



# The role of anxiety in cortisol stress response and cortisol recovery in boys with oppositional defiant disorder/conduct disorder



Jantiene Schoorl<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Sophie van Rijn<sup>a,b</sup>, Minet de Wied<sup>c</sup>, Stephanie van Goozen<sup>a,d</sup>, Hanna Swaab<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Clinical Child and Adolescent Studies, Leiden University, P.O. Box 9555, 2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>c</sup> Department of Adolescent Development, Utrecht University, P.O. Box 80140, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>d</sup> School of Psychology, Cardiff University, P.O. Box 901, Cardiff CF10 3AT, United Kingdom

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 4 March 2016

Received in revised form 2 August 2016

Accepted 3 August 2016

### Keywords:

Stress

Cortisol stress reactivity

Cortisol recovery

Oppositional defiant disorder

Conduct disorder

Anxiety

## ABSTRACT

Children with antisocial and aggressive behaviors have been found to show abnormal neurobiological responses to stress, specifically impaired cortisol stress reactivity. The role of individual characteristics, such as comorbid anxiety, in the stress response is far less studied. Furthermore, this study extended previous studies in that not only baseline and reactivity to a psychosocial stressor were examined, but also recovery from a stressor. These three phases of cortisol could be impacted differentially in boys with oppositional defiant disorder/conduct disorder (ODD/CD) with (+ANX) and without anxiety (−ANX). The results revealed that cortisol patterns in response to psychosocial stress were different for boys with ODD/CD + ANX ( $n = 32$ ), ODD/CD − ANX ( $n = 22$ ) and non-clinical controls (NC) ( $n = 34$ ), with age range of 7.8–12.9 years. The ODD/CD − ANX group showed lower overall cortisol levels than the NC group. When considering the three phases of cortisol separately, the ODD/CD − ANX group had lower baseline cortisol levels relative to the other groups, whereas the ODD/CD + ANX showed an impaired cortisol recovery response. Within those with ODD/CD, callous-unemotional traits were predictive of high baseline cortisol levels. Also, anxiety predicted high baseline and recovery cortisol levels, whereas a high number of CD symptoms predicted reduced cortisol stress reactivity. These results clearly indicate that comorbid anxiety is an important factor in explaining differences in stress response profiles in boys with ODD/CD; although boys with CD/ODD are generally characterized by an impaired cortisol stress response, we found that those with comorbid anxiety showed impaired cortisol recovery, whereas those without anxiety showed reduced baseline cortisol levels.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

There is increasing evidence that neurobiological deficits play a key role in aggressive and antisocial behavior in children (van Goozen et al., 2007). It is argued that stress regulating mechanisms, such as the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, are important in explaining individual differences in aggressive and antisocial behavior. The end product, cortisol, has received much attention because of its vital role in enabling adaptive responses to stress, in order to survive and cope with danger (Sapolsky, 1998).

Studies have reported mixed findings concerning the relationship between aggressive and antisocial behavior and cortisol (Alink et al., 2008; van Goozen et al., 2007). Inconsistencies in findings might be explained by methodological differences, such as different populations (community versus clinical, age, male/female), sampling of cortisol (plasma, urine, saliva) and time of the day, informant (self-, parent- or teacher-report) and type of stressor. However, another explanation might be found in the notion that children with aggressive and antisocial behavior form a heterogeneous group (Stadler, 2010), and that individual differences in levels of emotional problems vary greatly (Schoorl et al., 2015).

Nevertheless, studies on primary school-aged children with aggression problems have generally found normal cortisol baselines but reduced cortisol stress reactivity to stress, compared to controls (Snoek et al., 2004; van Goozen et al., 1998; van Goozen

\* Corresponding author at: Department of Clinical Child and Adolescent Studies, Leiden University, P.O. Box 9555, 2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands.

E-mail address: [j.schoorl@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:j.schoorl@fsw.leidenuniv.nl) (J. Schoorl).

et al., 2000). This blunted cortisol stress reactivity has been associated with fearlessness and deficient emotion regulation (van Goozen, 2015), which may be an important mechanism driving behavioral problems in children with oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) or conduct disorder (CD) (Burke, 2012; Cavanagh et al., 2014). Interestingly, studies on ODD/CD and anxiety show different results; cortisol levels were higher in anxious children with CD (McBurnett et al., 1991) and higher cortisol stress reactivity was found in boys with ODD (van Goozen et al., 1998) and ODD/CD (van Goozen et al., 2000) with relatively high levels of anxiety compared to low anxious boys. Thus not all children with ODD/CD have low cortisol levels and comorbid anxiety might be an important factor contributing to variability in cortisol responses within ODD/CD samples.

Because in previous studies variation in callous-unemotional (CU) traits has been considered a relevant factor contributing to variability in cortisol responses (Hawes et al., 2009), this was also included in the present manuscript. CU traits have been related to lower baseline cortisol as well as blunted cortisol response to stress (Loney et al., 2006; Stadler et al., 2011). However, two other studies did not find a relation between baseline cortisol and CU traits (Feilhauer et al., 2013; Poustka et al., 2010).

In addition to child factors that may contribute to variability, it may also be relevant to distinguish several phases of stress responses, which could be impacted differentially in these children. The degree to which children are able to regulate stress is not only evident in a blunted or sharpened cortisol response to stress, but also in their ability to recover from stress. The ability to recover after a stressor is an important indicator of the quality of an individual's emotion regulation (Freeman, 1939; Ji et al., 2016). Infants of mothers whose interactions with their infants were most disrupted, e.g. highly unresponsive, ineffective or inappropriate, did not recover from a stressor; their cortisol levels kept increasing after the stressor was gone (Crockett et al., 2013). Also, faster cortisol recovery after daily stressors was related to maternal sensitivity in infants, indicating that sensitive mothers helped their infants indirectly to regulate their cortisol response (Albers et al., 2008; Blair et al., 2008). Healthy individuals are able to rapidly down regulate emotions after a stressor has ended, as a means of adapting to environmental challenges without the severe biological cost of keeping stress levels high (Hastings et al., 2011). Recovery from stress is thus an important mechanism in behavioral adaptation. The aggressive and antisocial behavior that children suffering from ODD/CD show might be the result of impaired recovery. However, the literature examining cortisol recovery separate from cortisol response to stress in children with emotional and behavioral problems is sparse, and in relation to ODD/CD, to our knowledge, non-existent. Therefore, the aims of the study were to further investigate the role of anxiety within those with ODD/CD and to examine cortisol under baseline, stress and recovery conditions. To this end we included boys with ODD/CD with and without a comorbid anxiety disorder and also a sample of typically developing boys as controls.

## 2. Method

The current study was approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of Leiden University Medical Centre (LUMC). Prior to participation signed informed consent according to the declaration of Helsinki was obtained from the parents. Eleven boys with ODD/CD and two controls from the larger study were not able to produce saliva samples, missed one or more saliva sample or had one or two saliva samples that were inadequate for analyses, i.e. 3 SD above mean, and were excluded from the current study.

### 2.1. Participants

The ODD/CD group ( $n=54$ ) was recruited at clinical health centers ( $n=19$ ), special education schools ( $n=26$ ) and regular elementary schools ( $n=9$ ). All boys had an IQ over 70, were aged between 7.8 and 12.9, and had a diagnosis of ODD or CD on the Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (DISC-IV; Shaffer et al., 2000). All boys met criteria for ODD diagnosis and 17 boys (32%) also met CD criteria. Other comorbid diagnoses were: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) ( $n=38$ , 70%), depression ( $n=8$ , 15%), and other disorders, e.g. eating or tic disorders ( $n=15$ , 28%), as based on the DISC-IV. Twenty-two boys (41%) used psychostimulants and two (4%) were on risperidone.

Using the DISC-IV boys with ODD/CD were divided into the ODD/CD + ANX group if they met criteria for a comorbid anxiety disorder ( $n=32$ ). Boys in the ODD/CD + ANX group met criteria of one or more of the following anxiety disorder: separation anxiety disorder, social phobia, generalized anxiety disorder, panic disorder, agoraphobia and specific phobia. If they did not meet criteria for any of these anxiety disorders they were included in the ODD/CD-ANX group ( $n=22$ ).

The non-clinical control group (NC) ( $n=34$ ) was recruited at regular elementary schools. All boys had an IQ over 70 and were aged between 8.0 and 12.7. None of them used medication or showed severe aggressive behaviors, expressed as a diagnosis of ODD or CD, a score outside the normal range ( $T>60$ ) on the externalizing scale of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/6–18) or Teacher Report Form (TRF/6–18) (Achenbach and Rescorla, 2001).

### 2.2. Recruitment

Boys referred through clinical centers were first screened with the CBCL (Achenbach and Rescorla, 2001). Those who scored above the borderline cut off point on the externalizing scale were subsequently administered the DISC-IV interview Module E (section on ODD and CD) (Shaffer et al., 2000). Only those children who met criteria of either ODD or CD were asked to take part in this study.

Special educational needs schools and regular elementary schools were selected based on their location, no further than one hour's drive from Leiden University. Headmasters were contacted by one of the researchers and if the headmaster agreed to take part, information brochures for parents and response-cards were distributed by the teachers to the children in their class.


Participating boys were asked to visit Leiden University for one day with one of their parents. During this day parents signed an informed consent, filled out questionnaires and completed the DISC-IV interview.

### 2.3. Measures

IQ was estimated using the Vocabulary and Block Design subtests of the Dutch version (Kort et al., 2005) of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-IV) (Wechsler, 2003). These subtests have been found to provide a good estimation of full scale IQ scores (Sattler, 1992).

Child psychopathology was assessed using the Dutch version of the DISC-IV interview (Ferdinand and van der Ende, 2002) with one of the parents. The DISC-IV is a highly structured diagnostic instrument (Shaffer et al., 2000) and was conducted by a clinical trained psychologist with experience. Diagnosis occurred after completion of the interview, at time of measuring symptoms this interviewer was 'blind' to diagnosis. Symptom scores and diagnoses are according to the DSM-IV criteria (DSM-5 had not been published at the start of this study).

CU traits were measured with the CU subscale of the Dutch version (De Wied et al., 2014) of the Antisocial Process Screening



**Fig. 1.** Schematic representation of the test procedure and mean cortisol and mood rating sampling times.

Device (APSD; Frick and Hare, 2001). Parent and teacher ratings were combined by taking the highest rated score on each item (see Frick and Hare, 2001). The Cronbach's alpha was 0.66 for the whole sample.

**Psychosocial stress induction procedure** the stress paradigm took place in the afternoon. Stress was induced for 90 min using an established and ecologically valid psychosocial stressor that involves provoked, frustration and competition to increase emotional arousal. Participating boys were led to believe that they were competing against a videotaped opponent of similar age and sex for best performance and a highly favored award (for example Lego, a monster truck, a giant toy water pistol or magician tricks box), whilst they were led to believe they were losing out on winning the computer task competition (for details, see Fairchild et al., 2008; Schoorl et al., 2015; van Goozen et al., 2000).

**Stress manipulation** was checked with an adapted version of the Von Zerssen's (1986) clinical self-rating scale, containing eleven moods (happy, well, cheerful, good, liked, satisfied, afraid, worried, embarrassed, ashamed, angry, in control) and feeling of control. Boys rated themselves on a five-point scale ranging from positive towards negative feelings (e.g. 1 = happy, 5 = gloomy) each time a cortisol sample was taken. All moods were combined into one negative mood score. Mean Cronbach's alpha was 0.86.


**Procedure for cortisol collection** Participating boys completed a battery of questionnaires and neuropsychological tests in the morning. At the end of the morning they were asked to provide a baseline cortisol sample (see Fig. 1). In the stress phase four cortisol samples were taken, approximately one every 20 min. After the stress phase ended and disclosure was done, the boys remained seated in the same room for one more hour in which they completed questionnaires and watched relaxing cartoons. In this recovery phase three cortisol recovery samples were collected, one every 20 min. See Fig. 1 for a schematic representation of the test procedure.

Saliva was collected using a tube in which subjects could spit (passive drool) (0,5 ml). Children were instructed to accumulate saliva in the floor of their mouth and collect them directly into sterilized glass tubes. Contamination with food debris was avoided by rinsing the mouth with water before the stress experiment started. After all samples were collected they were stored at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  until analysis.

**Assay procedure for cortisol** Cortisol concentrations in the saliva samples were determined by using a time-resolved fluorescence immunoassay (DELFI), for details see (Dressendorfer et al., 1992). The intra- and interassay variability was below 7% and 6%, respectively. Results are reported in nmol/l.

#### 2.4. Statistical analysis

The three groups (ODD/CD+ANX, ODD/CD-ANX and NC) were compared on their self-reported mood and all eight cortisol sam-



**Fig. 2.** Mean and standard error of negative mood scores during baseline, stress and recovery phases for the ODD/CD+ANX, ODD/CD-ANX and NC group.

ples with a RANOVA. To explore the cortisol pattern in more detail we also examined cortisol during the three phases of the paradigm: baseline, stress and recovery. For the stress phase we calculated a cortisol stress reactivity level by calculating the area under the curve with respect to increase (AUCi) (Pruessner et al., 2003). Cortisol recovery was measured using delta scores of the first and last cortisol measure during the recovery phase (Linden et al., 1997). We applied a Greenhouse Geisser correction if assumptions of sphericity were violated. Finally, a backwards linear regression analysis was performed to investigate the predictive value of clinical characteristics for cortisol baseline, reactivity and recovery. Effect sizes are reported as eta squared ( $\eta^2$ ) with 0.01 being a small, 0.06 being a medium and 0.14 being a large effect (Cohen, 1988).

### 3. Results

A MANOVA revealed that medication use was not related to the cortisol measures,  $F=0.64$ ,  $p=0.596$ . Therefore, medication use was not controlled for in subsequent analyses. The ODD/CD+ANX group had higher levels of comorbid ADHD than the ODD/CD-ANX group, 84% versus 50%,  $\chi^2=7.39$ ,  $p=0.007$ . However, a correlation analysis indicated that ADHD was not related to any of the cortisol measures.

Descriptive statistics for the three groups are presented in Table 1. The three groups did not differ in age or percentage of Caucasians, respectively  $F=1.46$ ,  $p=0.237$  and  $\chi=2.85$ ,  $p=0.240$ . The ODD/CD+ANX group had a significantly higher anxiety level than the ODD/CD-ANX group and the NC group,  $F=33.75$ ,  $p<0.001$ , while the other groups did not differ from each other. CU traits were higher in both ODD/CD groups compared to controls,  $F=13.84$ ,  $p<0.001$ , but the ODD/CD groups did not differ from each other. The NC group had a higher IQ score than both ODD/CD groups,  $F=6.12$ ,  $p=0.003$ . Therefore, all subsequent analyses were repeated with IQ included as a covariate. Because results remained the same with or without this covariate, it was chosen to report the analyses without IQ as a covariate.

#### 3.1. Subjective mood effects

Data of one boy with ODD/CD-ANX was missing, because he refused to fill out the mood questionnaire. There was a significant main effect of time,  $F(2.98, 256.52)=35.28$ ,  $p<0.001$ ,  $\eta^2=0.29$ , but not of group,  $F(2, 86)=1.27$ ,  $p=0.287$ , and no time by group interaction,  $F(2.98, 256.52)=1.62$ ,  $p=0.141$ , indicating that stress induction was successful and similar in all groups (see Fig. 2).


#### 3.2. Cortisol

A repeated measures ANOVA over all 8 cortisol samples showed that there was a significant main effect of time

**Table 1**  
Descriptive statistics for the ODD/CD + ANX, ODD/CD-ANX and NC group.

	ODD/CD + ANX	ODD/CD-ANX	NC	F/ $\chi$
Age	10.1 ± 1.25	10.6 ± 1.35	10.0 ± 1.25	1.46
IQ	94.2 ± 13.46	94.2 ± 13.72	104.0 ± 12.29	6.12**
Caucasian (%)	72%	50%	67%	2.85
Anxiety (CBCL)	9.4 ± 4.32	3.6 ± 3.43	2.4 ± 2.95	33.75***
CU traits	6.8 ± 2.46	7.2 ± 1.57	4.5 ± 2.00	13.84***

ODD,oppositional defiant disorder;CD,conduct disorder;ANX,anxiety;NC,nonclinical control;CBCL,Child Behavior Checklist;CU,callous-unemotional. \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .



**Fig. 3.** Salivary cortisol levels during baseline, stress and recovery phases for the ODD/CD + ANX, ODD/CD-ANX and NC group. Means and standard errors are indicated.

$F(3.93, 334.41) = 11.04$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.12$ , of group  $F(2,85) = 3.27$ ,  $p = 0.043$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.07$ , and a time by group interaction  $F(3.93, 334.41) = 2.71$ ,  $p = 0.007$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.06$  (see Fig. 3). The post hoc analyses of the repeated measures ANOVA revealed that both ODD/CD groups did not differ from each other, but the ODD/CD-ANX group did have significantly lower overall cortisol levels than the NC group,  $p = 0.013$ .

Because the significant interaction effect indicates that the three groups had different cortisol patterns over time, which is also evident in Fig. 3, we subsequently did post-hoc ANOVA's to examine group differences for baseline, stress and recovery phase separately in the three groups. The ANOVA for baseline cortisol revealed that the ODD/CD-ANX group had a significantly lower baseline cortisol level than both the ODD/CD + ANX and NC group,  $F = 4.45$ ,  $p = 0.014$ .

The ODD/CD-ANX group had a marginally significant lower cortisol stress reactivity (AUCi) than the ODD/CD + ANX group,  $p = 0.066$ .

Finally, for the recovery phase it was found that the ODD/CD + ANX showed significantly less cortisol recovery than the ODD/CD-ANX and NC group,  $F = 9.44$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Furthermore, paired samples  $t$ -test revealed that the cortisol levels of the ODD/CD + ANX group did not decline in the recovery phase,  $t = -1.19$ ,  $p = 0.245$ , whereas cortisol levels declined in the ODD/CD-ANX group,  $t = 2.28$ ,  $p = 0.034$ , and NC group,  $t = 4.59$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

### 3.3. Predictive value of clinical symptoms for cortisol levels during baseline, stress and recovery

The correlation matrix shows that anxiety correlated positively with baseline cortisol and negatively with cortisol stress reactivity (AUCi) and cortisol recovery (see Table 2). CU traits correlated positively with baseline cortisol. CD symptoms correlated negatively with cortisol stress reactivity; no correlations were found with ODD symptoms and anxiety, CD and CU traits did not correlate with each other.

Backward regression analyses were done to predict the three phases of cortisol from the three clinical predictors: anxiety, CU traits and CD symptoms. Baseline cortisol was best predicted by

**Table 2**  
Correlation matrix of predictors and cortisol ( $r$ ) within ODD/CD.

	Baseline	Stress reactivity (AUCi)	Recovery
Anxiety	0.38**	-0.28*	-0.27*
CU traits	0.29*	-0.09	-0.03
ODD	0.13	-0.02	0.02
CD	0.21	-0.35*	0.04

CU,callous-unemotional;ODD,oppositional defiant disorder;CD,conduct disorder;AUCi,area under the curve with respect to increase.

\* correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

\*\* correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

**Table 3**  
Regressions of clinical predictors on baseline cortisol, cortisol reactivity and cortisol recovery.

	$b$	$SE\ b$	$\beta$
Baseline cortisol			
(Constant)	0.72	0.50	
Anxiety	0.90	0.27	0.41***
CU traits	0.17	0.06	0.33*
Stress reactivity (AUCi)			
(Constant)	0.62	0.72	
CD	-0.79	0.30	-0.35*
Recovery			
(Constant)	0.33	0.22	
Anxiety	-0.58	0.28	-0.27*

CU,callous-unemotional;CD,conduct disorder;AUCi,area under the curve with respect to increase.

\*  $p < 0.05$ .

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

a model that included anxiety and CU traits,  $F = 8.25$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ,  $R = 0.50$  (see Table 3); together they explained 25% of the variance in baseline cortisol. High levels of anxiety and high levels of CU traits were related to higher levels of baseline cortisol.

Cortisol stress reactivity (AUCi) was best predicted by a model that included only CD symptoms,  $F = 7.03$ ,  $p = 0.011$ ,  $R = 0.35$ . In this model CD symptoms significantly inversely predicted cortisol stress reactivity (see Table 3) and explained 12% of the variance in cortisol stress reactivity.

Finally, cortisol recovery was best predicted by a model that had anxiety as the only predictor,  $F = 4.23$ ,  $p = 0.045$ ,  $R = 0.27$  (see Table 3). High levels of anxiety were related to high levels of cortisol recovery. Eight percent of the variance in cortisol recovery was explained by anxiety.

## 4. Discussion

The aim of our study was to understand individual differences in cortisol patterns in ODD/CD, by focusing on child factors in terms of comorbid anxiety, and by distinguishing various phases of stress hormone (i.e. cortisol) responses which may be impacted differentially within the group of boys with ODD/CD. To this end, we exposed boys to an established and ecologically valid psychosocial stressor that involved provocation, frustration and competition. Cortisol levels were examined before the stressor (baseline), during the stressor (reactivity), and after the stressor ended (recovery).



Boys with ODD/CD with anxiety (+ANX) and without anxiety (-ANX) reported similar levels of negative mood over the course of baseline, stress and recovery, but showed different cortisol patterns than controls. Overall, i.e. irrespective of the phase, the ODD/CD-ANX group had lower cortisol levels than controls. Because there was a significant interaction between Group and Time we examined cortisol into more detail by looking at the three phases separately. During baseline, the ODD/CD-ANX group, but not the ODD/CD+ANX group, had lower baseline cortisol levels than controls. Both ODD/CD groups did not differ in stress cortisol reactivity levels compared to controls. During recovery the ODD/CD+ANX group showed less cortisol recovery than controls. Furthermore, the ODD/CD-ANX group had lower baseline cortisol levels, marginally lower cortisol stress reactivity and showed more cortisol recovery compared to the ODD/CD+ANX group. While cortisol levels reduced during the recovery phase in the ODD/CD-ANX and NC group, cortisol levels of the ODD/CD+ANX group did not decline. Interestingly, within boys with ODD/CD, CD symptoms were inversely associated with reduced cortisol stress reactivity, whereas anxiety was positively associated with baseline cortisol and inversely associated with reduced cortisol recovery levels. Also, CU traits were positively associated with baseline cortisol. In other studies CU traits have been associated with low baseline cortisol and low stress cortisol levels (Loney et al., 2006; Stadler et al., 2011), although this was not always found (Feilhauer et al., 2013; Poustka et al., 2010) with recent findings of hyperactivity (rather than hypoactivity) of the HPA axis in children with high levels of CU traits (Mills Koonce et al., 2015). Northover et al. (2016) found no correlation between baseline and stress cortisol levels and CU traits in male adolescents with ADHD with and without CD. Interestingly, they found that CD symptoms were predictive of reduced cortisol stress reactivity, just like we found. Literature on CU traits distinguishes between primary and secondary CU traits; secondary CU traits are proposed to be associated with higher levels of anxiety and emotional problems, trauma and maltreatment, whereas primary CU traits are associated with low anxiety, high heritability and low levels of trauma (Kimonis et al., 2012; Sharf et al., 2014). We did not distinguish our ODD/CD sample into boys with primary or secondary CU traits. Our findings that CU traits were only related to baseline cortisol levels, whereas anxiety symptoms were related to cortisol levels during baseline, stress as well as recovery, and CD symptoms were related to stress reactivity suggest that it may be interesting to also include dimensional measures of anxiety and CD symptoms in studies focusing on CU traits.

Our findings of hypoarousal overall cortisol samples in boys with ODD/CD-ANX and the relation between cortisol hyporeactivity and high levels of CD symptoms are in line with earlier clinical studies (Fairchild et al., 2008; Feilhauer et al., 2013; Popma et al., 2006; Snoek et al., 2004; van Goozen et al., 1998; van Goozen et al., 2000). In these earlier studies baseline cortisol was not found to be lower in ODD/CD samples. We, however, found that boys with ODD/CD-ANX had lower cortisol levels at baseline too, whereas those with ODD/CD+ANX did not. So distinguishing between those with and without anxiety might help understanding different findings concerning baseline cortisol. The low baseline and stress levels and their relations with a higher number of CD symptoms might be explained by the hypothesis that these children are motivated to seek stimulating activities due to low arousal (*sensation seeking theory*; Zuckerman, 1979) and do not fear consequences of their behavior (*fearlessness theory*; Raine, 1993). However, these arousal based theories fit boys with ODD/CD+ANX to a lesser extent. They did not differ from controls in baseline cortisol levels and cortisol stress reactivity. Moreover, they showed a significantly impaired cortisol recovery.

Furthermore, within boys with ODD/CD, high anxiety predicted high baseline cortisol and less cortisol recovery, whereas CD symp-

toms could not predict baseline and cortisol recovery levels. Higher cortisol levels in children with ODD/CD with comorbid anxiety (McBurnett et al., 1991) or higher levels of anxiety (van Goozen et al., 1998; van Goozen et al., 2000) are in line with earlier studies. In another study higher cortisol stress reactivity was found in boys with ADHD and comorbid anxiety, whereas those with comorbid ODD/CD had diminished cortisol reactivity (Hastings et al., 2009). Similarly, we also found that the ODD/CD+ANX group had marginally higher cortisol stress reactivity than the ODD/CD-ANX group. We add to this literature that those with anxiety also have higher cortisol recovery levels compared to non-anxious boys with ODD/CD or controls.

This hyperarousal during recovery of the ODD/CD+ANX group may be explained by an overly responsive 'basic threat circuit' (Blair, 2013) that continues to be activated after the stressor has ended. This circuit runs from the amygdala to the hypothalamus to the periaqueductal gray and is activated when a threat is experienced as impossible to escape. The behavior that follows is defensive or reactively aggressive. Indeed, in some boys with CD increased amygdala response to fearful expressions have been found (Viding et al., 2012). This 'basic threat circuit' becomes overly responsive by prior priming or inadequate regulation. Our results indicate that boys with ODD/CD with anxiety problems may continue to react to stressors after the stressful event is gone. Thus this subgroup might be better characterized as having impaired recovery or regulation instead of tonically low arousal. Self-regulation abilities are needed to manage stress levels and return to baseline states. It is known that individuals with high anxiety have reduced self-regulation and emotion regulation abilities. For example, individuals may have increased rumination, excessive worrying and decreased re-appraisal abilities (Meuwly et al., 2012; Stewart et al., 2013; Verstraeten et al., 2011), reflecting a lack of control over emotions and a continuation of emotional states even though the events that triggered these emotions have already subsided. This may also characterize children with ODD/CD scoring high on anxiety. Although a pure deficit in recovery or down regulation of the HPA axis would be reflected in cortisol levels that stay continuously high from T2 (when the stress induction began) onwards till the recovery phase, the cortisol pattern of the ODD/CD+ANX group showed a drop from T2 to T4 (see Fig. 3) and then a deflection upwards during the recovery phase. Apparently there was some regulation during the stress phase but not during the recovery phase. Interestingly, the ODD/CD group with anxiety reported improved mood once the stressor had terminated, just like the other two groups. We could speculate that this may suggest a discrepancy between subjective experience and physiological state, and that they are not aware of the physiological state of their body. However, further research is warranted to test this hypothesis.

The current study investigated cortisol recovery, besides baseline and reactivity, in a clinical sample of school-aged boys with ODD/CD. In this study cortisol recovery was investigated separate from cortisol stress reactivity. We used a highly controlled experiment involving provocation, frustration and competition to evoke psychosocial stress and collected multiple saliva samples to measure reactivity as well as recovery up till one hour after stress. Our sample consisted of boys only. Although gender differences in cortisol response in community children have not been found (Kudielka et al., 2004) and low baseline cortisol levels have been obtained in girls with CD as well (Pajer et al., 2001), we are hesitant to generalize our results to girls. Future studies should first examine cortisol stress reactivity and cortisol recovery in girls with ODD/CD. We did not include a group of boys with anxiety disorders without aggression. It would have been interesting to examine their response to the provocation, frustration and competition of our experiment, since such a stress situation has not been tested in anxious children yet and literature on their HPA axis activity is mixed (Dietrich

et al., 2013). This study did not include puberty status of the boys. This might be an interesting topic for future studies to include in their analyses since puberty status might influence baseline and stress cortisol levels (Gunnar and Quevedo, 2007).

Taken together, although both ODD/CD groups may have abnormal cortisol patterns, they are of a different nature; those without anxiety have low baseline cortisol levels, whereas those with high anxiety have a normal baseline cortisol level, but an impaired cortisol recovery. So different subtypes of children with ODD/CD experience different types of difficulties in adaptation to the environment. In line with this, within the ODD/CD group, those with more severe CD problems had more impaired stress reactivity. The aggressive and antisocial behavior of boys with ODD/CD may thus result from different underlying mechanisms. These results provide further evidence to the notion that boys with ODD/CD are a heterogeneous group (Stadler, 2010) and may ask for different interventions (van Goozen and Fairchild, 2008). For example van de Wiel et al. (2004) demonstrated that children with ODD/CD who showed elevated cortisol stress reactivity profited more from an intervention than those with low cortisol stress reactivity. The neurobiological profile of a child could thus provide information that can help to optimize treatment outcome.

### Conflict of interest

None.

### Contributors

All authors have participated in the research and article preparation. Van Rijn, De Wied and Van Goozen contributed to designing the study and choosing which instruments were used. Data collection was done by Jantiene Schoorl. Analyzing the data and writing the article was done by all authors.

### Role of the funding source

This study was supported by grant number 056-21-010 funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) awarded to Hanna Swaab, Minet de Wied and Stephanie van Goozen.

The funding organization (NWO) did not have any involvement in the study design, data collection, analysis or interpretation of data, writing of the article or the decision to submit the article for publication. NWO only supported financially.

### Acknowledgements

This study was supported by grant number 056-21-010 funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) awarded to Hanna Swaab, Minet de Wied and Stephanie van Goozen.

The funding organization (NWO) did not have any influence in the creation of the design of this study or in the writing process of the article, other than financing it.

### References

- Achenbach, T.M., Rescorla, L.A., 2001. *Manual for the ASEBA School-age Forms & Profiles*. University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families, Burlington.
- Albers, E.M., Riksen-Walraven, J.M., Sweep, F.C., de Weerth, C., 2008. Maternal behavior predicts infant cortisol recovery from a mild everyday stressor. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* 49, 97–103 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01818.x>.
- Alink, L.R., van Ijzendoorn, M.H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., Mesman, J., Juffer, F., Koot, H.M., 2008. Cortisol and externalizing behavior in children and adolescents: mixed meta-analytic evidence for the inverse relation of basal cortisol and cortisol reactivity with externalizing behavior. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 50, 427–450 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dev.20300>.
- Blair, C., Granger, D.A., Kivlighan, K.T., Mills-Koonce, R., Willoughby, M., Greenberg, M.T., Hibel, L.C., Fortunato, C.K., 2008. Maternal and child contributions to cortisol response to emotional arousal in young children from low-income, rural communities. *Dev. Psychol.* 44, 1095–1109 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.4.1095>.
- Blair, R.J., 2013. The neurobiology of psychopathic traits in youths. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 14, 786–799 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn3577>.
- Burke, J.D., 2012. An affective dimension within oppositional defiant disorder symptoms among boys: personality and psychopathology outcomes into early adulthood. *J. Child Psychol. Psych.* 53, 1176–1183 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02598.x>.
- Cavanagh, M., Quinn, D., Duncan, D., Graham, T., Balbuena, L., 2014. Oppositional defiant disorder is better conceptualized as a disorder of emotional regulation. *J. Atten. Disord.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1087054713520221>.
- Cohen, J., 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale.
- Crockett, E.E., Holmes, B.M., Granger, D.A., Lyons-Ruth, K., 2013. Maternal disrupted communication during face-to-face interaction at 4 months: relation to maternal and infant cortisol among at-risk families. *Infancy* 18, 1111–1134 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/infa.12015>.
- De Wied, M., Van der Baan, H., Raaijmakers, Q., De Ruiter, C., Meeus, W., 2014. Factor structure and construct validity of the Dutch version of the antisocial process screening device. *J. Psychopathol. Behav.* 36, 84–92 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10862-013-9371-4>.
- Dietrich, A., Ormel, J., Buitelaar, J.K., Verhulst, F.C., Hoekstra, P.J., Hartman, C.A., 2013. Cortisol in the morning and dimensions of anxiety, depression, and aggression in children from a general population and clinic-referred cohort: an integrated analysis. *The TRAILS study. Psychoneuroendocrinology* 38, 1281–1298 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2012.11.013>.
- Dressendorfer, R.A., Kirschbaum, C., Rohde, W., Stahl, F., Strasburger, C.J., 1992. Synthesis of a cortisol-biotin conjugate and evaluation as a tracer in an immunoassay for salivary cortisol measurement. *J. Steroid Biochem. Mol. Biol.* 43, 683–692.
- Fairchild, G., Van Goozen, S.H.M., Stollery, S., Brown, J., Gardiner, J., Herbert, J., Goodyer, I., 2008. Cortisol diurnal rhythm and stress reactivity in male adolescents with early-onset or adolescence-onset conduct disorder. *Biol. Psychiatry* 64, 599–606 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2008.05.022>.
- Feilhauer, J., Cima, M., Korebrits, A., Nicolson, N.A., 2013. Salivary cortisol and psychopathy dimensions in detained antisocial adolescents. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 38, 1586–1595 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2013.01.005>.
- Ferdinand, R.F., van der Ende, J., 2002. Nederlandse vertaling van de disc-iv; Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children. Afdeling kinder- en jeugdpsychiatrie van het Sophia Kinder-ziekenhuis, Rotterdam.
- Freeman, G.L., 1939. *Toward a psychiatric plimsoll mark: physiological recovery quotients in experimentally induced frustration*. *J. Psychol.* 8, 247–252.
- Frick, P.J., Hare, R.D., 2001. *The Antisocial Process Screening Device*. Multi-Health, Toronto.
- Gunnar, M., Quevedo, K., 2007. The neurobiology of stress and development. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 58, 145–173 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085605>.
- Hastings, P., Fortier, I., Utendale, W., Simard, L., Robaey, P., 2009. Adrenocortical functioning in boys with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: examining subtypes of ADHD and associated comorbid conditions. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 37, 565–578 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579411000538>.
- Hastings, P.D., Shirtcliff, E.A., Klimes-Dougan, B., Allison, A.L., Derose, L., Kendziora, K.T., Usher, B.A., Zahn-Waxler, C., 2011. Allostatic and the development of internalizing and externalizing problems: changing relations with physiological systems across adolescence. *Dev. Psychopathol.* 23, 1149–1165 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579411000538>.
- Hawes, D., Brennan, J., Dadds, M., 2009. Cortisol, callous-unemotional traits, and pathways to antisocial behavior. *Curr. Opin. Psychiatry* 22, 357–362 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0b013e32832bfa6d>.
- Ji, J., Negri, S., Kim, H., Susman, E.J., 2016. A study of cortisol reactivity and recovery among young adolescents: heterogeneity and longitudinal stability and change. *Dev. Psychobiol.* 283–302 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dev.21369>.
- Kimonis, E.R., Frick, P.J., Cauffman, E., Goldweber, A., Skeem, J., 2012. Primary and secondary variants of juvenile psychopathy differ in emotional processing. *Dev. Psychopathol.* 24, 1091–1103 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579412000557>.
- Kort W., Schittekatte M., Dekker P.H., Verhaeghe P., Compaan E.L., Bosmans M., Vermeir G., 2005. WISC-III NL Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. Derde Editie NL. Handleiding en Verantwoording. Harcourt Test Publishers/Nederlands Instituut voor Psychologen, Amsterdam.
- Kudielka, B.M., Buske-Kirschbaum, A., Hellhammer, D.H., Kirschbaum, C., 2004. HPA axis responses to laboratory psychosocial stress in healthy elderly adults, younger adults, and children: impact of age and gender. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 29, 83–98.
- Linden, W., Earle, T.L., Gerin, W., Christenfeld, N., 1997. Physiological stress reactivity and recovery: conceptual siblings separated at birth. *J. Psychosom. Res.* 42, 117–135.
- Loney, B., Butler, M., Lima, E., Counts, C., Eckel, L., 2006. The relation between salivary cortisol, callous-unemotional traits, and conduct problems in an adolescent non-referred sample. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* 47, 30–36 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2005.01444.x>.

- McBurnett, K., Lahey, B.B., Frick, P.J., Risch, C., Loeber, R., Hart, E.L., Christ, M.A., Hanson, K.S., 1991. Anxiety, inhibition, and conduct disorder in children: II. Relation to salivary cortisol. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 30, 192–196 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199103000-00005>.
- Meuwly, N., Bodenmann, G., Germann, J., Bradbury, T., Ditzgen, B., Heinrichs, M., 2012. Dyadic coping, insecure attachment, and cortisol stress recovery following experimentally induced stress. *J. Fam. Psychol.* 26, 937–947 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030356>.
- Mills Koonce, W., Wagner, N., Willoughby, M., Stifter, C., Blair, C., Granger, D., 2015. Greater fear reactivity and psychophysiological hyperactivity among infants with later conduct problems and callous-unemotional traits. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* 56, 147–154 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12289>.
- Northover, C., Thapar, A., Langley, K., Fairchild, G., van Goozen, S.H.M., 2016. Cortisol levels at baseline and under stress in adolescent males with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, with or without comorbid conduct disorder. *Psychiatry Res.* 242, 130–136 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2016.05.052>.
- Pajer, K., Gardner, W., Rubin, R.T., Perel, J., Neal, S., 2001. Decreased cortisol levels in adolescent girls with conduct disorder. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 58, 297–302.
- Popma, A., Jansen, L.M., Vermeiren, R., Steiner, H., Raine, A., Van Goozen, S.H.M., Van Engeland, H., Doreleijers, T.A., 2006. Hypothalamus pituitary adrenal axis and autonomic activity during stress in delinquent male adolescents and controls. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 31, 948–957 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2006.05.005>.
- Poustka, L., Maras, A., Hohm, E., Fellingner, J., Holtmann, M., Banaschewski, T., Lewicka, S., Schmidt, M., Esser, G., Laucht, M., 2010. Negative association between plasma cortisol levels and aggression in a high-risk community sample of adolescents. *J. Neural Transm.* 117, 621–627 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00702-010-0386-7>.
- Pruessner, J.C., Kirschbaum, C., Meinlschmid, G., Hellhammer, D.H., 2003. Two formulas for computation of the area under the curve represent measures of total hormone concentration versus time-dependent change. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 28, 916–931.
- Raine, A., 1993. *The Psychopathology of Crime: Criminal Behavior as a Clinical Disorder*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Sapolsky, R.M., 1998. *Why Zebras Don't Get Ulcers. The Acclaimed Guide to Stress, Stress-Related Diseases, and Coping*. Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Sattler, J.M., 1992. *Assessment of Children, 3rd edn*. J.M. Sattler, San Diego.
- Schoorl, J., Van Rijn, S., De Wied, M., Van Goozen, S.H.M., Swaab, H., 2015. Variability in emotional/behavioral problems in boys with oppositional defiant disorder or conduct disorder: the role of arousal. *Eur. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 25, 821–830 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-015-0790-5>.
- Shaffer, D., Fisher, P., Lucas, C.P., Dulcan, M.K., Schwab-Stone, M.E., 2000. NIMH diagnostic interview schedule for children version IV (NIMH DISC-IV): description, differences from previous versions, and reliability of some common diagnoses. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 39, 28–38 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200001000-00014>.
- Sharf, A., Kimonis, E.R., Howard, A., 2014. Negative life events and posttraumatic stress disorder among incarcerated boys with callous-unemotional traits. *J. Psychopathol. Behav. Assess.* 36, 401–414 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10862-013-9404-z>.
- Snoek, H., Van Goozen, S.H.M., Matthys, W., Buitelaar, J.K., van Engeland, H., 2004. Stress responsivity in children with externalizing behavior disorders. *Dev. Psychopathol.* 16, 389–406.
- Stadler, C., Kroeger, A., Weyers, P., Grasmann, D., Horschinek, M., Freitag, C., Clement, H.-W., 2011. Cortisol reactivity in boys with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and disruptive behavior problems: the impact of callous unemotional traits. *Psychiatry Res.* 187, 204–209 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2010.05.004>.
- Stadler, C., 2010. The heterogeneity of disruptive behavior disorders—implications for neurobiological research and treatment. *Front Psychiatry* 21, 1–14 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2010.00021>.
- Stewart, J., Mazurka, R., Bond, L., Wynne Edwards, K., Harkness, K., 2013. Rumination and impaired cortisol recovery following a social stressor in adolescent depression. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 41, 1015–1026 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-013-9740-1>.
- Verstraeten, K., Bijttebier, P., Vasey, M., Raes, F., 2011. Specificity of worry and rumination in the development of anxiety and depressive symptoms in children. *Br. J. Clin. Psychol.* 50, 364–378 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466510X532715>.
- Viding, E., Sebastian, C.L., Dadds, M.R., Lockwood, P.L., Cecil, C.A., De Brito, S.A., McCrory, E.J., 2012. Amygdala response to preattentive masked fear in children with conduct problems: the role of callous-unemotional traits. *Am. J. Psychiatry* 169, 1109–1116 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466510X532715>.
- Von Zerssen, D., 1986. *Clinical self-rating scales (CSRS) of the Munich psychiatric information system (PSYCHIS München)*. In: Sartorius, N., Ban, T.A. (Eds.), *Assessment of Depression*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 270–303.
- Wechsler, D., 2003. *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children—4th Edition (WISC-IV®)*. Harcourt Assessment, San Antonio.
- Zuckerman, M., 1979. *Sensation Seeking: Beyond the Optimum Level of Arousal*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale.
- van Goozen, S.H.M., Fairchild, G., 2008. How can the study of biological processes help design new interventions for children with severe antisocial behavior? *Dev. Psychopathol.* 20 (941) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s095457940800045x>.
- van Goozen, S.H.M., Matthys, W., Cohen-Kettenis, P.T., Gispens-de Wied, C., Wiegant, V.M., Van Engeland, H., 1998. Salivary cortisol and cardiovascular activity during stress in oppositional-defiant disorder boys and normal controls. *Biol. Psychiatry* 43, 531–539 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(97\)00253-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(97)00253-9).
- van Goozen, S.H.M., Matthys, W., Cohen Kettenis, P., Buitelaar, J.K., Van Engeland, H., 2000. Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis and autonomic nervous system activity in disruptive children and matched controls. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 39, 1438–1445 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200011000-00019>.
- van Goozen, S.H.M., Fairchild, G., Snoek, H., Harold, G.T., 2007. The evidence for a neurobiological model of childhood antisocial behavior. *Psychol. Bull.* 133, 149–182 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.149>.
- van Goozen, S.H.M., 2015. The role of early emotion impairments in the development of persistent antisocial behavior. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 9, 206–210 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12134>.
- van de Wiel, N.M.H., van Goozen, S.H.M., Matthys, W., Snoek, H., van Engeland, H., 2004. Cortisol and treatment effect in children with disruptive behavior disorders: a preliminary study. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 43, 1011–1018 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.chi.0000126976.56955.43>.