Attentional Bias and Training in Social Anxiety Disorder
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ABSTRACT

Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is one of the most effective treatment modalities for social anxiety disorder (SAD), showing a high level of clinical evidence supporting its effectiveness. On the other hand, lack of the desired benefit from this treatment in some patients causes continuation of the search for new techniques. Recent research studies have focused on attentional bias and attention training in SAD. Attention processes in SAD have been a major target of interest and investigation since the introduction of the first cognitive models explaining SAD. In the first model, it was highlighted that attention was self-focused. The relationship between threatening stimuli and attention was considered in the subsequent models. Attentional bias towards threat may take place in several ways, such as facilitated processing of threat, difficulty in disengaging attention from the threat and avoidance of attention from the threat. After these descriptions regarding the phenomenology of the disorder, treatments to modify attention, processes were developed. In spite of conflicting results, investigations on attentional training are promising. Attention processes, attentional bias and attentional training in SAD are discussed in this review.
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INTRODUCTION

Social anxiety disorder (SAD) is a prevalent (1) disorder which may cause severe disability (2). According to the cognitive model, individuals with SAD experience anxiety in social situations, due to their cognitive distortions that they will be rejected or fall into an embarrassing condition (3). Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is one of the treatment methods that are proven to be effective in SAD (4). Classical CBT includes detection and changing of dysfunctional cognitions and gradual exposure (5). Although classical CBT methods have been proven to be effective to some extent in patients with SAD, it does not cause a significant decrease in symptoms in one third of the patients (6). For this reason, search for more effective CBT methods for treatment of SAD continues. One of the most interesting among these new methods is attentional training, which is used to change attention processes.

Attention processes in SAD have become an area of research since the first cognitive models of the disorder. The advances in attentional training methods have brought a large amount of publications on this subject. For these reasons, attention processes in SAD, attentional bias, and attentional training were discussed comprehensively in this review.

Anxiety and Attention Processes

Bias occurring in the processing of information on danger plays an etiological role in anxiety disorders (7,8). Anxiety develops as a result of detection of threatening stimuli, activation of the archaic danger mode, secondary activation of thought and other reflective modes, respectively, according to the first anxiety model of Beck and Clark (9). Various cognitive and behavioral activities to provide safety follow these steps. Directing the attention toward a threat was explained by automatic processes, except for Wells and Matthews (10), according to whom, direction of attention toward threat is determined by a meta-cognitive belief such as “It is important to monitor threats.” In the model by Williams et al. (11), the decision that the threat level of the information to be processed is strong or weak is determined by the affective decision mechanism, after which sources are directed at processing the stimulus. In the anxiety model of Mogg and Bradley (12) significance evaluation mechanism automatically assesses the threatening stimuli and targets engagement system allocates attention toward the stimuli. The attention system in the anxiety model of Eysenck et al. (13) also operates automatically. The activity of the attention network related to threats is facilitated automatically and task-related attention system cannot work. In another model, pre-attention threat assessment system evaluates the environmental stimuli. The threatening stimuli are directed into a source allocation system and physiological stimulation occurs. After this, the threat assessment system evaluates the threat contextually and analyzes the present coping sources. If the level of threat is perceived as high, attention remains focused on the threat (14). Yiend and Matthews (15) claimed that anxiety is not decisive in the initial perception of threat, and the main difference between anxious and nonanxious indi-
Experimental Tasks Used To Reveal Attentional Bias

In the literature, several tasks have been used to evaluate attention processes in anxiety disorders. The emotional Stroop test, dot-probe paradigm, and emotional spatial cueing test are frequently used in experimental paradigms investigating the attentional bias in relation with threat in anxiety. Thus it can be useful to summarize them briefly.

The emotional Stroop test is a modified form of classical Stroop test. The Stroop effect reflects the performance difference in color naming between concordant (i.e., the word “red” written in red color) and discordant (i.e., the word “red” written in green color) stimuli. The Stroop effect defines the failure in focusing on the targeted dimension of the color. When pictures are used instead of words, the individual is asked to name the color of the face showing a neutral or angry expression. If there is bias about the threat, there is a delay in expressing the color of the related faces. But this delay is attributed to a voluntary avoidance of threatening stimulus or to the negative load of the stimulus, rather than trapping of attention by the threat (16,17). In order to overcome these problems, McLeod et al. (16) designed the dot-probe paradigm. In the paradigm of perception of probe (which may be a point or a line), neutral photographs (for example a tree) or a threatening face expression are used on the left and right sides of the screen. These photographs are simultaneously shown on the screen and fade away quickly (generally in 500 milliseconds) and a probe is shown on the right or left side of the screen. It is intended that the individual should follow this probe as quickly as possible. In other words, the patient is asked to direct his attention at the probe that appears on the screen. The participant should respond to a neutral stimulus (probe) in the dot-probe paradigm. Thus, development of a delayed response due to vigilance or other biased conditions is blocked (18).

In the dot-probe paradigm, when the target probe follows the threatening stimulus, this may cause an increase in performance in marking the probe. The cause of this increase may be an inability of detachment of attention from the threatening stimulus or a fast shift of attention to the threatening stimulus.

The attentional bias directed toward threat may occur in several forms: facilitation of directing attention toward the threat, difficulty in detaching attention from the threat, and avoidance of threat by attention. Facilitated attention is directing attention toward a threat stimulus or other biased conditions. In the presence of difficulty in detachment of attention from the threat, attention is trapped by threat and cannot be directed toward another direction. In attentional avoidance, attention is directed in the opposite direction of the threatening stimulus.

Attentional Training In Sad

One of the most intensely studied areas in SAD has been attentional bias and attention training in recent years. Computer technology is used in this training. The presence of a bias toward threatening stimuli in SAD is well known. This bias may be related to the interpretation of the stimulus or the attentional bias may be over-focusing on the threatening stimulus or avoidance of attention (22,37,38,39). There are many studies that have found the bias as disengagement of attention from the threatening stimulus (40,41). Attentional bias may be decreased with an effective cognitive behavioral therapy (42). The reoccurrence of attentional bias is an indication of an increase in anxiety in social phobia (43). All of these data suggest that interventions targeting attention processes may be beneficial in SAD.

Attentional training is one of the techniques for altering cognitive bias. The most frequently used procedure is the dot-probe paradigm. Attentional training is generally executed as 8 sessions of 20-minute duration. These training sessions are usually applied in parallel with CBT sessions. In these trainings the probe is generally placed after neutral stimuli. The patient may be trained to redirect his/her attention away from threatening stimulus, toward nonthreatening ones with the probe-finding paradigm.
Electrophysiological changes occurring during dot-probe paradigm were investigated in an interesting electrophysiological study in 12 patients with SAD and 15 healthy controls, and patients with SAD were found to show a hypervigilant behavior, with the contribution of the fusiform gyrus in the reaction against angry faces in the early phases, and a decrease in visual processing of stimuli with prominent emotional content was detected in SAD. These results were replicated in a double-blind, placebo-controlled study (44). In this study, which included 44 patients with SAD and after attention modification, half of the patients had improved to such an extent that they could not fulfill SAD diagnostic criteria after treatment. Recently, directing attention toward nonthreatening stimuli was investigated by Heeren et al. (45), and this training has caused a decreased anxiety which could be measured as self-report, behavioral, and physiological. Decrease in anxiety was more than directing attention toward the threat. In the study by Klumpp and Amir (50), training of both directing attention toward the threat and away from threat was found to decrease anxiety.

In the most recent studies about attentional training in SAD, internet or smartphones were used to deliver the treatment. For example, in a randomized controlled trial, attention bias modification training was delivered via smartphones, and this training compared to control training in a double-blind design, also including a waitlist condition in social anxiety. Both training groups showed greater reductions in social anxiety than the waitlist (53). A recently concluded trial examined effects of an internet-based attentional training on self-report measures, behavioral data, and diagnostic status in individuals with social phobia (N=56). The findings questioned the effectiveness of internet-based attentional training in social phobia because the effect was insignificant (54). Attention training via internet is studied in sixty-eight individuals seeking treatment for SAD. In this controlled study, the effectiveness of attention training with internet was also found to be low (55). As a result, internet-based attention training cannot be recommended as stand-alone intervention for SAD.

In many studies, attentional training was found to be effective in SAD (44, 47, 48, 49, 50). In the study by Li et al. (51), attentional bias was found to decrease after 7 days of attentional training on emotionally positive faces in individuals with SAD. In addition, such training decreased the fear that the individual reported to experience during social interactions (51). Similarly, Amir et al. (49) enabled individuals with SAD to pay attention to neutral faces or a control task after one session of training. Training toward focusing on neutral faces was found to be more effective. In their study on 36 patients with SAD, Schmidt et al. (52) detected a significant decrease in social anxiety of individuals after attentional training with neutral faces. These results were replicated in a double-blind, placebo-controlled study (44). In this study, which included 44 patients with SAD and after attention modification, half of the patients had improved to such an extent that they could not fulfill SAD diagnostic criteria after treatment. Recently, directing attention toward nonthreatening stimuli was investigated by Heeren et al. (45), and this training has caused a decreased anxiety which could be measured as self-report, behavioral, and physiological. Decrease in anxiety was more than directing attention toward the threat. In the study by Klumpp and Amir (50), training of both directing attention toward the threat and away from threat was found to decrease anxiety.

Response to probes opposite to threatening cues in SAD is slower than nonthreatening cues (31). Heeren et al. (45) found that training for directing attention toward nonthreatening stimuli was more effective than training for directing attention toward threatening stimuli in SAD in their study on 57 patients with generalized SAD. In a meta-analysis of 12 studies and 467 participants, therapies on attentional bias were found to be effective in the treatment of anxiety disorder (46).

In conclusion, attention processes are important parameters in the conceptualization of SAD; especially, the relationship between threatening stimuli and attention is important in the mechanisms underlying this disorder. It must be kept in mind that attention training is not a first-line treatment for SAD and should always be combined with CBT or other evidence-based treatment modalities. Nevertheless, attentional training may be beneficial because it exerts a positive effect on information processing, by redirecting attention processes trapped by threat in social environments toward other relevant stimuli.
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