



Q1 Look who's judging—Feedback source modulates brain activation to 2 performance feedback in social anxiety

Q2 Jutta Peterburs^{a,*}, Carolin Sandrock^b, Wolfgang H.R. Miltner^b, Thomas Straube^a

^a Institute of Medical Psychology and Systems Neuroscience, University of Münster, Von-Esmarch-Str. 52, 48149 Münster, Germany

^b Department of Biological and Clinical Psychology, University of Jena, Am Steiger 3, Haus 1, 07743 Jena, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 December 2015

Accepted 16 March 2016

Available online xxxx

Keywords:

Performance monitoring

Social phobia

Feedback processing

Social context

Self-focus

ABSTRACT

It is as yet unknown if behavioral and neural correlates of performance monitoring in socially anxious individuals are affected by whether feedback is provided by a person or a computer. This fMRI study investigated modulation of feedback processing by feedback source (person vs. computer) in participants with high (HSA) (N = 16) and low social anxiety (LSA) (N = 16). Subjects performed a choice task in which they were informed that they would receive positive or negative feedback from a person or the computer. Subjective ratings indicated increased arousal and anxiety in HSA versus LSA, most pronounced for social and negative feedback. FMRI analyses yielded hyperactivation in ventral medial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC)/anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and insula for social relative to computer feedback, and in mPFC/ventral ACC for positive relative to negative feedback in HSA as compared to LSA. These activation patterns are consistent with increased interoception and self-referential processing in social anxiety, especially during processing of positive feedback. Increased ACC activation in HSA to positive feedback may link to unexpectedness of (social) praise as posited in social anxiety disorder (SAD) psychopathology. Activation in rostral ACC showed a reversed pattern, with decreased activation to positive feedback in HSA, possibly indicating altered action values depending on feedback source and valence. The present findings corroborate a crucial role of mPFC for performance monitoring in social anxiety.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Inc. 31

1. Introduction

Exaggerated fear of social (performance) situations and particularly negative evaluation are core symptoms of social anxiety disorder (SAD; DSM-V, American Psychiatric Association, 2013). SAD patients experience such fear persistently, intensely and chronically, often leading to avoidance of social and performance situations, difficulties with everyday activities and work, and with forming and maintaining interpersonal relationships. Lifetime prevalence of SAD has been estimated at about 12.6 % for adults in the U.S. (Kessler et al., 2005), highlighting the need for research into etiology, neural underpinnings and treatment options for this disorder.

High levels of social anxiety can also be found in non-clinical populations, suggesting that SAD and non-pathological shyness as opposite ends of a continuum for social anxiety may depend on the same dysfunctional mechanisms (Stein et al., 2000). Contemporary theories of social anxiety in non-clinical populations and SAD focus on the role of cognitive processes, specifically negative information processing biases, for maintenance of the disorder (Clark and Wells, 1995; Leary and Kowalski, 1995; Rapee and Heimberg, 1997). Individuals with high levels of social anxiety are prone to destructive interpretation

particularly of negative evaluative information, anticipating social rejection and other negative consequences (Clark and Wells, 1995; Turner et al., 1992). Biased information processing is also evident in altered responses to ambiguous social stimuli and systematic underestimation of occurrence rates for positive social events (for a review, see Heinrichs and Hofmann, 2001). Furthermore, socially anxious individuals are prone to dysfunctional self-perception and self-focused processing in situations of potential social threat (Clark and Wells, 1995).

An increasing number of neuroimaging studies have taken on identifying the neural underpinnings of SAD. These studies frequently report hyperactivation in anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), amygdala, insula, prefrontal cortex (PFC), and sensory regions during processing of different types of disorder-related stimuli in SAD (e.g. Amir et al., 2005; Cooney et al., 2006; Phan et al., 2006; Stein et al., 2002; Straube et al., 2004; Straube et al., 2006). Moreover, anticipation of public speech situations, a common tool in symptom provocation, is associated with deactivation of the ventral striatum, a region crucially involved in reward processing (Boehme et al., 2013). Overall, these findings suggest that SAD involves a distributed network of brain regions contributing to emotional and threat processing as well as performance monitoring. In accordance with this, a recent study reported altered feedback processing in a sample of high socially anxious (HSA) subjects (Heitmann et al., 2014). Activation in medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) to performance feedback was increased in HSA as compared to low socially

* Corresponding author. Fax: +49 251 83 55494.

E-mail address: Jutta.Peterburs@uni-muenster.de (J. Peterburs).

86 anxious individuals (LSA), likely reflecting increased self-focused attention
87 in response to feedback in social anxiety. This notion is supported
88 by earlier findings of increased mPFC activation in response to self-
89 referential comments in HSA (Blair et al., 2008). This is well in line
90 with the cognitive model of social anxiety (Clark and Wells, 1995)
91 which proposes increased self-focused attention in social situations to
92 trigger anxiety and dysfunctional processing.

93 Surprisingly, only few studies have as yet investigated modulating
94 factors for performance monitoring in SAD patients or HSA individuals.
95 Recent findings from an electroencephalography (EEG) study with
96 event-related potentials suggest that presence of an observer is associ-
97 ated with increased neural responses to performance errors in HSA sub-
98 jects (Barker et al., 2015). These results emphasize the importance of
99 the (social) context in which an action takes place for performance
100 monitoring. Additionally, neural responses and brain activation patterns
101 to feedback may also be modulated by feedback source. Specifically, it is
102 as yet unclear if performance feedback is differentially processed in
103 HSA as compared to LSA subjects depending on whether feedback is
104 provided by a person (i.e. social feedback) or by, for instance, a comput-
105 er (non-social feedback). The present functional magnetic resonance
106 imaging (fMRI) study was aimed to scrutinize this question. HSA and
107 LSA subjects performed a computerized choice task in which they re-
108 ceived positive or negative performance feedback that was provided
109 by either a person or a computer. Subsequently, outside the scanner,
110 participants rated feedback with regard to subjective valence, arousal,
111 and perceived anxiety. HSA subjects were expected to experience both
112 negative and positive feedback as more negative, more arousing, and
113 more anxiety-inducing than LSA subjects, particularly when provided
114 by a person (social feedback). Moreover, we expected neural responses
115 to feedback to be modulated by both feedback valence and feedback
116 source in HSA as compared to LSA subjects. Specifically, HSA relative
117 to LSA subjects were hypothesized to show differential activation pat-
118 terns for social as compared to non-social feedback within brain regions
119 previously implicated in SAD and in feedback processing, i.e. mPFC, ACC,
120 amygdala, insula, and striatum.

121 2. Material and methods

122 2.1. Subjects

123 Participants were selected from a large volunteer database at the In-
124 stitute for Biological and Clinical Psychology at the University of Jena,
125 Germany. This database comprised 639 persons who had previously
126 completed an online version of the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale
127 (LSAS; German version; Stangier and Heidenreich, 2004) as part of
128 a large-scale screening for social anxiety. Of these persons, 32 (age
129 range 18 to 26 years) were selected for participation in the present
130 study based on strict criteria in order to yield two extreme groups of
131 subjects ($N = 16$ for each) that differed maximally with regard to social
132 anxiety scores. Specifically, 16 subjects (all female) with the highest
133 LSAS scores (≥ 60) were assigned to the high socially anxious (HSA)
134 group, and 16 subjects with the lowest LSAS scores (< 25), matched to
135 the HSA group for gender and age, were assigned to the low socially
136 anxious (LSA). Note that HSA subjects did not receive full diagnostic
137 evaluations and thus cannot be referred to as SAD patients, even though
138 LSAS scores > 60 indicate symptom levels that are commonly observed
139 in clinical samples (Mennin et al., 2002; Rytwinski et al., 2009). In
140 order to further ensure two extreme groups with regard to social
141 anxiety, subjects were required to complete the German version of the
142 Social Phobia and Anxiety Inventory [SPAI; Fydrich, 2002]. For HSA sub-
143 jects, SPAI scores of ≥ 4 were required. For LSA subjects, SPAI scores of
144 < 3.5 were required. All participants were female to ensure homogeneity
145 within and between the two groups, and none of the subjects were stu-
146 dents of either art or psychology, due to the stimulus material used in
147 the experimental task and the cover story (see below). All participants
148 were right-handed adults (according to self-report) with no history of

neurological or psychiatric diseases. Subjects had normal or corrected-
149 to-normal vision and met the general requirements for participation
150 in fMRI studies (e.g. no ferromagnetic implants, no claustrophobia). At
151 time of testing, participants were asked to complete the German ver-
152 sions of the Beck Depression Inventory [BDI, Hautzinger et al., 1995]
153 and the Fear of Negative Evaluation [SANB; Kemper et al., 2011]
154 questionnaire.

155 Mean age and mean scores on the clinical questionnaires for HSA
156 and LSA subjects are provided in Table 1. HSA as compared to LSA sub-
157 jects showed significantly higher scores for all questionnaires sensitive
158 to social anxiety and fear of evaluation. Furthermore, BDI scores were
159 significantly increased in HSA as compared to LSA, reaching mild clinical
160 significance.

161 The present study conforms to the Declaration of Helsinki and was
162 approved by the ethics committee of the University of Jena, Germany.
163 Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects prior to partic-
164 ipation. Subjects received monetary compensation or course credit for
165 participation.

166 2.2. Experimental task

167 The task was an elaborate computerized choice task specifically de-
168 signed for high personal relevance and standardized performance-
169 related feedback. Participants were informed that the study was
170 aimed to investigate task performance and feedback processing in task
171 that required high levels of abstract thinking. Subjects viewed pictures
172 of artwork and selected the alleged artist's intent from four options
173 provided on the screen, subsequently receiving positive or negative
174 feedback about their choice. Importantly, prior to starting the task, sub-
175 jects were informed that a member of the Psychology Department had
176 specifically selected the pictures according to unambiguity of content
177 and wealth of information about the artists and their work in order to
178 allow for correct and incorrect choices. In reality, pictures had been se-
179 lected for ambiguity and two plausible and two rather implausible
180 choices were provided on each trial in order to allow feedback to be
181 standardized while still appearing performance-related to the subjects.
182 In addition, for several pictures, one extremely unlikely response option
183 was provided and coupled with negative feedback in case subjects
184 wanted to “test” the task.

185 A schematic illustration of the time course of stimulus presentation
186 in the task is provided in Fig. 1. On each trial, a painting was presented
187 alongside four plausible artist intent options for 6 seconds. Participants
188 selected an option by pressing one of four response buttons, followed by
189 a delay phase (2 to 6 s) in which a fixation cross was presented. Subse-
190 quently, subjects received positive or negative feedback about their
191 choice or were asked to respond faster on future trials if response time
192 had exceeded 6 s. Feedback was represented by a letter stimulus
193 (“R” for correct, “F” for false) that was shown centrally for 2 s. Trials
194 ended with presentation of a fixation cross for 6 to 10 s.

195 Crucially, participants completed two runs of the task. In one run,
196 participants were informed that feedback was provided by the comput-
197 er based on a program that accessed information about correct and in-
198 correct responses for each picture. In the second run, participants
199 were informed that feedback would be provided by a person (social
200

201 **Table 1**
202 Mean age and mean scores (\pm standard deviation) on clinical questionnaires for high
203 (HSA) and low socially anxious subjects (LSA)

	HSA	LSA	<i>t</i> value	<i>p</i> value
Age (years)	20.88 \pm 1.93	21.75 \pm 2.05	-1.244	.223
LSAS	74.88 \pm 10.18	9.02 \pm 5.92	22.368	<.0001
SPAI	4.69 \pm 0.48	2.39 \pm 0.59	12.073	<.0001
SANB	59.63 \pm 8.68	37.63 \pm 7.96	7.474	<.0001
BDI	14.39 \pm 9.30	2.95 \pm 2.76	4.701	<.0001

204 LSAS, Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale; SPAI, Social Phobia Anxiety Inventory; SANB, Fear of
205 Negative Evaluation; BDI, Beck Depression Inventory.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6023601>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6023601>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)