive biases play a central and multifaceted role in mediating the relationship between anxiety and decision-making. By influencing attention, interpretation, and memory processes, these biases create a cognitive environment that is disproportionately oriented toward threat, leading to distorted risk perception and maladaptive behavioural outcomes. This review highlights the importance of integrating cognitive and emotional frameworks to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of anxiety and its impact on decision-making.

Addressing the identified research gaps and methodological limitations will be essential for advancing theoretical models and improving clinical interventions. Ultimately, a deeper understanding of cognitive biases and their role in decision-making has the potential to enhance both psychological well-being and functional outcomes in individuals with anxiety.

References

1. Aktar, E. (2022). Intergenerational transmission of anxious information processing biases: An updated conceptual model. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *25*[1], 182-203.
2. Ansari Lari, S., Zumot, M. S., & Fredericks, S. (2025). Navigating mental health challenges in international university students: adapting to life transitions. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, *16*, 1574953.
3. Augusto, R. (2024). Two kinds of process or two kinds of processing? Disambiguating dual-process theories. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, *15*[1], 277-298.
4. Beck, A. T., Rush, A. J., Shaw, B. F., Emery, G., DeRubeis, R. J., & Hollon, S. D. (2024). *Cognitive therapy of depression*. Guilford Publications.
5. Clauss, K., Gorday, J. Y., & Bardeen, J. R. (2022). Eye tracking evidence of threat-related attentional bias in anxiety-and fear-related disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical psychology review*, *93*, 102142.
6. Du, X., Witthöft, M., Zhang, T., Shi, C., & Ren, Z. (2023). Interpretation bias in health anxiety: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological medicine*, *53*[1], 34-45.
7. Everaert, J., Struyf, S., & Koster, E. H. (2023). Biased interpretation of ambiguity in depression and anxiety: Interactions with attention, memory, and cognitive control processes. *Interpretational Processing Biases in Emotional Psychopathology: From Experimental Investigation to Clinical Practice*, 79-96.
8. Fox, N. A., Zeytinoglu, S., Valadez, E. A., Buzzell, G. A., Morales, S., & Henderson, H. A. (2023). Annual Research Review: Developmental pathways linking early behavioural inhibition to later anxiety. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *64*(4), 537-561.
9. Gkintoni, E., Vassilopoulos, S. P., & Nikolaou, G. (2025). Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy in clinical practice: A systematic review of neurocognitive outcomes and applications for mental health and well-being. *Journal of clinical medicine*, *14*(5), 1703.
10. Grogans, S. E., Bliss-Moreau, E., Buss, K. A., Clark, L. A., Fox, A. S., Keltner, D., ... & Shackman, A. J. (2023). The nature and neurobiology of fear and anxiety: State of the science and opportunities for accelerating discovery. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *151*, 105237.
11. Gronchi, G., Gavazzi, G., Viggiano, M. P., & Giovannelli, F. (2024). Dual-process theory of thought and inhibitory control: An ALE meta-analysis. *Brain Sciences*, *14*[1], 101.
12. Hakamata, Y., Mizukami, S., Izawa, S., Okamura, H., Mihara, K., Marusak, H., ... & Tagaya, H. (2022). Implicit and explicit emotional memory recall in anxiety and depression: Role of basolateral amygdala and cortisol-norepinephrine interaction. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *136*, 105598.
13. Hengen, K. M., & Alpers, G. W. (2021). Stress makes the difference: Social stress and social anxiety in decision-making under uncertainty. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 578293.
14. Kochenderfer, M. J., Wheeler, T. A., & Wray, K. H. (2022). *Algorithms for decision making*. MIT press.
15. Korteling, J. E., & Toet, A. (2022). Cognitive biases. *Encyclopedia of behavioral neuroscience*, *3*, 610-619.
16. Kraemer, P. M., Weilbächer, R. A., Mechera-Ostrovsky, T., & Gluth, S. (2022). Cognitive and neural principles of a memory bias on preferential choices. *Current Research in Neurobiology*, *3*, 100029.
17. Kumar, R., & Pamucar, D. (2025). A comprehensive and systematic review of multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) methods to solve decision-making problems: two decades from 2004 to 2024. *Spectrum of Decision Making and Applications*, *2*[1], 177-196.
18. Mohanty, A., Jin, F., & Sussman, T. (2023). What do we know about threat-related perceptual decision making?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *32*[1], 18-25.
19. Morelli, M., Casagrande, M., & Forte, G. (2022). Decision making: A theoretical review. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, *56*(3), 609-629.
20. Pel-Littel, R. E., Buurman, B. M., Minkman, M. M., op Reimer, W. J. S., Twisk, J. W., & van Weert, J. C. (2024). The influence of health literacy, anxiety and education on shared decision making and decisional conflict in older adults, and the mediating role of patient participation: A video observational study. *Patient education and counseling*, *124*, 108274.
21. Riskind, J. H. (2024). Unscrambling the dynamics of danger: Scientific foundations and evidence for the looming vulnerability model and looming cognitive style in anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *48*(5), 808-832.
22. Segal, S. C., & Gobin, K. C. (2022). Threat-biased attention in childhood anxiety: A cognitive-affective developmental model. *Journal of Affective Disorders Reports*, *8*, 100315.
23. Todd, J., Pickup, B., Coutts-Bain, D., Duijzings, M., & Sharpe, L. (2022). Interpretation bias and its relationship with pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain*, 10-1097.

24. Valadez, E. A., Pine, D. S., Fox, N. A., & Bar-Haim, Y. (2022). Attentional biases in human anxiety. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *142*, 104917.
25. Vos, L. M., Nieto, I., Amanvermez, Y., Smeets, T., & Everaert, J. (2025). Do cognitive biases prospectively predict anxiety and depression? A multi-level meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Clinical psychology review*, *116*, 102552.
26. Vrijsen, J. N., Grafton, B., Koster, E. H., Lau, J., Wittekind, C. E., Bar-Haim, Y., ... & Wiers, R. W. (2024). Towards implementation of cognitive bias modification in mental health care: State of the science, best practices, and ways forward. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *179*, 104557.
27. Vrinzen, S., Everaert, J., & Salemink, E. (2026). Who benefits from anxiety-related interpretation bias training? The role of individual differences in interpretation inflexibility and intolerance of uncertainty. *Behavior Therapy*.
28. Wang, X., Chen, S., Tian, B., & Cai, W. P. (2025). Threat-related attentional bias in subjects with different looming cognitive styles: Evidence based on eye-tracking study. *World Journal of Psychiatry*, *15*(10), 111286.
29. Williams, M., Honan, C., & Matthews, A. J. (2024). Attentional bias to threat: an investigation of psychological predictors beyond trait anxiety. *Current Psychology*, *43*[19], 17373-17389.
30. Wong, A. H., Aslanidou, A., Malbec, M., Pittig, A., Wieser, M. J., & Andreatta, M. (2023). A systematic review of the inter-individual differences in avoidance learning. *Collabra: Psychology*, *9*[1], 77856.
31. Zucchelli, M. M., Matteucci Armandi Avogli Trotti, N., Pavan, A., Piccardi, L., & Nori, R. (2025). The Dual Process model: the effect of cognitive load on the ascription of intentionality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1451590.