Review: The association between anxiety and poor attendance at school – a systematic review
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Background: Anxiety may be associated with poor attendance at school, which can lead to a range of adverse outcomes. We systematically reviewed the evidence for an association between anxiety and poor school attendance. Anxiety had to be assessed via standardised diagnostic measure or validated scale. Articles were screened independently by two reviewers. Meta-analyses were performed where possible, otherwise results were synthesised narratively. Results: A total of 4930 articles were screened. Eleven studies from six countries across North America, Europe and Asia, were included. School attendance was categorised into: (a) absenteeism (i.e. total absences), (b) excused/medical absences, (c) unexcused absences/truancy and (d) school refusal. Findings from eight studies suggested associations between truancy and any anxiety disorder, as well as social and generalised anxiety. Results also suggested cross-sectional associations between school refusal and separation anxiety, generalised anxiety, social anxiety and simple phobia. Few studies investigated associations with absenteeism or excused/medical absences. Conclusions: Findings suggest associations between anxiety and unexcused absences/truancy, and school refusal. Clinicians should consider the possibility of anxiety in children and adolescents with poor attendance. However, there is a lack of high quality evidence, little longitudinal research and limited evidence relating to overall absenteeism or excused/medical absences, despite the latter being the most common type of absence. These gaps should be a key priority for future research.

Key Practitioner Message
- Anxiety may be associated with poor attendance at school, which can lead to a range of adverse academic, social and economic outcomes.
- This systematic review found evidence for cross-sectional associations between unexcused absences/truancy and any anxiety, as well as social anxiety and generalised anxiety, specifically.
- Evidence was also found for a cross-sectional association between school refusal and separation anxiety, generalised anxiety, social anxiety and simple phobia.
- Clinicians should consider the possibility of anxiety in children and adolescents with poor school attendance.
- There is a lack of high quality evidence, little longitudinal research and limited evidence relating to associations between anxiety and overall absenteeism, or excused/medical absences, despite the latter being the most common type of absence. Further research is required to address these gaps.
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Introduction
School plays a key role in children’s academic, emotional and social development. Frequent absence from school is a risk factor for poor academic outcomes (Credé, Roch, & Kiesczynka, 2010), social isolation (Kearney, Pursell, & Alvarez, 2001), economic deprivation (Kearney, 2008b) and future unemployment (Attwood & Croll, 2014). In the United Kingdom, 56.7 million school days were missed in 2016/2017 due to pupil absence, and 10.8% of children were deemed ‘persistently absent’ as a result of missing 10% or more of school sessions in that academic year (Department for Education, 2018). There are many reasons why a child might be absent from school, and a range of personal, familial, school and community influences are risk factors (Egger, Costello,
Several studies have demonstrated that poor mental health is associated with reduced school attendance, with anxiety described in the literature as a particular risk factor (Egger et al., 2003; Elliott & Place, 2009; Kearney, 2008b; Pellegrini, 2007). There are many facets of the school setting that have the potential to evoke anxiety, including separation from primary caregivers, social interaction with school staff and peers and academic stress, all of which may lead to avoidance of school by way of negative reinforcement (Kearney, 2008b). Somatic symptoms such as headaches, stomach aches and fatigue are also common among children with anxiety (Campos, 2012), and may contribute to school absence, particularly if interpreted by adults around the child as signs of physical, as opposed to mental ill health. Anxiety is commonly considered to be related to 'school refusal', rather than other types of absence such as truancy or absenteeism in general (Elliott & Place, 2009; Kearney, 2008b; Pellegrini, 2007). Indeed, 'school refusal' is a term used to describe absence due to anxiety or emotional distress, in contrast with 'truancy', which is often used to describe absence associated with antisocial behaviour (King & Bernstein, 2001). However, evidence suggests that there is substantial overlap between 'school refusal' and 'truancy', with many school refusers displaying signs of behavioural disorder, and many truants experiencing emotional distress (Egger et al., 2003). This has led several scholars to promote the use of broader terminologies such as 'problematic absenteeism' (Kearney, 2008a) or 'extended non-attendance' (Pellegrini, 2007), which avoid assumptions about the underlying aetiology of the problem. However, others argue that co-occurrence of school refusal and truancy is rare and that these subcategories are valuable for understanding individual differences in the presentation of attendance problems (Heyne, Gren-Landell, Melvin, & Gentle-Genitty, 2018), and debate continues regarding the utility of various different definitions.

The diversity of terminology used among researchers is a central challenge to the study of school attendance, and there is a lack of consensus about how best to define, measure and address poor attendance (Kearney, 2008b; Lauchlan, 2003; Pellegrini, 2007). Terminology has important implications, because evidence suggests that anxiety-related school refusal is viewed more sympathetically by school staff than is truancy (Finning et al., 2017; Torrens Armstrong, McCormack Brown, Brindley, Corell, & McDermott, 2011). These views can result in disparate attitudes towards children who are frequently absent from school, and can influence their access to intervention or support, as well as the type of intervention provided, with an emphasis placed on therapeutic interventions for anxious school refusers, and punitive approaches for truants (Finning et al., 2017; Lyon & Cotler, 2007; Torrens Armstrong et al., 2011).

To date there have been no systematic reviews to investigate the relationship between anxiety and school attendance. Given the frequent emphasis in the literature on the presumed role of anxiety in poor attendance, the current study aims to systematically review the evidence regarding the association between anxiety and poor school attendance. Although anxiety is commonly comorbid with depression, much of the literature in relation to school attendance has separated these two constructs. Therefore, this paper focuses on associations between anxiety and school attendance, and findings for associations with depression and internalising problems (i.e. combined symptoms of anxiety and depression) are reported elsewhere (Finning, In preparation; Finning et al., 2019). Understanding the role of anxiety in relation to poor school attendance is important in order that children with anxiety can be identified quickly, and appropriate interventions implemented.

**Methods**

This systematic review was conducted and reported in line with best practice guidelines (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009; Liberati, Tetzlaff, Altman, 2009). Searches were conducted as part of a broader review that reported associations between school attendance and all emotional disorders (anxiety, depression, internalising difficulties) (Finning, In preparation; Finning et al., 2019). In order to explore the impact of anxiety in sufficient depth, only studies that investigated anxiety are included in the current paper, but we acknowledge that anxiety is commonly comorbid with depression. The protocol was registered on the PROSPERO database (CRD42016052961) and published in a peer-reviewed journal (Finning et al., 2017).

**Eligibility criteria**

We searched for quantitative studies of any design, from any country, where the sample was school-aged children and/or adolescents, which reported the association between anxiety and school attendance. Studies were eligible if the age range of the sample was applicable for the education system of the country of study. Given that both anxiety disorders and subclinical symptoms of anxiety have the potential to negatively impact a young person’s education, studies were eligible if they used measures of anxiety symptoms using a validated scale, diagnosis using a standardised diagnostic measure or a history of medical diagnosis. We included any terminology and any method of measuring school attendance. Exclusion criteria were: case studies/series, retrospective reports collected in adulthood, studies where the sample was not considered comparable to the general population (e.g. children with a specific health condition) and those not published in English. Intervention studies were also excluded because it was considered that the samples would be selective, and that the intervention might impact the association of interest to this review.

**Information sources and search strategy**

We searched MEDLINE, PsychINFO, Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC), Education Research Complete, British Education Index, Australian Education Index and Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA), from date of inception to 12 December 2016. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Health Management Information Consortium, Conference Proceedings Citation Index and OpenGrey (http://opengrey.eu) were searched for grey literature. The search strategy combined child, school attendance and anxiety terms (see Supporting Information for full search strategy). In addition, forward and backward citation chasing was performed using Google Scholar, and lead authors of included studies and experts in the field were contacted for additional sources.

**Study selection and data extraction**

KF and EDW independently screened titles and abstracts, and then full texts, using EndNote X7. Disagreements were
resolved through discussion and, if necessary, referral to TF and DAM. Twenty papers (0.6%) were referred at the stage of title and abstract screening, and nine (3.8%) at full text screening. The following items were extracted from included studies by KF and checked by DAM, IRDJ, LSh or LSt: study details (author, year of publication, country, design, primary aim, population), participant characteristics (sample size, age, gender, ethnicity), methods used to assess anxiety and school attendance (name of measure, validation, informant) and study results (effect estimates, 95% confidence intervals, p-values, adjustment for confounding). Where necessary and possible, study authors were contacted to clarify unclear data (n = 3 studies).

Assessment of study quality
The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (Wells et al., 2008), adapted for the current review, was used to assess the quality of included studies. The NOS is a widely used measure designed to assess the quality of observational studies. There are published versions for case-control and cohort studies, as well as a recent adaptation for cross-sectional studies (Herzog et al., 2013). The NOS evaluates studies on the selection of participants, comparability of participant groups and assessment of the outcome for cohort and cross-sectional studies, or assessment of the exposure for case-control studies. A star-rating system is used to indicate the overall quality of studies, with a maximum of nine stars for cohort and case-control studies, and eight for cross-sectional studies.

Data analysis
Effect sizes included correlation coefficients (r), standardised mean differences (Cohen’s d) and odds ratios (ORs). Some studies did not report effect sizes, and in these instances we used an online calculator published by the Campbell Collaboration (Wilson, 2017) or StaTa 14.2 (StataCorp, 2015) to calculate effect sizes, 95% confidence intervals and p-values. Published guidelines were used to aid the interpretation of effect sizes (Chen, Cohen, & Chen, 2010; Cohen, 1992; Hemphill, 2003).

Where two or more studies investigated the same constructs in comparable populations, and reported the same type of effect size (correlation coefficient, standardised mean difference, or odds ratio), random effects meta-analysis was performed using the DerSimonian and Laird method (DerSimonian & Laird, 1986), in RevMan v5.3 (The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). The I-squared (I²) statistic was used to quantify heterogeneity; this is the percentage of the total variation across estimates that is due to heterogeneity as opposed to sampling variation (Higgins, Thompson, Deeks, & Altman, 2003). Some studies reported multiple results that were applicable to this review. For example, one study reported results for the same association using both correlation and multiple linear regression (Hunt & Hopko, 2009), and other studies reported both adjusted and unadjusted results (e.g. Vaughn, Maynard, Salas-Wright, Perron, & Abdon, 2013). In these cases, for the purpose of meta-analysis we selected the one result considered most comparable to other studies, and additional results were synthesised narratively. Analyses that adjusted for variables likely to be on the causal pathway between anxiety and school absence (e.g. psychiatric comorbidity), were not included in meta-analyses due to the potential for bias (Schisterman, Cole, & Platt, 2009). Results that could not be included in meta-analyses due to heterogeneity, were synthesised narratively. An effect direction plot was used to provide a visual display of findings from all studies (Thomson & Thomas, 2013).

Our protocol specified that subgroup analyses would be performed to explore the impact of age, anxiety measurement method, informant, setting or school type, on the association between anxiety and school attendance, but this was not possible due to methodological heterogeneity. The protocol also specified that funnel plots and Egger’s test would be used to assess publication bias, but there were too few studies for this (Sterne et al., 2011).

Results
Searches identified 4930 articles, of which 3086 were title and abstract screened, and 239 full-text screened (see Figure 1). Eleven studies were included.

Study characteristics
Study characteristics are summarised in Table 1. Studies were conducted in six countries across North America, Europe and Asia. Sample sizes ranged from 54 to 13,056, with a combined sample size of 25,724 from all studies. The combined mean age across all studies was 14.62 years, covering children aged from 5 to 21 years. Two studies included young people in their 20s, but since both explained that this age range was typical of the education system in their respective countries (Norway and Germany), they were included. Anxiety was assessed by measuring continuous symptoms with a validated scale (n = 6), binary classification using diagnostic interviews (n = 4), history of medical diagnosis (n = 1) and screening questions from a diagnostic interview (n = 1); see Supporting Information for further details. Studies used a variety of methods to assess school attendance (see Supporting Information), which, for the purposes of data synthesis, were grouped into four categories that were mutually exclusive (i.e. each result was included in only one category). These categories were: absenteeism (i.e. absence for any reason; n = 1), excused/medical absences (n = 2), unexcused absences/truancy (n = 8) and school refusal (n = 2). One study additionally reported a separate analysis for students meeting criteria for school refusal and truancy (‘mixed school refusal and truancy’). Although there was variations in the ways in which each study measured these four constructs (see Supporting Information), we considered the methods used within each construct to be sufficiently similar to justify their grouping for the purposes of data synthesis. In some cases there were discrepancies between the construct that studies reported to be measuring, and what was actually measured. In these cases, we used the measurement method, rather than the terminology, to inform our grouping of constructs.

Results of quality assessment
Results of quality assessment are provided in Table 2. Cross-sectional studies scored between one and six out of eight on the NOS, suggesting poor-to-moderate quality. Common problems were no justification of sample sizes, no description of nonrespondents, using questionnaires rather than diagnostic measures and inappropriate or poorly reported statistical tests. The two longitudinal studies scored two and six out of nine. Both used symptom questionnaires rather than diagnoses of anxiety, and neither adjusted for confounds. The two case-control studies were of higher quality than other study designs, scoring seven out of nine.

Data synthesis
Table 3 summarises the direction and statistical significance of all results (Thomson & Thomas, 2013). The following synthesis is presented under subheadings relating to the four school attendance constructs, plus a fifth heading for ‘mixed school refusal and truancy’.
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Meta-analysis was only possible for small subsamples of studies, and the majority of results are synthesised narratively.

**Absenteeism.** One study investigated associations between overall absenteeism and anxiety, and reported a small positive, cross-sectional association ($r = .08, 95\% \text{ CI } 0.01–0.15, p = .032$), although this study was of poor quality (Tsar, 2011). There was no longitudinal evidence regarding associations between anxiety and absenteeism.

**Excused/medical absences.** Two studies reported associations between excused/medical absences and anxiety. Jones, Hoare, Elton, Dunhill, and Sharpe (2009) reported small, nonstatistically significant increased odds of anxiety for students who missed at least 20% of school days for medical reasons, compared to controls with good attendance (best 10% of the year group) (any anxiety disorder OR = 1.36, 95% CI 0.69–2.69, $p = .380$; obsessive-compulsive disorder OR = 2.07, 95% CI 0.99–4.2, $p = .060$; post-traumatic stress disorder OR = 2.12, 95% CI 0.65–6.89, $p = .220$). Likewise, Burton, Marshal, and Chisolm (2014) reported a small and nonstatistically significant correlation between self-reported symptoms of anxiety and excused absences 6 months later ($r = .17, 95\% \text{ CI } -0.02 \text{ to } 0.35, p = .079$). Overall, there is little evidence to suggest associations between anxiety and excused or medical absences.

**Unexcused absences/truancy.** There were mixed findings regarding associations between overall anxiety and unexcused absences/truancy. Vaughn et al. (2013) reported an association between a lifetime diagnosis of any anxiety disorder and ‘moderate’ (OR = 1.72, 95% CI 1.18–2.51, $p = .005$) and ‘high’ (OR = 3.46, 95% CI 1.72–6.79, $p < .001$) truancy. After adjusting for lifetime depression, this only remained statistically significant for moderate truancy (OR = 1.97, 95% CI 1.13–3.44, $p = .017$), however, this result is likely to be biased given that depression might lie on the causal pathway between anxiety and truancy. Pflug and Schneider (2016) reported a greater number of anxiety disorder screening questions answered ‘yes’ for truants compared to nontruants (Cohen’s $d = 0.21, 95\% \text{ CI } 0.00–0.42, p = .046$), but Corville-Smith, Ryan, Adams, and Dalicandro (1998) reported only weak evidence of a difference in anxiety symptoms between cases with a high number of unexcused absences and controls with good attendance ($d = 0.49, 95\% \text{ CI } 0.06–1.03, p = .076$), although this was based on a small sample ($n = 54$). Hunt and Hopko (2009) also reported little evidence for an association between self-reported anxiety and unexcused absences in a
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Publication status</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Emotional disorder and school attendance main aim?</th>
<th>Recruitment setting</th>
<th>Sample size (% female)</th>
<th>Age in years (mean (SD); range, as provided)</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton 2014</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>LO (follow-up 6 months)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Two primary care medical clinics, Pennsylvania &amp; Ohio</td>
<td>108 (71%)</td>
<td>16.3 (0.9) T1 14–19 T1</td>
<td>59% African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corville-Smith 1998</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Y (one of)</td>
<td>Two high schools from one small city in Ontario</td>
<td>54 (70%)</td>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egger 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Public schools in 11 counties in North Carolina, taking part in GSMS</td>
<td>1422 (44%)</td>
<td>9–16</td>
<td>70% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green 2005</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Children and adolescents living in private households in England, Scotland and Wales, sampled via UK Child Benefit Records</td>
<td>7621/4689 (48%)</td>
<td>5–16</td>
<td>86% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt 2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Y (one of)</td>
<td>Four high schools in Appalachian mountains</td>
<td>367 (58%)</td>
<td>15.9 (1.4) 4–19</td>
<td>94% Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingl 2012</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>One urban and one rural high school</td>
<td>809 (52%)</td>
<td>15.2 (1.2) 16–21</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones 2009</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Nested CC</td>
<td>Y (one of)</td>
<td>Ten representative local authority secondary schools in Edinburgh</td>
<td>184 (60%)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park 2015</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>LO (follow-up 5 months)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Participants expected to enter primary school in next 2 months, from 34 kindergartens in Seoul Social network, advert in journal for teachers &amp; Facebook profile; open to all secondary-aged students in Germany</td>
<td>248 (48%)</td>
<td>10–21</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pflug 2016</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Y (one of)</td>
<td>Fifty randomly selected schools in large district school board, Ontario</td>
<td>715 (53%)</td>
<td>10.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>71% Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsar 2011</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Representative sample of US youth selected through multistage area probability sampling (NSDUH study)</td>
<td>13,056 (49%)</td>
<td>14.6 (1.7)</td>
<td>59% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn 2013</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Y (one of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC, Case–control; CS, Cross-sectional; GSMS, Great Smoky Mountains Study; LO, Longitudinal; N, no; NR, not reported; NSDUH, National Survey on Drug Use and Health; T1, time-point one; Y, yes.  

Egger et al. (2003) aggregated data from multiple time waves and thus analysed 6676 observations from 1422 participants.  

Green et al. (2005) had total sample of 7977, of which school attendance data were available for 7621 and 4689 using parent- and teacher-reports, respectively; gender and ethnicity distribution refers to entire 7977 sample.  

Pflug (2016) had a total sample of 1359, of which 1140 had data from diagnostic interviews and 977 had data from the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; gender distribution refers to entire 1359 samples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Comparability</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Total (out of 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-sectional studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pflug 2016</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsar 2011</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingul 2012</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green 2005</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt 2009</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn 2013</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egger 2003</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longitudinal studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton 2014</td>
<td>-/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park 2015</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case-control studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corville-Smith 1998</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones 2009</td>
<td>+/C0/C0/C0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ One star awarded as per the NOS rating scale; ++ two stars awarded as per the NOS rating scale; – no stars awarded as per the NOS rating scale. A higher score reflects greater study quality (i.e lower risk of bias).
correlation (r = .05, 95% CI −0.05 to 0.15, p = .339), and multiple linear regression adjusting for other predictors (regression coefficient = −0.05, p = .542; suggesting that for each one point increase on the Youth Self-Report anxiety subscale, unexcused absences decreased by 0.05 days). Only one study reported longitudinal evidence and found a nonstatistically significant correlation between baseline anxiety symptoms and unexcused absences at 6 months (r = .15, 95% CI −0.04 to 0.33, p = .121; Burton et al., 2014).

In terms of particular types of anxiety, two studies demonstrated positive, cross-sectional associations between unexcused absences and social anxiety, both in response to a social anxiety screening question (OR = 1.98, 95% CI 1.27–3.08, p = .003; Pflug & Schneider, 2016), and a self-report questionnaire that compared students with 'high' versus 'no' (d = 0.34, 95% CI 0.10–0.58, p = .005) and 'high' versus 'normal' (d = 0.33, 95% CI 0.12–0.54, p = .003) unexcused absences (Ingul, Klockner, Silverman, & Nordahl, 2012). Egger et al. (2003), however, found little evidence of an association between truancy and social anxiety assessed via diagnostic interview (OR = 0.3, 95% CI 0.1–1.4, p = .100). Meta-analysis of two studies found little evidence for an association between unexcused absences/truancy and separation anxiety disorder (SAD) (pooled OR = 0.75, 95% CI 0.22–2.57, p = .65; see Figure 2). Additional findings that could not be meta-analysed also
provided little evidence for an association. Pflug and Schneider (2016) reported no association between unexcused absences and an SAD screening question (OR = 0.84, 95% CI 0.30–2.37, p = .741). Ingul et al. (2012) reported a difference in self-reported SAD symptoms between students with ‘high’ and ‘no’ unexcused absences (d = 0.36, 95% CI 0.12–0.60, p = .003), but not when comparing those with ‘high’ and ‘normal’ unexcused absences (d = 0.19, 95% CI –0.03 to 0.40, p = .088).

Meta-analysis of two studies also revealed little evidence for an association between unexcused absences/truancy and generalised anxiety disorder (GAD) (pooled OR = 1.62, 95% CI 0.35–7.53, p = .54; see Figure 3), although there was substantial heterogeneity between studies (I² = 79%), with Green, McGinnity, Meltzer, Ford, and Goodman (2005) reporting a moderate positive association and Egger et al. (2003) reporting a small negative association. Pflug and Schneider (2016) reported no association between unexcused absences and answers to a GAD screening question (OR = 1.37, 95% CI 0.90–2.07, p = .138), but Ingul et al. (2012) reported differences in GAD symptoms when comparing students with ‘high’ and ‘no’ (d = 0.45, 95% CI 0.21–0.69, p < .001) and ‘high’ and ‘normal’ (d = 0.30, 95% CI 0.08–0.51, p = .007) unexcused absences. There was little evidence for associations between unexcused absences/truancy and specific phobia (pooled OR = 1.57, 95% CI 0.41–5.92, p = .51; see Figure 4), agoraphobia (OR = 1.15, 95% CI 0.71–1.87, p = .572; Pflug and Schneider (2016)) or panic disorder assessed via a screening question (OR = 1.32, 95% CI 0.85–2.06, p = .219; Pflug and Schneider (2016)) or diagnostic interview (OR = 0.7, 95% CI 0.1–3.7, p = .700; Egger et al. (2003)).

Overall, there is evidence to suggest that unexcused absences/truancy may be associated with symptoms of anxiety in general, as well as social anxiety disorder and GAD specifically. However, findings between individual studies were inconsistent, and there was a lack of longitudinal research.

**School refusal.** Using diagnostic interviews, Egger et al. (2003) reported large positive, cross-sectional associations between school refusal and SAD (OR = 11.0, 95% CI 4.9–24.0, p < .001), social anxiety (OR = 6.6, 95% CI 2.6–17.0, p < .001), GAD (OR = 2.9, 95% CI 1.0–8.0, p = .050) and simple phobia (OR = 11.0, 95% CI 3.3–39.0, p < .001). After adjusting for psychiatric comorbidity, only the association with SAD remained statistically significant; however, these results may be biased given that other disorders might be on the causal pathway between anxiety and school refusal. One longitudinal study found little evidence for differences in baseline state (d = 0.31, 95% CI –0.15 to 0.78, p = .342) or trait (d = 0.28, 95% CI –0.19 to 0.75, p = .216) anxiety, nor SAD assessed via diagnostic interview (OR = 1.30, 95% CI 0.47–3.57, p = .619), for students with and without school refusal at 5-month follow-up (Park et al., 2015). However, this study had low statistical power due to the small number of school refusal cases (n = 19).

Overall, therefore, the evidence suggests that school refusal may be associated with SAD, GAD, social anxiety and simple phobia, but there is little evidence for a longitudinal association. However, only two studies investigated these relationships.

**Mixed school refusal and truancy.** Egger et al. (2003) reported large, positive, cross-sectional associations between mixed school refusal/truancy and SAD (OR = 19.0, 95% CI 3.3–110, p = .001), panic disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio (IV, Random, 95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egger 2003</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>1.00 [0.22, 4.53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green 2005</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>0.42 [0.05, 3.54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.75 [0.22, 2.57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.42, df = 1 (P = 0.52); I² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Forest plot showing pooled odds ratio for the association between SAD and unexcused absences/truancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio (IV, Random, 95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egger 2003</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>0.70 [0.22, 2.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green 2005</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>3.57 [1.64, 7.74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.62 [0.35, 7.53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.97; Chi² = 4.71, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I² = 79%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.61 (P = 0.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Forest plot showing pooled odds ratio for the association between GAD and unexcused absences/truancy
The greatest body of evidence was in relation to unexcused absences or truancy, which may be associated with anxiety overall, as well as GAD and social anxiety specifically. School refusal appears to be associated with SAD, GAD, social anxiety and simple phobia, although only two studies investigated this relationship. These conclusions should be interpreted in the light of the substantial limitations of the evidence, which are discussed below. There was little evidence with respect to absences or truancy that required authorisation. It could be argued that the absence was ‘not due to anxiety or emotional disturbance’. The majority of research to-date has been cross-sectional, and only two longitudinal studies (maximum follow-up period of 6 months) were included in this review. Longitudinal research is essential in order to inform discussions about the measurement and reporting of poor attendance (Heyne et al., 2018; Kearney, 2008b; Lauchlan, 2003; Pellegrini, 2007). Studies used widely varied methods to assess attendance (see supplementary information in Abstract S1.), which hampered our ability to draw broad conclusions. Furthermore, whilst ‘truancy’ and ‘unexcused absence’ are sometimes considered to represent different constructs, the studies included in this review tended to use these terms interchangeably, and many used the phrase ‘truancy’ when they had in fact measured unexcused absences. Achieving consensus on appropriate terminology, creating a clear definition and establishing agreed methods for measuring and reporting these constructs, should be a key priority for future research. Government policy may provide a helpful starting point for the development of such consensus. The UK Department for Education (DfE) uses the term ‘persistent absence’ to describe students who miss 10% or more of school sessions, whether authorised or unauthorised (Department for Education, 2018). This metric is also commonly utilised in the United States (Whitemore Schanzenbach, Bauer, & Mumford, 2016). However, it is unclear whether 10% is the most meaningful cut-point in terms of the potential for adverse educational, social or emotional consequences. Future research to explore the effects of different thresholds would help inform discussions about the measurement and reporting of poor attendance.

It is surprising that research to-date has largely focused on associations between anxiety and unexcused absences or truancy, since truancy is commonly believed to be associated with behavioural, rather than emotional disorders (Elliott & Place, 2009; Kearney, 2008b; Pellegrini, 2007). Further research is needed to investigate relationships between anxiety and absences, especially given that the majority of absences are authorised (Department for Education, 2018; Kearney, 2008b). Since school staff take a more sympathetic approach to absence perceived to be related to anxiety, rather than behavioural difficulties (Finning et al., 2017; Torrens Armstrong et al., 2011), it is possible that the absences of anxious children are more likely to be authorised. Additionally, somatic symptoms commonly accompany anxiety (Campo, 2012) and if these symptoms are interpreted as signs of physical illness rather than emotional distress, any associated absences are likely to be authorised.

The majority of research to-date has been cross-sectional, and only two longitudinal studies (maximum follow-up period of 6 months) were included in this review. Longitudinal research is essential in order to
understand the direction of the association, which could have important implications for practice. For example, if anxiety is a cause of poor attendance, then attendance patterns may assist clinicians, school staff and families in identifying children with anxiety, which would allow for prompt recognition and implementation of appropriate intervention. However, the isolation and withdrawal associated with missing school may itself cause anxiety, which would have implications for children who are frequently absent from school, for example those with long-term conditions. Future research should utilise longitudinal data to explore the direction of these relationships.

**Strengths and limitations**

This was the first systematic review that we are aware of to synthesise the literature regarding associations between anxiety and poor school attendance. We followed best practice guidelines for conducting (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009) and reporting (Moher et al., 2009) systematic reviews. Our searches did not restrict by date or country, and anxiety had to be assessed using a validated scale or diagnostic measure, which included both diagnoses and symptoms of anxiety. The inclusion criteria for school attendance were broad, which resulted in a review with conceptual breadth. Grey literature was included, and searches were supplemented with additional search strategies to reduce the likelihood of missing relevant studies. Screening was independently completed by two reviewers, and data extraction and quality assessment completed by one reviewer and checked by a second, minimising bias and error.

However, there were also limitations. Methodological heterogeneity made synthesis challenging, restricted our ability to draw broad conclusions and limited our ability to combine studies in meta-analyses. The meta-analyses that were performed each included only two studies, which results in less certain effect estimates and a limited representation of between-study variance (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009). We were unable to assess publication bias as there were insufficient studies, and it is possible that such bias was present, although the searches included strategies to minimise this. The NOS was considered the most appropriate and user-friendly quality assessment tool for this review after extensive consideration and pilot testing of several tools. However, the NOS required adaptation in order for us to directly compare studies of different designs, and this limits comparability with other reviews. Given that the searches were conducted in December 2016, it is possible that new studies that meet our inclusion criteria have since been published.

There were also limitations of the included studies. Although variable, the quality of included studies was mostly poor-to-moderate. Five out of 11 studies only reported unadjusted results, which is important given that several variables are likely to confound the association between anxiety and school attendance (e.g. age, socioeconomic status). There were no longitudinal studies that adjusted for confounds. Results were often poorly reported, and rarely included effect estimates, confidence intervals and exact p-values. In addition, most used questionnaires to assess symptoms of anxiety rather than using diagnostic interviews to assess for clinical diagnoses. This benefits from allowing the entire spectrum of symptoms to be assessed, but given the key role that diagnostic frameworks play in policy and service provision, it may be helpful for future studies to also utilise clinical diagnoses.

**Conclusions**

There is evidence to suggest that both unexcused absences/truancy and school refusal are associated with anxiety. However, these conclusions should be interpreted in the light of the inconsistent findings between studies, and the limitations of the evidence. Little research has investigated associations between anxiety and total absenteeism, or excused/medical absences, despite the latter being the most common type of absence. There is also a lack of longitudinal research. These gaps should be a key priority for future research.

**Acknowledgements**

This project was funded by a PhD studentship awarded to KF by the University of Exeter Medical School, supported by the Wellcome Trust (104908/Z/15/Z). OCU was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care South West Peninsula (NIHR CLAHRC South West Peninsula). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. All authors contributed to preparation of the manuscript and would like to thank Dr Sophie Epstein at King’s College London, for her knowledge-sharing and collaboration, and Simon Briscoe from the University of Exeter Medical School Information Specialist team, for his assistance in the development of our search strategy. The protocol was registered on the PROSPERO database (CRD42016052461) and published in a peer-reviewed journal (Finning et al., 2017).

**Conflict of interest**

The authors have declared that they have no competing or potential conflicts of interest.

**Ethical information**

No ethical approval was required for this review.

**Correspondence**

Katie Finning, Child Mental Health Research Group, University of Exeter Medical School, College House, St Luke’s Campus, College Road, Exeter, EX1 2LU, UK; Email: K.Finning@exeter.ac.uk

**Supporting information**

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article: **Appendix S1.** Summary of search terms and measurement types used by studies.

**References**


© 2019 Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health.


StataCorp. (2015). *Stata statistical software: Release 14*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.


*Accepted for publication: 14 January 2019*