

## **Looming Cognitive Style As A Predictor of Social Anxiety**

### **Authors**

Ayşenaz Akbay<sup>1\*</sup>

### **Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Master Program in Clinical Psychology, Graduate School of Social Sciences Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 34755, Turkey.

\*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-Mail:

[aysenaz.akbay@std.yeditepe.edu.tr](mailto:aysenaz.akbay@std.yeditepe.edu.tr)

Preprint

## **Abstract**

Looming Cognitive Style (LCS) has been proposed as a cognitive vulnerability factor specific to anxiety. This study aims to investigate the predictive role of LCS on trait and state social anxiety. With this purpose, for social anxiety manipulation, 30 participants were asked to make a short presentation about themselves. This relationship of concern was aimed to be investigated by assessing LCS and social anxiety assessments taken prior to the presentation.

In this regard, the Demographic Information Form, Liebowitz Social Anxiety Questionnaire, Looming Maladaptive Style Questionnaire-Revised (LMSQ-R), State Social Looming Questionnaire, and Visual Analogue Scales for anxiety level were used to gather data from the participants. In order to test and finalize the applied procedure, pilot studies were conducted and expert opinions were taken prior to the main study. The results yielded by correlation and regression analysis showed that LCS and trait social anxiety were positively correlated, and state social looming predicted the change in anxiety. A significant relationship between trait LCS and state social looming or trait social anxiety and state social anxiety could not be found. The findings were debated in the light of relevant previous research, and possible contributions of the study to the literature and clinical practice were discussed.

**Keywords:** State looming cognitive style; state social anxiety; trait looming cognitive style; trait social anxiety

## **INTRODUCTION**

Social anxiety is a highly prevalent and debilitating problem affecting the lives of many people (Kessler et al., 2005). It significantly diminishes the quality of life in many domains causing a marked decrease in occupational, relational, or cognitive functioning (Acarturk et al., 2009; Alden & Taylor, 2004; Crum & Pratt, 2001; Eysenck et al., 2007; Moitra et al., 2011; Patel et al., 2002). Therefore, it is important to comprehensively understand social anxiety to be able to better help people who suffer from it.

Social situations are inherently threatening for socially anxious people causing great distress before, during, and after them. Feared social situations might vary from holding eye contact with someone to using a public restroom or making a presentation for a large group of people. Socially anxious individuals usually fear that they will embarrass themselves or people will criticize them when they encounter a social situation. Physical symptoms often accompany these fears such as blushing, trembling, or pounding heartbeats. These social situations are endured with great anxiety or avoided to a great extent if possible.

Individuals who suffer from social anxiety have biased cognitions regarding social situations such as attentional bias, memory bias, or interpretation bias. They tend to selectively focus on negative social cues, selectively recall negative information, or interpret neutral stimuli as threatening (Cody & Teachman, 2010; Heimberg et al., 2010; Mansell & Clark, 1999). For example, one might perceive a neutral face listening to them as being bored, or critical (Yoon & Zimbarg, 2008). To date, the significant contribution of these cognitive factors to the development and maintenance of social anxiety has been stressed in the relevant literature (e.g., Huppert & Foa, 2004; Hirsch et al., 2006; Penney & Abbott, 2014). The cognitive models of social anxiety disorder (SAD) propose that socially anxious individuals have certain beliefs or assumptions about themselves, other people, or the world that are activated in social situations (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997) They predominantly engage in danger-related thoughts and their information processing is disturbed (Hirsch & Clark, 2004).

Riskind (1997) introduced Looming Cognitive Style (LCS) as an overarching cognitive vulnerability factor for anxiety disorders. LCS is a danger schema emphasizing the dynamic nature of threat appraisals. This model focuses not only on the content of biased cognitions but the way in which they are experienced. It refers to a tendency of people to have perceptions, mental images, and scenarios that the actual or anticipated danger is rapidly approaching and increasing in risk. The model assumes that LCS acts as a danger schema leading to biased information processing

which elicits anxiety. LCS differentiates from broadly accepted cognitive models not only because it centers upon the dynamic nature of danger appraisals, but it is also believed to be an anxiety-specific vulnerability factor, unlike the previously formulated cognitive models. Previously formulated cognitive models predict both mood disorders like depression and anxiety-related disorders, while LCS is a vulnerability factor specifically predicting anxiety, not depression (Riskind & Williams, 2005). It shows that LCS is possibly an important cognitive antecedent or moderator of anxiety-related problems that are worthy of further exploration. Although numerous studies have provided support that LCS is associated with anxiety, much less has focused on more specific anxiety disorders and problems such as social anxiety. Therefore, the present study aims to explore LCS and its relationship to social anxiety.

### **Social Anxiety**

SAD is characterized by a persistent fear or anxiety of social situations in which there is possible scrutiny or evaluation of other people. Some examples of such situations can be eating in front of others, holding eye contact with strangers, or performing to a crowded audience. The potential negative judgements, humiliation or embarrassment evokes intense fear and anxiety which is disproportionate to the situation. People suffering from SAD usually either avoid such situations or endure them with intense fear and anxiety leading to significant impairments in many domains of life (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2013). SAD is among the most common mental health disorders, and it is the second most prevalent anxiety disorder following specific phobias (Kessler et al., 2005; Bandelow et al., 2015). Individuals with SAD experience difficulty and impairment in social, occupational, and educational domains of their lives. These functional impairments often lead to a poor or decreased quality of life (Dryman et al., 2016). This reduction in quality is not only true for clinical samples, but it also affects non-clinical groups (Chartier et al., 1998).

### **Cognitive Vulnerability to Social Anxiety**

In addition to biological and environmental factors that play a role in the development and maintenance of SAD, contemporary theories of social anxiety stress the importance of cognitive processes (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). These cognitive approaches emphasize the importance of thoughts, assumptions, and beliefs the socially anxious individual holds that contribute to the maintenance of the disorder (Hofmann, 2008). It is proposed that socially anxious individuals exhibit certain threat-related cognitive biases or distortions regarding potentially threatening social situations. They perceive social situations as intrinsically threatening, and tend to exaggerate the possible negative consequences of a social situation such as rejection or humiliation. Therefore, they are likely to avoid putting themselves in a socially threatening situation that induces great anxiety developing self-protective strategies referred to as “safety behaviors” which contribute to the maintenance of the problem (Salkovskis, 1991). In order to understand cognitive processes underlying the maintenance of social anxiety, several models are introduced that provide a framework. Clark and Wells’ (1995) and Rapee and Heimberg’s (1997) cognitive models of social anxiety are the most influential models that contributed to the comprehension of social anxiety to a great extent.

These cognitive models propose that when an individual encounters a feared social situation, a series of assumptions, beliefs, and rules are triggered about oneself, other people, or the world in general. For example, one might have thoughts or hold beliefs such as, “I am boring,” “People are judging me,” or “I must be perfect so that people will like me.” This leads to biased appraisals of a given situation and leads to increased anxiety. One of the fundamental factors contributing to the persistence of the disorder Clark and Wells (1995) propose is “self-focused attention.” According to the model, in an anxiety-provoking social situation, socially anxious individuals experience a shift in their attention. Their attention shifts from outer objective reality to their internal processes. It leads them to monitor themselves with high self-consciousness, neglecting what is happening externally. This processing of the self as a social object prevents them from evaluating the objective social situation or other people’s actual reactions. As a result, processing the external evidence contradictory to what is believed and experienced internally is prevented. Another important factor that contributes to maintaining social anxiety is “safety behaviors.” Safety behaviors refer to any sort of behaviors, mental operations, or internal processes that help the individual avoid a feared situation. They can vary from not eating in front of other people to memorizing what one is going to speak about. When the feared catastrophe does not occur, it is

attributed to these safety behaviors. Therefore, the individual fails to discover whether there is a real social danger, and their fears remain disconfirmed (Wells et al., 2016). Finally, Clark and Wells' (1995) model focuses on biased information processing during and after social situations. It is hypothesized that socially anxious individuals retrieve distorted information about the encountered social situation. For example, selectively recall negative social cues instead of positive ones, and have a tendency to interpret ambiguous information as negative. This biased post-event processing leads to strengthening their negative beliefs and assumptions contributing to the maintenance of social anxiety. All of the discussed factors interact with each other and create a vicious cycle. In line with Clark and Wells' (1995) model, Rapee and Heimberg (1997) emphasize the importance of attentional processes and posit that self-focused attention plays a central role in the maintenance of social anxiety. It is argued that socially anxious individuals hold strong beliefs that other people are inherently critical, and they will be evaluated negatively. Also, they value other people's opinions about them. Encountering or anticipating a social situation, they have mental representations of themselves about their appearance, behavior, and how they might come up to other people. In addition to Clark and Wells' model, it is hypothesized that individuals do not direct their attention to internal processes neglecting the environment, but they pay close attention to external cues as well (Shultz & Heimberg, 2008). They monitor both internal and external information about the likelihood of their feared outcomes such as negative evaluation. These processes do not occur in isolation, instead, they often influence and interact with each other.

### **Looming Cognitive Style (LCS)**

Riskind (1997) introduced the looming maladaptive vulnerability model as another cognitive model of anxiety postulating that LCS is an overarching cognitive factor predicting anxiety symptoms and disorders. The model proposes that some individuals develop LCS due to a number of possible factors such as adverse childhood experiences, and this puts them at a greater risk for anxiety. LCS, also known as looming maladaptive style, is a danger schema referring to an individual's biased interpretations of danger and threat. It is characterized by a tendency to perceive threats and dangers as rapidly intensifying, escalating, and approaching. Individuals who are vulnerable to LCS construct mental scenarios and appraisals in which the danger rapidly approaches in time and space while rising in risk.

What distinguishes LCS from conventional cognitive models and theories of anxiety is this emphasis on the temporal and dynamic nature of perceived threats and dangers. Similar to other widely cited models, it emphasizes the importance of maladaptive cognitions that contribute to the development and maintenance of anxiety symptoms; but it shifts the focus from the content of the cognitions to the way they are experienced. It is unique for highlighting the importance of not only what people think, but also how they think.

LCS has been proposed as a predictive factor specific to anxiety (Riskind et al., 2000). However, it has not attracted enough attention compared to other well-known cognitive models (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997) in the literature regarding cognitive vulnerability to anxiety. Studies investigating the relationship between LCS and specific anxiety-related problems such as social anxiety are even more limited. The present study aims to expand on previous studies and examine the predictive role of LCS in social anxiety. One of the main objectives of the study is to replicate the results of limited studies that provide evidence that LCS predicts trait social anxiety. In the relevant literature, the relationship between LCS and social anxiety has not been examined in the present time, in the presence of an actual social threat. Therefore, the secondary goal of the study is to address this gap in the literature. It aims to extend the previous findings by investigating this relationship in an anxiety-provoking environment. In order to accomplish this, the study exposes the participants to a presentation task in which they are expected to make a presentation about themselves. Prior to the presentation, participants were asked to fill out questionnaires regarding LCS and social anxiety similar to previous studies (e.g., Brown & Stopa, 2008; Haikal & Hong, 2010). What is unique to the present study is that in the second part where the levels of state social anxiety and state social looming of participants were assessed. Most, if not all, of the studies in the literature focus on the relationship between LCS and social anxiety, considered them only as trait characteristics. The present study is concerned about momentary states of anxiety and looming as responses to a socially stressful situation. It aims to further examine the relationship between LCS and social anxiety as state-like characteristics by exposing the participants to an anxiety-provoking environment. This manipulation of anxiety allows observing whether and to what extent social looming accounts for the change in anxiety. In this way, gaining a better understanding of the relationship between LCS and social anxiety during a performance would be possible. In addition, LCS puts great emphasis on the dynamic nature of perceived threats (Riskind et al., 2005a), so measuring the level of social looming at a time in

which the individual is engaging in it, might help to better capture this dynamic nature of it. Therefore, the current study also explored how trait-like characteristics present themselves in the presence of a social demand possibly inducing anxiety, and whether a similar relationship between social anxiety and cognitive looming style is observed.

In summary, the goal of the present study is to contribute to the literature and support the previous findings that LCS predicts social anxiety. The secondary purpose of the study is to test whether trait LCS and social anxiety predict momentary responses of anxiety and looming during a situation that provokes social anxiety. Finally, it aims to find out whether the increase in anxiety is predicted by the extent to which they engage in social looming at that moment.

The hypotheses of the study are as below:

1. It is expected that trait LCS is positively correlated with trait social anxiety.
2. It is expected that trait LCS is positively correlated with state social looming.
3. It is expected that trait social anxiety is positively correlated with state social anxiety.
4. It is hypothesized that state social looming predicts the change in anxiety levels after the manipulation.

## **Method**

### **Pilot Study**

In order to establish a valid and reliable procedure with regard to state social anxiety and social looming, several studies were conducted including the expert views and repetitive pilot tests with necessary updates. Prior to the data collection, five psychologists were asked to evaluate the procedure that was going to be followed and the measurement tool for assessment of state social looming. A previous study including a similar procedure evaluation provided a basis for the current study (cf. Derin & Yorulmaz, 2021). The evaluators were given a brief description of the study, and presented with an evaluation form via Google Forms consisting of questions which were rated on a 10-point Likert-type scale. First of all, the evaluators were asked to rate the extent to which the instructions given to the participants were clear and understandable. It was agreed that



instructions were quite clear and easy to follow ( $M= 9.80, SD= .45$ ). They rated how much making participants prepare a presentation about themselves and the presence of a so-called evaluator during the presentation contribute to the procedure. Likewise, it was agreed that they were meaningfully contributing to the procedure ( $M= 9.00, SD= 1.23; M= 8.40, SD= 2.07$ ). Then, they rated whether they found the procedure appropriate for assessing the relationship between LCS and social anxiety; and the results showed a consensus that the procedure was overall appropriate ( $M= 9.20, SD= 0.84$ ).

Finally, the evaluators were asked to rate each item of the state social looming questionnaire. All four items of the questionnaire were found to be appropriate to measure state looming cognitive style with mean scores of 9.2, 9.4, 8.6, 9.2, and standard deviations of 1.30, 0.55, 2.07, 1.30, respectively. After the ratings, written feedback was given by the experts at the end about the procedure as well. Overall, the procedure was evaluated as appropriate for assessing the state social looming of the participants and investigating its relationship to social anxiety. Based on the ratings and comments of the evaluators, minor revisions were made in the structure of certain sentences in the state social looming questionnaire and in the instructions to make it more clear for the participants. After the expert view, participants who completed the pilot study were asked for their opinions about the procedure as well. After the participants completed the study, they were presented with an evaluation and feedback form. The form involved four questions rated on a 10-point Likert scale. The first question asked participants how clear the instructions and questions in the study were. Similar to the expert view, it was found quite understandable and clear ( $M= 9.42, SD= 0.69$ ). The second question assessed the believability of the deception asking how persuasive it was being informed that an expert was evaluating them while presenting. The results supported that the deception worked properly ( $M= 8.42, SD= 1.26$ ). The third and fourth questions asked participants how anxiety-provoking it was to make a presentation about themselves, and being presented with a 30-second countdown while preparing on a 5-point Likert type scale. The answers showed that the demands of the study evoked moderate anxiety in the participants ( $M= 3.21, SD= 0.98; M= 3.63, SD= 1.01$ ) Finally, participants also provided written feedback about their opinions of the study. Based on the expert views and participants' feedback requiring minor revisions, the procedure was finalized.

## **Participants**

Nineteen participants (12 female, 7 male) in total who volunteered to participate in the study completed the pilot study. They were recruited from the general population by convenience sampling through social media. The mean age of the participants was 25.21 ( $SD= 1.93$ ), and the age range was between 20 to 30. The demographic information of the participants is displayed in Table 1. None of the participants were reported to be diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder before, or currently suffering from one.

## **Measures**

In the first part of the study participants completed Looming Maladaptive Style Questionnaire (LMSQ-R), The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, and a demographic information form. In the second part, they were presented with Visual Analogue Scales, State Social Looming Scale followed by an evaluation and feedback form.

### **Looming Maladaptive Style Questionnaire (LMSQ-R)**

LMSQ-R is a measure of LCS originally developed by Riskind et al. (2000) assessing an individual's tendency to appraise threatening situations as rapidly increasing in danger and escalating in risk. The scale has been adapted to Turkish by Altan-Atalay and Saritas-Atalar (2018). It includes six vignettes depicting potentially anxiety-provoking situations involving either a physical or social threat such as speaking in front of a large audience or having an unusual heart palpitation all of a sudden. The participants are asked to vividly imagine themselves in the described situations and answer three 5-point Likert-type questions following each vignette. The questions assessed the extent to which threats are constant or rapidly escalating, worsening, increasing in risk, and the extent they vividly imagine them (See Appendix 4)

The scale has two subscales of physical looming and social looming. The physical looming subscale includes depictions of stressful events involving a physical threat (e.g., a car crash), while the social looming subscale includes social threats (e.g., a potential breakup). Higher scores on the scales indicate a higher level of LCS. The original scale has a high level of internal consistency ( $\alpha = .91$ ) and test-retest reliability ( $r = .91$ ) over a 4-month time interval. In the present study, the Turkish form of the scale is used. The Turkish translation of the scale displays adequate levels of internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The internal consistency scores ranged from .85 and .90 while test-retest reliability scores are between .69 and .72 for the total scores and the subscale scores.

### **Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale**

The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale (LSAS) is a 24-item scale developed by Liebowitz (1987) to be able to assess individuals' fear or anxiety and avoidance behavior in a range of social situations such as making a phone call, maintaining eye contact, returning an item to the store, or expressing dislike/disagreement. The participants rate each item on a 4-point scale both for "fear or anxiety" and for "avoidance" from 0 (none, never avoided this in the last week) to 4 (severe, usually avoided this in the last week). These scores are summed to yield a total score with higher scores indicating greater social anxiety. The original scale demonstrated excellent internal consistency with a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.96 (Heimberg et al., 1999). The Turkish adaptation of the scale was established by Soykan et al. (2003) reporting sufficient psychometric properties.

### **State Social Looming Measure**

This is a measure derived from LMSQ-R constructed for assessing momentary social looming as it occurs. While LMSQ-R measures cognitive looming as a trait-like, persistent characteristic, this measure aims to capture the variance in state-like looming individuals engage in when exposed to an anxiety-provoking social situation. The measure is specific to the situation participants are in and reflects the potential social threat posed in the study. Participants are expected to make a presentation in front of two people, and they are informed that they will be evaluated. LMSQ-R had a vignette describing a similar situation involving public speaking as described before. The vignette was modified briefly to reflect the current real event (presentation). The same four 5-point Likert-type questions followed the brief vignette, again with little modifications (See Appendix 5). In the pilot study, the scale showed good internal consistency ( $\alpha = .93$ ).

### **Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)**

In order to assess participants' levels of anxiety, a visual analogue scale was presented at three different time points in the study. It asked participants to indicate the extent they feel comfortable, confident, and anxious (c.f., Haikal & Hong, 2010, Hirsch et al., 2003). The emotion intensity was rated on a scale ranging from 0 to 10 indicating not comfortable, confident, anxious at all; and extremely comfortable, confident, and anxious respectively. Level of anxiety is the main measure that was relevant for the study, and the other measures functioned as filler items.

### **Demographic Information Form**

At the end of the study, a demographic information form was presented to participants. It included information regarding their age, gender, and whether or not they have ever been or currently are diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder (See Appendix 1).

### **Procedure**

Ethical approval for all procedures was obtained from the Yeditepe University IRB committee prior to data collection. Participants for the pilot study were recruited by convenient sampling through social media. The study is conducted online via the video call software *Zoom* and the survey administration platform Google Forms in two parts. In the first part, participants who consented to participate in the study filled out the informed consent form followed by two questionnaires and a demographic information form using Google Forms. In the following week, for the second part of the study, participants were asked to join a Zoom meeting. First, the mood of the participants were assessed asking how happy, sad, and anxious they were feeling using visual analogue scales (VASs) ranging from 0 to 10 (Time 1). Then instructions were given to them regarding the presentation they are expected to make about themselves. They were asked to make a 2-minute presentation about things they like and things they would like to change about themselves (cf. Chen et al., 2018; Haikal & Hong, 2010; Kocovski et al., 2011; Perini et al., 2006). It is said that another person, a so-called expert, will be joining the meeting soon. They were also informed that the experimenter and this other professional will be evaluating their speaking and presentation skills. After the instructions, they were given the VASs again (Time 2). The participants were given 30 seconds to prepare for the presentation, and a countdown was presented during this time (cf. Haikal & Hong, 2010). Then, the experimenter joined the session from another account, displaying a different name and acting like the so-called expert. Right before the presentation, the participants completed VASs (Time 3) one more time followed by a short

questionnaire adapted from the LCS to the upcoming presentation in order to assess their state looming levels. Then they started their presentation and stopped by the experimenter when their time was up. After the presentation, they were all given positive feedback to lower presentation stress and boost positive mood. Participants re-rated their mood using the VAS (Time 4) to make sure they felt comfortable at the end of the study. Finally, they were thanked for their participation, and presented with a brief debriefing form followed by the evaluation and feedback form.

## **Main Study**

### **Participants**

Thirty-two participants were recruited via social media by convenience sampling. Two of the participants did not complete the second part of the study, and their data was not included in the analyses. The final sample consisted of 30 participants (22 female, 8 male). The mean age of the participants was 25.97 ( $SD= 1.69$ ), and the age range was between 22 to 29. None of the participants were reported to be currently diagnosed with a psychiatric diagnosis, and 1 of the participants has been diagnosed with depression in the past. The demographic information of the participants is demonstrated below in Table 2.

### **Measures**

Same measures are used as in pilot study.

### **Procedure**

The finalized procedure is followed as in pilot study.

## **RESULTS**

Before starting the analyses, 2 of the participants' data had been eliminated since they did not complete the second part of the study. Then, the distribution of the variables was assessed for normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were in the acceptable range. The visual inspections were orderly in favor of the normal distribution. The following analyses (t-test, correlation, and regression) were performed with data from 30 participants using SPSS.

## Descriptive

## Statistics

Means scores, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores for variables in the study are presented in Table 3.

## Manipulation Check

In order to test how the manipulation of social anxiety affected the participant, their change in anxiety levels was tested. VAS measurements assessing the anxiety levels of the participants were taken at the very beginning of the study (Time 1), right before the presentation (Time 2), and at the end of the study (Time 3). To examine the change in anxiety, VAS scores at three different time points were compared. It was expected that the manipulation would lead to a fluctuation in anxiety levels. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to compare the anxiety level in Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3. As expected, results showed that there was a significant change in anxiety levels at different time points it was measured ( $F(2,58)= 12.77, p < .001$ ).

It was predicted that the anxiety level of the participants was going to increase after they were given the instructions before they started their presentation. Therefore, it was expected that anxiety increases from Time 1 (at the beginning of the study) to Time 2 (right before the presentation). In order to test this, a paired samples t-test was conducted. The results confirmed that there was a significant increase in anxiety from Time 1 ( $M= 3.17, SD= 2.20$ ) to Time 2 ( $M= 4.63, SD=2.21$ ), ( $t(29) = -4.34, p < .001$ ).

The last VAS measurement was taken at the end of the study to make sure anxiety was induced only temporarily. Therefore, it was expected that the level of anxiety would drop from Time 2 to Time 3 (at the end of the study after positive feedback). To test this, another paired sample t-test was conducted. Likewise, the results of the analysis supported the expectation. There was a significant decrease in anxiety from Time 2 ( $M= 4.63, SD=2.21$ ) to Time 3 ( $M= 3.03, SD=2.06$ ), ( $t(29) = 4.44, p < .001$ ).

## Correlation Analysis

In order to test the correlations between study variables Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated. As Table 4 shows, LCS scores are positively correlated with trait social anxiety scores. It indicates that higher cognitive looming was found to be associated with higher social anxiety. However, the correlation between LCS and state social anxiety was not found to be significant. LCS was found to be significantly and positively correlated with change in anxiety. Trait social

anxiety was not significantly correlated with VAS2 scores measuring the anxiety level before the presentation or with change in anxiety. Intercorrelations among the variables of the study are presented in Table 4.

### **Regression Analysis**

One of the primary aims of the study was to investigate the relationship between state social looming and state anxiety. It was hypothesized that state social looming predicts the change in anxiety levels. In order to test this main hypothesis of the study, a simple linear regression was calculated. In the regression analysis change in anxiety scores places as the independent variable, whereas the state social looming was placed as the independent variable. State social looming explained %14 of the variance, and a significant regression equation was found ( $F(1,28)= 4.85, p < .001$ ) with an  $R^2$  of .15. State social looming significantly predicted the change in anxiety level. The summary of the regression model is presented in Table

### **Exploratory Analysis**

As stated above, the results did not yield a significant correlation between LCS and the state social looming measure. Exploratory analysis was conducted to examine this relationship in more detail. To test the relationship between the social looming sub-dimension of LMSQ-R and the state social looming measure, Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated. Similarly, the results did not yield a significant correlation between the social looming sub-scale of LMSQ-R and state social looming ( $r = .20, p > .05$ ).

## **DISCUSSION**

This study aimed to explore the relationship between LCS and social anxiety. It tried to investigate this relationship approaching LCS and social anxiety both as trait and state factors. By exposing the participants to an anxiety-provoking situation, it tried to understand whether LCS accounts for momentary changes in social anxiety in an anxiety-provoking situation. It contributed to the literature by drawing attention to LCS since the model offers a unique framework for understanding anxiety. Building on previous research, the present study tried to more thoroughly examine the role of LCS in social anxiety for a better understanding of the cognitive mechanisms underlying social anxiety.

The first hypothesis of the study was LCS and trait social anxiety are positively correlated. Consistent with the expectation, the results of the present study supported this prediction that LCS

was positively associated with trait social anxiety. This implies that people who perceive real or anticipated threats as rapidly approaching, increasing in risk, and getting closer in time tend to get more anxious in social situations and to engage in avoidance behaviors. These results are in accordance with previous studies that demonstrate a strong relationship between LCS and social anxiety. It contributes to the literature by showing that LCS plays an important role in more specific anxiety problems such as social anxiety.

What was novel about the present study is that it aimed to observe this relationship over the course of a social anxiety provoking situation. The design of the study exposed participants to a potentially socially threatening situation to observe short-term changes in anxiety. One of the studies examining the impact of LCS on short-time changes in anxiety was conducted by Riskind et al. (2007). Participants completed self-report measures multiple times in a short time interval. It was found that LCS predicted even a small amount of change in anxiety in a brief time interval. Likewise, it was hypothesized in the present study that LCS predicted change in state anxiety. As mentioned before, the highlight of the current study is that it attempts to examine this relationship in the presence of a threatening event. The study aimed to manipulate anxiety and test whether cognitive looming accounts for this momentary change in anxiety.

Based on the literature, a design was made that would allow observing both social looming and a change in social anxiety. Public speaking is one of the most common worries of socially anxious individuals, so the study involved a presentation task. In addition, it included a deception of being evaluated. Most, if not all, of the socially anxious people are worried that they will be evaluated in a negative manner in a social encounter. Fear of negative evaluation is a core component of social anxiety which is also one of the primary criteria in DSM-V characterizing SAD (APA, 2013). Cognitive models (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997) of social anxiety support that this anticipation of negative evaluation of other people contributes to social anxiety as well. Based on the relevant literature, deception was used to be able to better manipulate anxiety. The participants were told that another evaluator would join the presentation, and they will be evaluated based on their speaking skills. It was assumed that the deception would contribute to the anxiety manipulation. In addition, to be able to make temporal looming more salient, a countdown was used emphasizing the time for presentation approaching. The procedure was pilot tested and found to be appropriate for its purpose. State social looming of the participants and their anxiety levels at different time points were assessed. The results were in accordance with the hypothesis



that state social looming predicted the anxiety level of the participants before making a presentation and predicted the increase in anxiety.

As discussed previously, there is a gap in the literature examining the predictive role of LCS in specific kinds of anxiety. However, its relationship with different kinds of anxiety is not investigated thoroughly in the literature. The study expands the research on the relationship between LCS and anxiety and contributes to the literature with its focus on social anxiety both as a state and trait factor. It is beyond the scope of this present study to explore whether LCS is more strongly associated with social anxiety compared with other kinds of anxiety. However, it can be speculated that LCS might be a successful predictor of social anxiety in particular for several reasons. The looming model proposed by Riskind et al. (2000) provides a framework for understanding anxiety differentiating from other widely accepted cognitive models of anxiety (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). The most prominent quality of the model is that LCS was proposed as an anxiety-specific vulnerability factor. Many studies in the literature have demonstrated that LCS predicts anxiety, but not depression (for a review, see Riskind & Williams, 2005). Considering that LCS has a social looming sub-dimension that specifically focuses on social threat appraisals, it might be especially important in predicting social anxiety.

Another unique quality of LCS is important in understanding its relationship to social anxiety which is its focus on the dynamic nature of threat appraisals. Imagery plays a key role in the development and maintenance of social anxiety (Makkar & Grisham, 2011). Socially anxious individuals engage in negative imagery when exposed to a feared social situation or when they think about this feared situation (Hirsch & Holmes, 2007). In the literature, the content of the negative imagery has been greatly explored. For example, it has been explained that socially anxious people often construct visual images of themselves from an observer's point of view (Wells et al., 1998). In a semi-structured interview conducted by Hackmann et al. (2000), the images that occur to socially anxious people recurrently are explored. Recurring negative self-images were the most commonly reported images. Appearing anxious, being viewed negatively, or being judged are common themes of negative self-images (Chiu et al., 2022). Hinrichsen and Clark (2003) investigated anticipatory processing in social anxiety and found that individuals with high social anxiety have these negative imagery not only in real-life situations but when anticipating a social situation as well. However, the nature of these images is not paid that much attention in the literature regarding social anxiety. Broadly accepted cognitive models largely

focused on static mental images. However, these images are often dynamic which elevates anxiety. For example, people who suffer from OCD and have contamination anxiety, do not only have static beliefs and images about contamination; but they have distorted beliefs that contamination is rapidly spreading and approaching in time (Tolin et al., 2004).

As hypothesized the results showed that LCS and trait social anxiety were positively correlated. Similarly, state social looming predicted changes in state social anxiety. It was expected that trait measures would correlate with state measures. LMSQ-R measuring LCS involves hypothetical scenarios, and it was predicted that responses to these anticipated scenarios would be the same when encountering them in real life. However, the results did not support this expectation. There was not a significant positive correlation between the trait and state social looming.

One of the reasons that there was not a significant correlation between LCS and state social looming could have been explained by the fact that the LCS captures both physical and social threats, while the study is about social threats only. In order to eliminate this possibility, further analysis was conducted. The scores from the sub-dimension of LMSQ-R regarding social situations were calculated separately. The state social looming questionnaire was directly derived from an item of LMSQ-R that is most closely related to the situation in which the participants are exposed in the study with minor modifications. Therefore, a positive correlation between them was expected. However, the results showed that there was not a significant correlation between state social looming and LCS or the social looming dimension of LCS either.

The results failing to demonstrate a significant correlation between LCS and state social looming could raise questions about the validity of the state social looming questionnaire at first. This is the first study known that tries to capture social looming as a state factor developing a new measure based on the original scale. However, a similar domain-specific measure for assessing looming was used in previous research, derived from the original scale as in the present study. Riskind et al. (1997) developed the Looming of Contamination Questionnaire to assess cognitive looming related to fear of contamination and examined its relationship with OCD symptoms. Similar to the present study, they modified the vignettes so that the scenario represents the type of anxiety focused on. Then, they asked similar questions as in the original scale. It can be suggested that modifying the vignettes of LMSQ-R according to the specific anxiety-provoking situation in interest, and asking the follow-up questions is an acceptable method for assessing domain-specific looming. In addition, the results did not show a significant correlation between trait anxiety and

state anxiety either. Therefore, this discrepancy between trait and state measurements might be due to other reasons than simply being a validity issue.

The goal of the study design was to expose the participants to one of the anxiety-provoking situations. A public speech task was used in the study which was a situation that was used in the LMSQ-R. It was expected that the responses to the anticipated scenario would parallel the real-life experience. Since the results did not support this expectation, the design of the study could have failed to successfully represent an anxiety-provoking situation and capture social anxiety. However, this possibility is substantially eliminated due to anxiety manipulation results.

The anxiety levels of the participants were assessed at three different time points. First, they rated their anxiety in the very beginning (Time 1), then right before making a presentation (Time 2), and finally at the end of the study (Time 3). To measure the increase in anxiety, the difference between Time 2 and Time 1 ratings was calculated. The results yielded a significant increase in anxiety which shows that the design was successful in eliciting anxiety. In addition, for ethical reasons, the anxiety elicited in the study should not have remained at the end at high levels. Participants were comforted with positive oral feedback in the end in order to make sure they felt comfortable in the end. The results showed that the anxiety level of the participants decreased significantly at the end of the study. Therefore, it can be suggested that the study causes anxiety to some participants for a short amount of time which is not long-lasting as intended. Ultimately, the anxiety manipulation was successful. Making a presentation and being evaluated did elicit the intended increase in anxiety.

It is a plausible speculation that the study was too anxiety provoking and equally stressful for all participants. The task was to make a presentation to the experimenter and another professional. They were informed that their skills were going to be evaluated. It is possible that these demands of the task were anxiety-provoking for most people. This might explain the reason why the results did not yield a positive correlation between trait and state anxiety. The trait anxiety measures involve many social and interpersonal situations most of which might not be threatening for people with low social anxiety. However, making a presentation might be threatening for many. In fact, the most commonly feared social situation for all people regardless of their social anxiety levels is public speaking (Rapee, 1995). There are studies in the literature that can support this explanation. For example, a public speaking task was used in a study conducted by Hinrichsen & Clark (2003) in which anxiety levels of people with high and low anxiety during the task were comparable to

each other. The intention of the study was to expose the participants to an anxiety-provoking situation. The results testing the anxiety manipulation showed that the task caused an increase in anxiety levels. However, making a presentation might not be able to capture the differences between people with different levels of anxiety since it is a commonly feared situation for all.

In fact, Kessler et al. (1998) pointed out the fact that there are many people who are considered to be socially anxious that have exclusively public speaking fears. It is discussed that although people with solely public speaking fears do have impairments, people who fear a number of social situations instead of just public speaking results in more dysfunctions in their lives. In addition, compared with generalized social anxiety, public speaking anxiety alone shows different patterns of onset, recovery rates, or responses to treatment (Ruscio et al., 2008). For these reasons, they raise the question of whether people with only public speaking anxiety should be considered as a relatively mild form of social anxiety in the spectrum, or as a distinct problem on its own. Stein and Deutch (2003) supported the argument that public speaking anxiety is a distinct domain of social anxiety emphasizing the importance that it should be approached separately in the assessment and treatment of social anxiety.

Still, public speaking tasks are broadly used in social research for the assessment of social anxiety. In their review, Blöte et al. (2009) draw attention to these concerns and question how suitable it is to use an impromptu public speaking task in studies as a measure of social anxiety. They argue that whether public speaking anxiety is considered a less severe form of social anxiety or a distinctive subtype of it has important implications for the interpretation and validity of social anxiety research involving a public speaking task. Although the classification of public speaking anxiety is beyond the scope of the present study, these concerns might be considered in the explanation of the findings that a significant correlation between trait anxiety and state anxiety could not be found. Hence, future research might investigate LCS and social anxiety in a variety of social situations other than public speaking.

### **Clinical Implications**

Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is a largely used and well-researched intervention technique for the treatment of social anxiety (Rodebaugh et al., 2004). This approach to treatment is based on the cognitive models of SAD (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg 1997). The treatment often includes psychoeducation, exposure, and cognitive restructuring (Hope et al., 2006). The main focus of these treatment techniques is maladaptive and distorted cognitive processes. They

target thoughts, beliefs, or perceptions socially anxious people have trying to disconfirm them (Overholser, 2002).

The presented study focused on LCS as an overarching vulnerability factor for anxiety. It aimed to draw attention to relatively less researched cognitive factors for anxiety disorders to be able to understand the cognitive mechanisms that play a role in the development and maintenance of anxiety disorders. It can be suggested that reducing LCS can likely result in a decrease in social anxiety symptoms. Therefore, interventions for social anxiety, or other anxiety disorders, might focus more on the dynamic nature of threat perceptions. They might try to work with mental simulations socially anxious individuals anticipate, trying to target reducing LCS. Incorporating LCS-oriented treatment techniques into CBT practice can help individuals to change their maladaptive cognitions, and reduce the social anxiety symptoms as a result. Targeting and reducing LCS might also be important in preventing social anxiety or other kinds of anxiety. Future research is required to assess the applicability and efficacy of LCS-focused cognitive-behavioral techniques in treatment.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

There are certain limitations to the current study. First of all, the demographic characteristic of the participants did not include a wide range of variability. For example, most of the participants were in their mid-twenties. In addition, the gender distribution was uneven. The sample dominantly consisted of female participants. Social anxiety research regarding gender differences showed that females suffer from social anxiety more than males. Also, the age of onset of social anxiety is usually during adolescence (Kessler et al., 2005), and it affects people who are in their twenties a lot. It is observed that social anxiety diminishes as people are aged. Therefore, the sample is believed to be an optimal one to be able to observe social anxiety and the antecedent cognitive mechanisms. The examination of gender differences and the presentation of social anxiety or its links to cognitive factors in different age groups were beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, future research can be conducted to better understand the similar or differentiating dynamics of the relationship between LCS and social anxiety in different groups of people.

Another limitation concerning the study sample was that it constituted predominantly healthy individuals with no past or current psychiatric diagnosis of any psychiatric disorder. The generalizability of the results to the clinical population might be tested in future studies. However, the study design poses a difficulty in having variability in social anxiety levels. There are many

people who significantly suffer from social anxiety even in the non-clinical population. The present study might not have allowed to include these people with high anxiety due to the demands of the study design. For ethical concerns, participants were informed about the nature of the study that they were expected to make a presentation which can be highly anxiety provoking. It can be argued that people who were able to tolerate certain anxiety in making a presentation agreed to participate. It is demonstrated in the literature that two key factors determine the severity of social anxiety. The first factor is the amount of anxiety or fear one suffers from when encountering a feared social situation, and the other is the extent to which they avoid these situations. Given that socially anxious people tend to avoid situations that cause fear or anxiety, it is plausible to argue that people who are highly socially anxious might not want to voluntarily make a presentation about themselves. It is highly likely that people who are high in social anxiety were not willing to participate in a study like this. Therefore, the sample consisted of people who could at least be willing to tolerate a certain amount of anxiety the nature of the study elicits, instead of avoiding it. In addition to limitations related to sample characteristics, one of the main issues to be discussed is that the study fails to demonstrate a positive correlation between LCS and state social looming, or with trait anxiety and state anxiety. There are possible explanations as previously discussed, but future research might be necessary to understand the relationship between trait and state characteristics. This study was one of the few studies attempting to assess cognitive looming in a specific situation by deriving a domain-specific measure with certain adjustments to the LMSQ-R. Future studies replicating and extending the current study, or developing similar measures to assess physical or social looming as a state factor would contribute to better understanding how LCS functions and affects anxiety.

## **CONCLUSION**

LCS is introduced as a transdiagnostic vulnerability factor to all kinds of anxiety in the literature (Riskind et al., 2000). To date, the relationship between LCS and anxiety has been examined broadly; but only a few studies have focused on its links to specific anxiety-related problems such as social anxiety (e.g., Haikal & Hong, 2010; Riskind et al., 2013). One of the main goals of the present study was to build upon previous studies and explore the link between LCS and social anxiety. It further aimed to examine this relationship in the present time observing the emotions and cognitions of the individuals in the presence of an actual threat. For this purpose, participants

are asked to make a presentation about themselves in the study. Their social anxiety and cognitive looming were assessed prior to the study and during the study. The results showed that there was not a significant relationship between trait and state characteristics. However, a significant relationship between trait social anxiety and trait looming cognitive style was found as predicted. Likewise, it was found that state social looming predicted the change in state social anxiety. The implications of these findings are discussed thoroughly.

In conclusion, the present study is important for exploring LCS as an alternative cognitive model and its role in social anxiety. It is unique in its attempt to examine this relationship in an experimental design. Similar research with different sample characteristics or with a specific focus on different kinds of anxiety can be conducted in the future. Understanding the role of LCS in anxiety in these studies can help develop psychological interventions and improve the treatment of anxiety.

Preprint

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

- Acarturk C, Smit F, de Graaf, R, van Straten, A, Ten Have M, Cuijpers P. (2009). Economic costs of social phobia: a population-based study. *Journal of affective disorders*, 115(3), 421–429.
- Adler, AD, Strunk, DR. (2010). Looming maladaptive style as a moderator of risk factors for anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 34(1), 59–68.
- Alden LE, Taylor, CT. (2004). Interpersonal processes in social phobia. *Clinical psychology review*, 24(7), 857–882.
- Altan-Atalay A. (2018). Looming Cognitive Style (LCS), Repetitive Negative Thinking (RNT), and Anxiety: a Cross-Sectional Study. *International Journal of Cognitive Therapy*, 11(3), 262–271.
- Altan-Atalay, A, Sarıtaş-Atalar D. (2018). Psychometric Properties of the Turkish version of Looming Maladaptive Style Questionnaire (LMSQ) (Turkish). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 21(1), 52-60.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.).
- Amir N, Elias J, Klumpp, H, Przeworski A. (2003). Attentional bias to threat in social phobia: facilitated processing of threat or difficulty disengaging attention from threat?. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 41(11), 1325–1335.
- Bandelow B, Charimo-Torrente, A, Wedekind, D., Broocks, A, Hajak, G, Rüther E. (2004). Early traumatic life events, parental rearing styles, family history of mental disorders, and birth risk factors in patients with social anxiety disorder. *European archives of psychiatry and clinical neuroscience*, 254(6), 397–405.
- Bandelow B, Michaelis S. (2015). Epidemiology of anxiety disorders in the 21st century. *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience*, 17(3), 327–335.
- Blöte AW, Kint MJ, Miers AC, Westenberg PM. (2009). The relation between public speaking anxiety and social anxiety: a review. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 23(3), 305–313.
- Böheim R, Grübl D, Lackner M. (2019). Choking under pressure—Evidence of the causal effect of audience size on performance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 168, 76–93.



- Brown MA, Stopa L. (2008). The Looming Maladaptive Style in Social Anxiety. *Behavior Therapy*, 39(1), 57–64.
- Dorfan NM, Woody SR. (2006). Does threatening imagery sensitize distress during contaminant exposure?. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 44(3), 395–413.
- Calvete E, Orue I, Hankin BL. (2015). A longitudinal test of the vulnerability-stress model with early maladaptive schemas for depressive and social anxiety symptoms in adolescents. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 37(1), 85–99.
- Chavira DA, Stein MB, Malcarne VL. (2002). Scrutinizing the relationship between shyness and social phobia. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 16(6), 585–598.
- Chen J, Milne K, Dayman J, Kemps E. (2019). Interpretation bias and social anxiety: does interpretation bias mediate the relationship between trait social anxiety and state anxiety responses?. *Cognition & emotion*, 33(4), 630–645.
- Chiu K, Clark DM, Leigh, E. (2022). Characterising Negative Mental Imagery in Adolescent Social Anxiety. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 46(5), 956–966.
- Clark DM, Wells A. (1995). A cognitive model of social phobia. In R. Heimberg, M. Liebowitz, D. A. Hope, & F. R. Schneier (Eds.), *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment and treatment*. New York: Guilford.
- Cody MW, Teachman BA. (2010). Post-event processing and memory bias for performance feedback in social anxiety. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 24(5), 468–479.
- Crum RM, Pratt LA. (2001). Risk of heavy drinking and alcohol use disorders in social phobia: a prospective analysis. *The American journal of psychiatry*, 158(10), 1693–1700.
- Derin S, Yorulmaz O. (2021). Obsesif-Kompulsif Belirtileri Azaltmada Birleştirilmiş Bilişsel Yanlılık Değişimlemeye Yönelik Müdahalenin Etkisinin İncelenmesi. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation/master's thesis]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
- Dryman MT, Gardner S, Weeks JW, Heimberg RG. (2016). Social anxiety disorder and quality of life: How fears of negative and positive evaluation relate to specific domains of life satisfaction. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 38, 1–8.
- Eysenck MW, Derakshan N, Santos R, Calvo MG. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336–353.
- Festa CC, Ginsburg GS (2011). Parental and peer predictors of social anxiety in youth. *Child psychiatry and human development*, 42(3), 291–306.

- González-Díez Z, Orue I, Calvete E. (2017). The role of emotional maltreatment and looming cognitive style in the development of social anxiety symptoms in late adolescents. *Anxiety, stress, and coping*, 30(1), 26–38.
- Hackmann A, Clark DM, McManus F. (2000). Recurrent images and early memories in social phobia. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 38(6), 601–610.
- Haikal M, Hong RY. (2010). The effects of social evaluation and looming threat on self-attentional biases and social anxiety. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 24(3), 345–352.
- Heimberg RG, Brozovich FA, Rapee RM. (2010). A cognitive behavioral model of social anxiety disorder: Update and extension. In S. G. Hofmann & P. M. DiBartolo (Eds.), *Social anxiety: Clinical, developmental, and social perspectives* (pp. 395–422).
- Heiser NA, Turner SM, Beidel DC, Roberson-Nay R. (2009). Differentiating social phobia from shyness. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 23(4), 469–476.
- Hinrichsen H, Clark DM. (2003). Anticipatory processing in social anxiety: Two pilot studies. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 34(3-4), 205–218.
- Hirsch CR, Clark, DM. (2004). Information-processing bias in social phobia. *Clinical psychology review*, 24(7), 799–825.
- Hirsch CR, Clark DM, Mathews, A. (2006). Imagery and interpretations in social phobia: support for the combined cognitive biases hypothesis. *Behavior therapy*, 37(3), 223–236.
- Hirsch, CR, Clark DM., Mathews, A., & Williams, R. (2003). Self-images play a causal role in social phobia. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 41(8), 909–921.
- Hirsch, CR, Holmes EA. (2007). Mental imagery in anxiety disorders. *Psychiatry*, 6(4):161–165.
- Hofmann SG, Otto MW. (2008). *Cognitive-behavior therapy for social anxiety disorder: Evidence-based and disorder-specific treatment techniques*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hong RY, Riskind JH, Cheung MW, Calvete E, González-Díez Z, Atalay AA, Curzik D, Jokic-Begic N, Del Palacio-Gonzalez A, Mihić L, Samac N, Sica C, Sugiura Y, Khatri S, Kleiman EM. (2017). The Looming Maladaptive Style Questionnaire: Measurement invariance and relations to anxiety and depression across 10 countries. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 49, 1–11.

- Hope DA, Heimberg RG, Turk CL. (2006). Therapist guide for managing social anxiety: A cognitive-behavioral therapy approach. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Huppert JD, Foa EB. (2004). Maintenance mechanisms in social anxiety: An integration of cognitive biases and emotional processing theory. In J. Yiend (Ed.), *Cognition, emotion and psychopathology: Theoretical, empirical and clinical directions*. 213–231
- Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Merikangas KR, Walters EE. (2005). Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 62(6), 593–602.
- Kessler RC, Stein MB, Berglund P. (1998). Social phobia subtypes in the National Comorbidity Survey. *The American journal of psychiatry*, 155(5), 613–619.
- Knappe S, Beesdo-Baum K, Fehm L, Stein MB, Lieb R, Wittchen HU. (2011). Social fear and social phobia types among community youth: differential clinical features and vulnerability factors. *Journal of psychiatric research*, 45(1), 111–120.
- Kocovski NL, MacKenzie MB, Rector NA. (2011). Rumination and distraction periods immediately following a speech task: effect on post event processing in social anxiety. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 40(1), 45–56.
- Krans J, Peeters, M, Näring G, Brown AD, de Bree J, van Minnen A. (2017). Examining temporal alterations in Social Anxiety Disorder and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: The relation between autobiographical memory, future goals, and current self-views. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 52, 34–42.
- Lemasson A, André V, Boudard M, Lippi D, Hausberger M. (2018). Audience size influences actors' anxiety and associated postures on stage. *Behavioural processes*, 157, 225–229.
- Makkar SR, Grisham JR. (2011). Social anxiety and the effects of negative self-imagery on emotion, cognition, and post-event processing. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 49(10), 654–664.
- Mansell W, Clark DM. (1999). How do I appear to others? Social anxiety and processing of the observable self. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 37(5), 419–434.
- Miers AC, Blöte AW, de Rooij M, Bokhorst CL, Westenberg PM. (2013). Trajectories of social anxiety during adolescence and relations with cognition, social competence, and temperament. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 41(1), 97–110.

- Morrison AS, Heimberg RG. (2013). Attentional control mediates the effect of social anxiety on positive affect. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 27(1), 56–67.
- Mostajeran F, Balci MB, Steinicke F, Kühn S, Gallinat, J. (2020). The Effects of Virtual Audience Size on Social Anxiety during Public Speaking. *IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*, Atlanta. 303-312,
- Naragon-Gainey K. (2010). Meta-analysis of the relations of anxiety sensitivity to the depressive and anxiety disorders. *Psychological bulletin*, 136(1), 128–150.
- Norton A, Abbott M. (2017). The Role of Environmental Factors in the Aetiology of Social Anxiety Disorder: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature. *Behaviour Change*, 34(2), 76-97.
- Ollendick TH, Benoit KE. (2012). A parent-child interactional model of social anxiety disorder in youth. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, 15(1), 81–91.
- Overholser JC. (2002). Cognitive Behavioral Treatment of Social Phobia. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 32, 125–144. doi:10.1023/a:1020534025102
- Patel A, Knapp M, Henderson J, Baldwin D. (2002). The economic consequences of social phobia. *Journal of affective disorders*, 68(2-3), 221–233.
- Penney E, Abbott M. (2014). Anticipatory and Post-Event Rumination in Social Anxiety Disorder: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature. *Behaviour Change*, 31(2), 79-101.
- Perini SJ, Abbott MJ, Rapee RM. (2006). Perception of Performance as a Mediator in the Relationship Between Social Anxiety and Negative Post-Event Rumination. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 30(5), 645–659.
- Rao PA, Beidel DC, Turner SM, Ammerman RT, Crosby LE, Sallee FR. (2007). Social anxiety disorder in childhood and adolescence: descriptive psychopathology. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 45(6), 1181–1191.
- Rapee RM, Heimberg RG. (1997). A cognitive-behavioral model of anxiety in social phobia. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 35(8), 741–756.
- Rapee RM. (1995). Descriptive psychopathology of social phobia. In R. G. Heimberg, M. Liebowitz, D. A. Hope, & F. R. Schneier (Eds.), *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment and treatment* (pp. 41–66). New York: Guilford Press.

- Reardon JM, Williams NL. (2007). The specificity of cognitive vulnerabilities to emotional disorders: anxiety sensitivity, looming vulnerability and explanatory style. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 21(5), 625–643.
- Riskind JH. (1997). Looming vulnerability to threat: a cognitive paradigm for anxiety. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 35(8), 685–702.
- Riskind JH, Sica C, Caudek C, Bottesi G, Disabato DJ, Ghisi M. (2021). Looming cognitive style more consistently predicts anxiety than depressive symptoms: Evidence from a 3-wave yearlong study. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 45(4), 745–758.
- Riskind JH, Williams NL. (2005a). The Looming Cognitive Style and Generalized Anxiety Disorder: Distinctive Danger Schemas and Cognitive Phenomenology. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 29(1), 7–27.
- Riskind JH, Williams NL. (2005b). A unique vulnerability common to all anxiety disorders: The looming maladaptive style. In L. B. Alloy, & J. H. Riskind (Eds.), *Cognitive vulnerability to emotional disorders*. NJ: Erlbaum.
- Riskind JH, Williams NL, Gessner TL, Chrosniak LD, Cortina JM. (2000). The looming maladaptive style: Anxiety, danger, and schematic processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 837.
- Riskind JH, Abreu K, Strauss M, Holt R. (1997). Looming vulnerability to spreading contamination in subclinical OCD. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 35(5), 405–414.
- Riskind JH, Calvete E, Gonzalez Z, Orue I, Kleiman EM, Shahar G. (2013). Direct and indirect effects of looming cognitive style via social cognitions on social anxiety, depression, and hostility. *International Journal of Cognitive Therapy*, 6(1), 73-85.
- Riskind JH, Sagliano L, Trojano L, Conson M. (2016). Dysfunctional freezing responses to approaching stimuli in persons with a Looming Cognitive Style for physical threats. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 521.
- Riskind JH, Tzur D, Williams NL, Mann B, Shahar G. (2007). Short-term predictive effects of the looming cognitive style on anxiety disorder symptoms under restrictive methodological conditions. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 45(8), 1765–1777.
- Rodebaugh TL, Holaway RM, Heimberg RG. (2004). The treatment of social anxiety disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 24(7), 883–908.
- Ruscio AM, Brown TA, Chiu WT, Sareen J, Stein MB, Kessler RC. (2008).

- Social fears and social phobia in the USA: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Psychological medicine*, 38(1), 15–28.
- Salkovskis PM. (1991). The importance of behaviour in the maintenance of anxiety and panic: A cognitive account. *Behavioural Psychotherapy*, 19(1), 6–19.
- Scaini S, Belotti R, Oglia A. (2014). Genetic and environmental contributions to social anxiety across different ages: a meta-analytic approach to twin data. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, 28(7), 650–656.
- Schwartz CE, Snidman N, Kagan J. (1999). Adolescent social anxiety as an outcome of inhibited temperament in childhood. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38(8), 1008–1015.
- Soykan C, Ozgüven HD, Gençöz T. (2003). Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale: the Turkish version. *Psychological reports*, 93(3), 1059–1069.
- Stein MB, Deusch R. (2003). In search of social phobia subtypes: similarity of feared social situations. *Depression and anxiety*, 17(2), 94–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10093>
- Stein MB, Stein DJ. (2008). Social anxiety disorder. *Lancet*, 371(9618), 1115–1125.
- Stein MB, Chen CY, Jain S, Jensen KP, He F, Heeringa SG, Kessler RC, Maihofer A, Nock MK, Ripke S, Sun X, Thomas, ML, Ursano RJ, Smoller JW, Gelernter J, Army STARRS Collaborators (2017). Genetic risk variants for social anxiety. *American journal of medical genetics. Part B, Neuropsychiatric genetics : the official publication of the International Society of Psychiatric Genetics*, 174(2), 120–131.
- Stopa L, Clark DM. (1993). Cognitive processes in social phobia. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 31(3), 255–267.
- Stopa L, Clark DM. (2001). Social phobia: Comments on the viability and validity of an analogue research strategy and British norms for the fear of negative evaluation questionnaire. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 29(4), 423–430.
- Teachman BA, Allen JP. (2007). Development of social anxiety: social interaction predictors of implicit and explicit fear of negative evaluation. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 35(1), 63–78.
- Tolin DF, Worhunsky P, Maltby N. (2004). Sympathetic magic in contamination-related OCD. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry*, 35(2), 193–205.
- Turner SM, Beidel DC, Townsley RM. (1990). Social phobia: Relationship to

- shyness. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* , 28(6), 0–505.
- Watson D, Gamez W, Simms LJ. (2005). Basic dimensions of temperament and their relation to anxiety and depression: A symptom-based perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39(1), 46-66.
- Wells A, Clark DM, Ahmad S. (1998). How do I look with my minds eye: perspective taking in social phobic imagery. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 36(6), 631–634.
- Wells A, Clark DM, Salkovskis P, Ludgate J, Hackmann A, Gelder M. (2016). Social Phobia: The Role of In-Situation Safety Behaviors in Maintaining Anxiety and Negative Beliefs Behavior therapy, 47(5), 669–674.
- Yoon KL, Zinbarg RE. (2008). Interpreting neutral faces as threatening is a default mode for socially anxious individuals. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 117(3), 680–685.

## Tables and Figures

**Table 1**

*Demographic Characteristics of the Pilot Study Sample*

Demographic Variable	Type	n	%
Sex	Male	7	36.84
	Female	12	63.16
Previous Psychiatric Diagnosis	Yes	0	0
	No	19	100
Current Psychiatric Diagnosis	Yes	0	0
	No	19	100

**Table 2**

*Demographic Characteristics of the Participants*

Demographic Variable	Type	n	%
Sex	Male	8	26.67
	Female	22	73.33
Previous Psychiatric Diagnosis	Yes	1 <sup>a</sup>	5.26
	No	29	94.74
Current Psychiatric Diagnosis	Yes	0	0
	No	30	100

Note.<sup>a</sup> One of the participants was diagnosed with depression previously.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive statistics for the measures of the study*

	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
LSAS	30	86.70	22.18	52.00	153.00
LMSQ-R	30	67.67	16.32	37.00	96.00
State Social Looming	30	10.87	4.21	4.00	17.00
VAS2	30	4.63	2.20	1.00	9.00
Anxiety Change	30	1.47	1.85	-3.00	5.00

**Table 4**



*Intercorrelations among variables*

	1	2	3	4	5
1 LSAS		0.67**	.19	1.15	1.20
2 LMSQ-R			.25	.23	.31.
3 State Social Looming				.76**	.38*
4 VAS2					.42*
5 Anxiety Change					

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 5**

*Regression Analysis Summary for State Social Looming Predicting Change in Anxiety*

Variable	B	$\beta$	SE
Constant	-.37*		.89
Anxiety Change	.17*	.38	.08
R <sup>2</sup>	.15		

\* $p < .05$