

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Book Title	Encyclopedia of Psychopharmacology	
Copyright Year	2010	
Copyright Holder	Springer-Verlag	
Chapter Title	Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts	
Copyright Year	2009	
Copyright Holder	Springer-Verlag	
Author	Family Name	Cassaday
	Particle	
	Given Name	Helen J.
	Suffix	
	Division	School of Psychology, Institute of Neuroscience
	Organization	University of Nottingham
	Address	University Park, Room 321, NG7 2RD, Nottingham, Notts, UK
	Email	helen.cassaday@nottingham.ac.uk

B

Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts

HELEN J. CASSADAY

School of Psychology, Institute of Neuroscience,
University of Nottingham, Nottingham, Notts, UK

Synonyms

Attentional learning; Selective learning

Definition

Blocking is a reliable cross-species learning effect. It has been studied primarily using ► [Classical \(Pavlovian\) Conditioning](#) in which animals come to show their learned anticipation of a biologically significant outcome, typically food or foot shock, through a behavioral conditioned response. This conditioned response often resembles the unconditioned response for the outcome (unconditioned stimulus, UCS) – for example, in Pavlov's original studies, the salivation response to food came to be elicited by a bell, termed the conditioned stimulus (CS), that preceded food delivery. This anticipatory responding allows us to quantify the strength of the conditioned association.

Importantly, classical conditioning is selective to the best predictors of outcomes, raising the possibility that here is a mechanism allowing animals to build up a representation of the causal structure of the environment. In any event, in the absence of selectivity, the learning mechanism would be overloaded and inefficient. The blocking effect, discovered by Kamin in 1968, is an example of selectivity based on the redundancy of a potential CS (B). This redundancy arises because there already exists a reliable CS (A) for the outcome in question.

Impact of Psychoactive Drugs

The impact of psychoactive drugs on blocking can only be evaluated with respect to the behavioral controls in place, and these vary from study to study. Blocking in its simplest form is demonstrated in a two-stage procedure: (Stage 1) present A followed by the UCS; (Stage 2) present A in combination with B, followed by the same UCS. Ideally, several controls are needed: For example, because

A might be intrinsically more salient than B, the best designs counterbalance the stimulus identities; most importantly, because conditioning to B might be reduced due to competition with A, the Stage 2 conditioning is also compared with that seen in a separate group of animals conditioned to the compound. This control group is given equivalent Stage 2 training in the absence of any Stage 1 pre-training with A. Thus, we can separate out the reduced conditioning to B, which results from direct cue competition through ► [Overshadowing](#) as distinct from the pre-training with A to establish B as redundant. Overshadowing refers to the attenuation of learning to B as a consequence of conditioning in compound with A, relative to a group who are conditioned to B in isolation. The most essential experimental comparison groups to demonstrate blocking and overshadowing are shown in Table 1.

Thus, blocking is typically examined together with overshadowing in the same procedure. The fact that the blocking effect is reliably demonstrated over and above the reduction in learning to B produced by overshadowing in the control group suggests that it may rely on additional mechanisms (beyond direct cue competition). At the psychological level, the prior learning in Stage 1 is most likely an important factor.

Related Selective Learning Effects

There exist a number of other selective learning phenomena, likely to be related to blocking or overshadowing in terms of underlying mechanisms. Like blocking, ► [Latent Inhibition](#) is a two-stage procedure in which Stage 1 experience reduces subsequent Stage 2 conditioning. A variety of mechanisms have been proposed to contribute to this effect (Escobar et al. 2002; Gray et al. 1991; Hemsley 1993; Weiner 2003). For example, selectivity in learning could arise from changes in the effective salience of less predictive cues or interference between competing associations. Like overshadowing, ► [Relative Validity](#) procedures show the superiority of one available CS at the expense of another. In this case, the best predictor is established on a probabilistic basis over a number of conditioning trials. All of these selective learning effects reflect competition between the range of experimental cues available, including those provided by the context.

Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Table 1. Basic design to show a blocking effect (learning in group 2 minus learning in group 1) and overshadowing (learning in group 3 minus learning in group 2). A and B represent the alternative CSs.

Experimental group	Stage 1	Stage 2	Learning test
1. Blocking	A → Shock	[A + B] → UCS	Weak conditioning to B
2. Overshadowing		[A + B] → UCS	Moderate conditioning to B
3. Conditioning control		B → UCS	High conditioning to B

Blocking as an Endophenotype for Schizophrenia

Selective learning effects like blocking have become targets for translational research. Overconditioning to cues that would normally be treated as irrelevant or redundant provides an **▶ Animal Model** of disorder. First, when selectivity in learning fails, the animal is flooded with a profusion of potential conditioning cues and aberrant associations will be formed. Second, the neural substrates implicated in selective learning effects point to a key role for the dopamine system known to be dysfunctional in schizophrenia (Gray et al. 1991; Hemsley 1993; Kapur 2003; Weiner 2003). Furthermore, studies with human participants show that the normal blocking effect is abolished in schizophrenia (Fig. 1). Thus, like impaired latent inhibition, impaired blocking shows excellent validity, both at the behavioral and the neurochemical level, as an **▶ Endophenotype** for schizophrenic attention deficit (Gottesman and Gould 2003).

Animal Studies of Blocking and Overshadowing

In animals, psychopharmacological studies have shown that treatment with indirect dopamine agonists given systemically (typically amphetamine at around 1.5 mg/kg in rats) abolishes blocking and overshadowing. In every case, abolition of the normal effect results in overconditioning, with the consequence that the CS that would normally be treated as uninformative, whether because of redundancy in the case of blocking or relatively low intensity in overshadowing, accrues more associative strength than in non-drug-treated groups (Cassaday and Moran 2010).


In part for practical reasons, because of the need to test for dose-related effects, psychopharmacological studies are not always run with full behavioral controls. In the case of blocking, further reduction in learning produced by the Stage 1 pre-training can be a relatively small effect when compared to that seen in an overshadowing group. In some studies, apparent amphetamine-induced abolition of blocking may be entirely attributable to impaired overshadowing under amphetamine (Fig. 2).

However, patients with schizophrenia have been reported to show impaired blocking, over and above any change in overshadowing (Fig. 1) and in animal studies blocking and overshadowing may be dissociable in terms of their differential sensitivity to dopamine D2-like (Fig. 2) vs. dopamine D1-like (Fig. 3) receptor agents.

With respect to the neural mediation of the systemic effects of amphetamine, dopamine activity in part of the ventral striatum, specifically nucleus accumbens, has been reported to modulate blocking in the absence of any effect on overshadowing in the control group (Fig. 4). Similarly, the evidence for a pivotal role of nucleus accumbens and related structures is overwhelming in the case of latent inhibition (Gray et al. 1991; Weiner 2003). However, it is important to note that the nucleus accumbens is a heterogeneous structure and opposing effects of drug treatments and lesions can be seen in relation to very small differences in the laterality of the cannula placement. Moreover, the evidence with respect to the neural substrates of other selective learning phenomena is patchy, in part because of the poor selectivity of the lesion methods used to date. Techniques in neuro-psychopharmacology such as lesions selective to dopamine and precisely targeted microinjection studies are required to delineate the underlying substrates of blocking, overshadowing, and related effects. To date, the role of dopamine has been an understandable focus for pharmacological studies, principally of latent inhibition, though also of blocking and other selective learning effects, due to the fact that established antipsychotics are dopamine antagonists. The modulation of these effects by other neurotransmitter systems remains to be established. For example, based on the known effects of serotonergic treatments on latent inhibition (Weiner 2003), serotonin would similarly be expected to modulate blocking and related effects.

Blocking and Prediction Error

The blocking effect has been targeted, to understand the biological basis of attentional abnormality, to a large




Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Fig. 1.

Blocking in human participants shown in normal participants as an increased number of trials (to the learning criterion) required in the blocking condition relative to the overshadowing controls. This blocking effect was abolished or even reversed in schizophrenic participants (Schiz) and their relatives (Rels), irrespective of levels of schizotypy (st) as measured by questionnaire. (Adapted from Jones et al. (1997) *Behav Brain Res* 88:103–114, see text for full details.)

extent without a full consideration of its underlying psychological mechanisms. This situation may soon be remedied in that blocking has recently assumed prominence as a tool to investigate the neural basis of **Prediction Error**. Prediction error is fundamental to normal associative learning because it provides the basis on which to learn when there is a discrepancy between what is expected, and what actually occurs. Thus, uncertainty is an important factor in determining attention in learning and dominant learning theories propose that new learning requires that an association is not already at full strength. Positive prediction error generates excitatory conditioning; negative prediction error generates inhibitory conditioning (Fig. 5).


Electrophysiological studies show the pivotal role of dopamine as a neurochemical substrate of prediction error (Schultz 2006; Schultz and Dickinson 2000). Blocking was the key paradigm that drove our understanding of associative learning in terms of prediction error: the Stage 1 pre-training means that the UCS is fully predicted by the time that the competing cue is introduced in Stage 2. Thus, there can be no prediction error and thus no additional conditioning to the redundant cue. However, prediction error can be systematically manipulated by changing the UCS delivered. If the UCS is other than expected, **Unblocking** occurs. This can take the form



Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Fig. 2.

Overshadowing shown as reduced learning relative to the conditioning control group in a standard fear conditioning (lick suppression) procedure. The dependent variable is the log transform of the time taken to complete 10 licks in the presence of the CS. Overshadowing was shown in the saline- (SAL) and haloperidol- (HAL) injected groups. Overshadowing was abolished by treatment with amphetamine (AMP) and the amphetamine-induced abolition of overshadowing was not reversed by treatment with haloperidol, suggesting that dopamine D2-like receptors do not mediate the amphetamine-induced abolition of overshadowing. (Adapted from O’Tuathaigh and Moran (2002) *Psychopharmacology* 162:225–231, see text for full details.)

of additional excitatory conditioning to the additional CS if the UCS is more than expected (e.g., a higher intensity foot shock is delivered in upshift unblocking) or inhibitory conditioning to the additional CS if the UCS is less than expected (e.g., a lower intensity of foot shock is delivered in downshift unblocking). Electrophysiological studies have confirmed that some of the same populations of dopamine neurons that show increased activation following the presentation of excitatory CSs, that signal “more than expected,” show depressed neuronal firing following the presentation of inhibitory CSs, that signal “less than expected” (Schultz 2006). These neurons show no change in neuronal firing when there is zero prediction error, in other words when things remain “as expected.” Such a case is provided in the blocking procedure. Pre-training with CS A normally blocks learning about CS B because the prediction error is small. The standard blocking procedure is readily adapted to study the neural bases




Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Fig. 3. Overshadowing shown as reduced learning relative to the conditioning control group in a standard fear conditioning (lick suppression) procedure. The dependent variable is the log transform of the time taken to complete 10 licks in the presence of the CS. Overshadowing was shown in the saline (SAL) and SCH23390- (SCH, dopamine D1-like antagonist) injected groups. Overshadowing was abolished by treatment with amphetamine (AMP) and the amphetamine-induced abolition of overshadowing was reversed by treatment with SCH23390, suggesting that dopamine D1-like receptors mediate the amphetamine-induced abolition of overshadowing. (Adapted from O’Tuathaigh and Moran (2002) *Psychopharmacology* 162:225–231, see text for full details.)

of excitatory and inhibitory learning (Fig. 5) by manipulating the UCS delivered (Table 2).

Thus, blocking and unblocking variants provide target tasks to identify the neuropharmacological substrates of prediction error, for example, using microinjections into the nucleus accumbens (Fig. 6).

Thus, analysis of blocking from an associative learning theory perspective has identified the same underlying neural substrates that are the target of translational studies of blocking as an endophenotype for schizophrenia. At the behavioral level, abnormalities in the processing of prediction error may be the cause of the formation of inappropriate associations in schizophrenia. In other words, studies of prediction error, known from electrophysiological studies to depend on the dopamine system, also further our understanding of dopaminergic disorders such as schizophrenia. Deficits in blocking, seen both in schizophrenia and under amphetamine, represent a paradigm instantiation of abnormalities in the processing of



Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Fig. 4. Blocking shown as a low percentage of baseline learning in a contextual fear conditioning procedure. The comparison group controls for overshadowing by context which it can be seen was unaffected by any of the drug treatments. Blocking was increased by injection of amphetamine in n. acc and decreased by combined D1 and D2 receptor antagonism produced either by injection of cis-(z)-flupenthixol or combined treatment with SCH23390 and sulpiride. In isolation, SCH23390 and sulpiride were without effect, suggesting that a combined action at dopamine D1-like and D2-like receptors mediates the amphetamine-induced abolition of blocking. (Adapted from Iordanova et al. (2006a) *Eur J Neurosci* 24:3265–3270, see text for full details.)


prediction error. Future studies of the relevant neural substrates of prediction error should include, but are not restricted to, those identified in blocking procedures. Downstream from these Pavlovian effects, abnormal processing of prediction error has been linked to abnormalities of action, including drug addiction where overconditioning in hyperdopaminergic states could promote cue-driven relapse because of the increased representation of drug-related cues (Montague et al. 2004; Schultz and Dickinson 2000).

Advantages and Limitations of Blocking and Overshadowing

Latent inhibition, now well established as a model for schizophrenia, shows the predicted sensitivity to psychoactive drugs, and human participants with schizophrenia show impaired latent inhibition (though this demonstration depends on medication status). Similarly, there is good evidence for impairments in blocking in schizophrenia; hence blocking provides a potential animal model in which to assess the effects of psychoactive drugs; for example, to distinguish the role of dopamine D1 and D2


Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Table 2. Basic comparison groups to show Unblocking due to upshift when the UCS is more than expected (UCS) and downshift when the UCS is less than expected (ucs). A and B represent the alternative CSs.

Experimental group	Stage 1	Stage 2	Learning test
Blocking	A → UCS	[A + B] → UCS	Weak conditioning to B
Upshift unblocking		[A + B] → UCS	Excitatory conditioning to B
Downshift unblocking		[A + B] → ucs	Inhibitory conditioning to B



Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Fig. 5. Positive prediction error when the probability (p) of the UCS is increased on presentation of the CS in question generates excitatory conditioning. Negative prediction error when the probability of the UCS is decreased on presentation of the CS in question generates inhibitory conditioning. When $p(\text{UCS}/\text{CS})=p(\text{UCS}/\text{no CS})$ along the diagonal trend line, there can be no new learning.

receptor families in this aspect of attentional learning, as distinct from overshadowing (Figs. 2–4). Much of this work has yet to be done, in part because reliable parameters to demonstrate blocking can be difficult to establish. An additional disadvantage in the use of blocking arises because a fully controlled study necessitates the use of an overshadowing comparison condition and overshadowing is itself affected by some of the same dopaminergic treatments. Future studies should address this confound. However, overshadowing remains of interest in its own right as a procedure to present stimuli that



Blocking, Overshadowing and Related Concepts. Fig. 6. Blocking shown as a low percentage of baseline learning in a fear conditioning procedure. Unblocking was produced by halving the UCS (shock intensity) and was demonstrated as relatively increased percentage learning. The control level of learning was around 50%. Blocking and unblocking were affected in opposite ways by injection of opioid compounds in nucleus accumbens. (Adapted from Iordanova et al. (2006b) *J Neurosci* 26: 4036–4045, see text for full details.)

should normally show reduced salience for learning, to test for overconditioning to weak cues in hyper-dopaminergic states (Cassaday and Moran 2010; Gray et al. 1991; Kapur 2003).

In principle, blocking has an additional attraction in that it relates an issue of fundamental importance in normal associative learning, namely the role of surprise, encapsulated in the study of prediction error. Through unblocking manipulations, we can study the liberation of attention by surprise and drug effects thereon. However, the reliable demonstration of unblocking can require extensive behavioral pilot work. Moreover, attention is only half the story in that successful associative learning should reflect the direction of change when the outcome is more or less than expected. Aficionados have noted that inhibitory learning is not consistently demonstrated in aversively motivated downshift unblocking procedures – on the contrary, a

weaker UCS than expected can result in excitatory conditioning to the additional CS B (Fig. 6).

Cross-References

- ▶ Aminergic Hypotheses for Schizophrenia
- ▶ Animal Models for Psychiatric States
- ▶ Antipsychotic Drugs
- ▶ Attention
- ▶ Attentional Bias to Drug Cues
- ▶ Classical (Pavlovian) Conditioning
- ▶ Cognitive Enhancers
- ▶ Latent Inhibition
- ▶ Schizophrenia
- ▶ Schizophrenia: Animal Models
- ▶ Translational Research

References

- Cassaday HJ, Moran PM (2010) Latent inhibition and other salience modulation effects: same neural substrates? In: Lubow RE., Weiner I. (eds) *Latent Inhibition: Cognition, Neuroscience, Applications and Schizophrenia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Escobar M, Oberling P, Miller RR (2002) Associative deficit accounts of disrupted latent inhibition and blocking in schizophrenia. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 26:203–216
- Gottesman II, Gould TD (2003) The endophenotype concept in psychiatry: etymology and strategic intentions. *Am J Psychiatry* 160:636–645
- Gray JA, Feldon J, Rawlins JNP, Hemsley DR, Smith AD (1991) The neuropsychology of schizophrenia. *Behav Brain Sci* 14:1–20
- Hemsley DR (1993) A simple (or simplistic?) cognitive model for schizophrenia. *Behav Res Ther* 31:633–645
- Iordanova MD, Westbrook RF, Killcross AS (2006a) Dopamine activity in the nucleus accumbens modulates blocking in fear conditioning. *Eur J Neurosci* 24:3265–3270
- Iordanova MD, McNally GP, Westbrook RF (2006b) Opioid receptors in the nucleus accumbens regulate attentional learning in the blocking paradigm. *J Neurosci* 26:4036–4045
- Jones SH, Hemsley D, Ball S, Serra A (1997) Disruption of the Kamin blocking effect in schizophrenia and in normal subjects following amphetamine. *Behav Brain Res* 88:103–114
- Kapur S (2003) Psychosis as a state of aberrant salience: a framework linking biology, phenomenology, and pharmacology in schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry* 160:13–23
- Montague PR, Hyman SE, Cohen JD (2004) Computational roles for dopamine in behavioural control. *Nature* 431:760–767
- O’Tuathaigh CMP, Moran PM (2002) Evidence for dopamine D1 receptor involvement in the stimulus selection task overshadowing in the rat. *Psychopharmacology* 162:225–231
- Schultz W, Dickinson A (2000) Neuronal coding of prediction errors. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 23:473–500
- Schultz W (2006) Behavioural theories and the neurophysiology of reward. *Ann Rev Psychol* 57:87–115
- Weiner I (2003) The “two-headed” latent inhibition model of schizophrenia: modeling positive and negative symptoms and their treatment. *Psychopharmacology* 169:257–297