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ABSTRACT

This study examined the impact that perceptions of oneself and others have on shyness. Data were collected from 286 undergraduates who completed a questionnaire containing measures of shyness, expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, 5 domains of interpersonal competence, self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism and interpersonal trust.

Consistent with hypotheses, very shy subjects had higher expectations of rejection and similar levels of desire for affiliation compared to nonshy subjects; the relationships between shyness and these measures were also in the predicted direction. The very shy had significantly lower ratings on all interpersonal competence domains and the relationship between shyness and each domain was negative. Although the very shy had higher ratings of socially-prescribed perfectionism and lower levels of interpersonal trust than the nonshy as predicted, the groups did not differ on self-oriented perfectionism. The findings are discussed in terms of their implications for self-presentation theory and the treatment of shyness.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The human animal is, by nature, a social animal. Virtually everything we do, say, and think about is focused directly on our interpersonal relationships or is shaped profoundly by them. Our lives are played out in the arena of social affairs; we are confronted with a continuing flow of ongoing and one-time only interactions — some intimate and others casual, some pleasant and others distasteful, some routine and still others unexpected. Consequently, personal attributes and experiences that either facilitate or hinder interpersonal functioning are outstanding features of our social lives that can affect overall life satisfaction to a tremendous extent. Shyness, a psychological syndrome involving social anxiety and behavioural inhibition in interpersonal contexts (Leary, 1983; 1986), is a case in point.

Recent Developments in Shyness Research

Briggs, Cheek and Jones (1986) note that in recent years long term relationships have become more difficult to sustain, as once secure social bonds are routinely broken by geographic mobility, high divorce rates, and the dissolution of family support groups. More than ever, individuals are required to initiate and nurture new friendships and alliances on their own, outside traditional group and family ties. Here, shyness can play a significant role. Perhaps
as a result of these trends, several popular books attempting to explain shyness to the lay person and offering advice and strategies for overcoming shyness began to appear in the middle and late 1970's.

By far the best known, most widely read, and most often cited book of this type is Phillip Zimbardo's *Shyness: What It Is, What To Do About It* (1977). Zimbardo and his colleagues at Stanford University found that 80 percent of the 5000 respondents who had completed the Stanford Shyness Survey (Zimbardo, 1977) reported being shy at some point in their lives. Forty percent considered themselves to be presently shy and one quarter of those sampled reported being chronically shy, now and always.

Aside from demonstrating its prevalence, Zimbardo argued that shyness has both positive and negative consequences. Between 10 and 20 percent of those individuals identifying themselves as shy liked it and described its positive side. Shyness can make one appear "reserved," "retiring," "unassuming," or "modest," descriptors of shy people that usually have positive connotations. Furthermore, shy people may appear to be discreet and introspective and they sometimes benefit from increases in privacy, anonymity and protection that are related to shyness.

More often, however, Zimbardo reported that silence is not golden. Negative aspects of shyness include
difficulties in meeting new people, making new friends, forming intimate relationships, speaking up for rights and expressing opinions. Additionally, it may limit positive evaluations from others of one's personal strengths, encourage preoccupation with personal reactions, and present problems in thinking clearly and communicating effectively.

In recent years, there has been a marked increase in the number of reports published on shyness in research journals (Briggs, Cheek & Jones, 1986). During the past fifteen years, shyness has been defined more carefully and in ways that allow empirical testing. Consequently, a more lucid conceptualization of the domain of shyness and clear explanations of its relationship to related constructs have emerged (e.g., Arkin, 1981; Buss, 1986; Crozier, 1979; Harris, 1984; Harrison, Jones & Carpenter, 1984; Leary, 1983; Schlenker & Leary, 1982; Trower & Gilbert, 1989). New measures have been developed and efforts have been directed towards producing scales that are conceptually pure, behaviourally valid, and psychometrically sound (e.g., Cheek & Buss, 1981; Jones, Briggs & Smith, 1984; Morris, 1982).

In addition to these direct attempts to understand shyness, other research traditions have contributed to an interest in the phenomenon. Shyness has been studied as a dimension of emotion and in relation to other emotions such as shame (e.g., Izard, 1977; 1986). Studies involving multifactorial personality inventories that include shyness
as a dimension of personality garnered much of the earliest empirical information in relation to shyness (e.g., Guilford & Guilford, 1936; Cattell, 1965; Comrey, 1973). Recent research on shyness also has been stimulated by previous and ongoing investigations into related topics in psychology and other disciplines. Shyness research has profited from studies in related areas such as introversion (e.g., Morris, 1979), assertiveness (e.g., Crozier, 1986; Izard & Hyson, 1986; Langston & Cantor, 1989; Linehan, Goldfriend & Goldfriend, 1979; McFall & Twentyman, 1975), minimal dating (e.g., Gilmartin, 1987; Melnick, 1973), loneliness (e.g., Cheek & Busch, 1981; Jones & Briggs, 1984; Jones, Briggs & Smith, 1986), and social skills (e.g., Curran, 1977), as well as topics falling under the general heading of social anxiety, such as shame, embarrassment, and evaluation apprehension (e.g., McCroskey & Beatty, 1986; Miller, 1986; Modigliani, 1971).

Recently, several theories have been proposed to aid in our conceptual understanding of shyness. Investigators have explained shyness as reflecting self-perceptions of one's inhibited behaviour (e.g., Bem, 1972; Crozier, 1982), low self-esteem (e.g., Crozier, 1979), social skills deficits (e.g., McFall & Twentyman, 1975) and negative self-attentional processes (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1981). Another interesting framework distinguishes between fearful and self-conscious subtypes of shyness on the basis of the
age of onset of shyness and the types of situations which elicit shyness (Buss, 1986); while the approach holds promise in that it emphasizes greater specificity in delineating subtypes of shyness and offers precursors that are unique to each subtype, measures that distinguish between the subtypes have not been developed. For the purposes of this research, the self-presentation theory of shyness (e.g., Arkin, 1981; Arkin, Lake, & Baumgardner, 1986) was employed.

**Self-Presentation Theory**

Research on self-presentation and impression management has grown immensely in scope and sophistication during the past twenty-five years. Standing on the shoulders of astute observers of social behaviour such as Goffman (1959) and Jones (1964), psychologists have begun sampling a plethora of behaviours falling into the category of social influence tactics.

Self-presentation refers to the process by which individuals attempt to establish an identity through controlling the images of self available to others (Arkin et al., 1986). The existence of self-presentation is an inevitable consequence of social perception (Snyder, 1977). People are acutely aware that others form impressions of them and make use of these impressions to guide the course and outcome of social interaction (Arkin, 1981). Thus, the tendency to convey a definition of the situation and of
oneself is a natural extension of the human capacity to view social interaction from perspectives other than one's own.

From the self-presentation perspective, social behaviour always carries meaning and can always be interpreted by others; a watching audience -- including an internalized general audience -- routinely evaluates an individual's social actions. Actors understand this process because they too constantly observe and evaluate others. Thus, because actors want "to interact successfully, they are careful to present themselves (consciously and unconsciously) as they want to be seen. They carefully manage the images that are conveyed or projected in a social encounter" (Briggs & Cheek, 1988: 675).

The image an actor is likely to convey depends on the particular goals or interests s/he has in a social interaction (Arkin et al., 1986). These goals are many and varied and diverse presentations of self may be necessary to achieve desired audience reactions in specific contexts (Jones & Pittman, 1982). In spite of the apparent diversity of interaction goals sought through impression management, people generally prefer to present themselves in socially desirable ways to gain social approval, sustain an interaction, and maximize the likelihood that others will help meet their social and material needs. As Goffman (1959) notes, it is clearly in one's "interest to control the conduct of others, especially their responsive treatment
of him" (p.3). A common way of obtaining this control is to garner social approval whenever and wherever possible.

**Acquisitive and Protective Self-Presentation**

Arkin (1981) proposes a model linking self-presentation and shyness whereby shyness is an exception to the social convention that people try to behave in socially desirable ways to win the approval of significant others. His theory explicitly addresses shyness as a precursor to stylistic differences in self-presentation and complements a framework (Schlenker & Leary, 1982) that focuses on self-presentation as an antecedent of social anxiety.

There is risk inherent in all interpersonal relations, with failure, embarrassment, rejection and losses of social status being potential outcomes as well as the joys and pleasures of relating to others. Arkin (1981) coined the terms "acquisitive self-presentation" and "protective self-presentation" to capture individual differences in reactions to this risk.

Acquisitive self-presentation refers to instances in which the individual approaches and embraces interpersonal risks. The presentation of self is treated as a challenge, as the person presents an image of self which is the most favourable possible to enhance the likelihood that social approval will be obtained at present or in the future (Arkin et al., 1986). Acquisitive self-presentation would also
apply to people who are blissfully unselfconscious of their presentations of self.

Protective self-presentation, in contrast, is characterized by social conservatism. Arkin et al. (1986) argue that the individual who attempts to create an impression which is merely "safe" is engaged in protective self-presentation. A unique motive system is hypothesized to underlie this guarded self-presentation style. Whereas the traditional motive of achieving social approval is seen as underlying acquisitive self-presentation, avoiding social disapproval is proposed as the motivational basis of protective self-presentation. According to this view, all people from time to time, and some people chronically, approach social situations intending merely to avoid social disapproval rather than to engender approval. This goal is accomplished proactively through choosing, modifying, or creating contexts whereby social disapproval is unlikely to occur.

Zimbardo (1977) notes this interaction style in the shy. The shy individual sometimes acts "like a very conservative investor in a risky, volatile economic market. Expectations of what might be gained are outweighed by anticipation of what could be lost by getting involved" (p.40). Arkin (1981) proposes that the shy person is prototypical of individuals inclined to adopt this "safe" social orientation. Self-doubts and shaky self-confidence
are given a prominent role in the link between shyness and disapproval concerns. Uncertainties about social competence are related intimately to doubts regarding general self-worth, as there are almost always inverse relationships between measures of shyness and general self-esteem (Arkin et al., 1986; Baumeister, Tice, & Hutton, 1989; Baumgardner, Kaufman, & Levy, 1989; Briggs, Cheek & Jones, 1986; Cheek & Buss, 1981; Jones & Briggs, 1984; Kowalski & Leary, 1990). Doubts about social competence should contribute to the perception of a high probability of engendering the disapproval of others; this perception should raise questions about general self-worth. Similarly, low (or uncertain) self-esteem should raise doubts about social competence and thus produce concerns about engendering disapproval from others.

**Empirical Links Between Shyness and Self-Presentation**

Arkin (1981) outlines target characteristics (punitiveness, unpredictability, stranger status, competitiveness), features of the interaction context (dependence, audience evaluation, measurement conditions), and presenter characteristics (self-esteem, social anxiety, shyness, depression, need for approval, individuation tendencies) that affect the likelihood of acquisitive versus protective orientations in general, but only a small amount of research has examined specifically the self-presentations of shy individuals. Nonetheless, several studies shed light
indirectly on this relationship and a few seem to illuminate the issue directly.

Avoidance and Withdrawal. Affiliating with others is one of the most basic human tendencies (Trower & Gilbert, 1989). The early empirical work of Schachter (1959) suggested that affiliative tendencies increase with increasing anxiety and hunger, and that, for anxiety, ordinal position of birth is an effective discriminator of the magnitude of affiliative tendency. Schachter argued that his findings were best interpreted as a manifestation of needs for anxiety reduction and a means for socially evaluating and determining the proper reaction in ambiguous circumstances.

Regarding the literature on the relationship between shyness and need for affiliation, the disaffiliative tendencies of persons high in social anxiety have been asserted in some research. Shy people will often disaffiliate completely by avoiding or quickly leaving social encounters (Arkin, 1981). For example, people who score high on inventories of shyness and social anxiety date less frequently (e.g., Curran, 1977; Gilmartin, 1987) and are said to prefer working alone rather than with others (McGovern, 1976).

Several of the more interesting studies in this area imply that shy people migrate to the fringes of social interaction, where they are better able to regulate its
course and outcome. For example, Dykeman and Reis (1979) found that students scoring high on feelings of vulnerability and inadequacy tended to occupy seats near the rear of the classroom. From this vantage point they remained withdrawn and safe when uncertain and yet they could enter into the flow of classroom activity when they felt competent.

Moreover, shy people speak for a smaller percentage of time, take longer to respond to others' queries, contribute more to conversational dysfluencies (i.e., prolonged, uncomfortable silences) and tend to interrupt less (Natale, Enlin & Jaffe, 1979) relative to their nonshy counterparts. Instead of speaking, shy individuals can be safe and avoid the social limelight by murmuring "uh-huh," smiling, nodding and appearing attentive (Natale et al., 1979). It has been suggested that shy people will not engage in social interaction until a safe conversational territory has been figured out (Efran & Korn, 1969).

Fear of disapproval has been implicated directly in social behavior. Stephen and Wachtel (1983) found that men were far more willing to approach an attractive woman if their approach could occur under the guise of a motive other than a desire to be with the woman. Specifically, the men chose to watch the same movie that the attractive woman watched and sat next to her only when it appeared they had joined her because they preferred the
movie she had chosen over a film presented elsewhere. When the two movie options were the same, most of the men sat away from the attractive confederate. A follow-up study indicated that the only men willing to approach the woman in the same-movie condition, where no cover for affiliating was available, were those rated as physically attractive -- presumably those who were self-confident.

**Attitude Neutrality and Conformity.** Another empirical link between shyness and self-presentation relates to the tendency the shy have to be neutral in opinions and to conform to others' attitudes. Turner (1977) found that shy individuals moderated their judgements (i.e., they endorsed neutral attitudinal positions) when they expected to be confronted by someone who supposedly held a strong, and perhaps different, opinion from their own. In doing this, a safe stance could be attained; by appearing to have no opinion at all, one avoids having the wrong opinion. In remaining neutral at the outset of a social encounter, shy persons avoid disapproval for the moment. Later, they can adopt the position advocated by the other and gain approval for being similar through allowing the other to enjoy the rewards of being persuasive (Gradini & Mirels, 1978).

Arkin and Sherman (1983) also provide direct evidence for the link between fear of disapproval and protective self-presentation. They found that shy persons wrote less in defense of a decision (relative to nonshy individuals)
when an experimental situation was rigged so that they could only lose social approval they had gained earlier (i.e., their essays might produce disapproval). Interestingly, when subjects could only gain social approval, (i.e., their essays could produce approval only), shy individuals wrote more than their nonshy counterparts. On another measure, shy participants were more hesitant in starting to write a defense of a decision when faced with the prospect of disapproval but were quicker getting started in comparison with nonshy subjects when they could gain approval only. These findings imply that shy people exceed the nonshy in both fear of disapproval and desire for approval.

Self-Attribution. While it has been demonstrated that people generally make greater self attributions for their positive outcome behaviours than their negative outcome behaviours (Brown, 1986), socially anxious individuals attribute greater causality to themselves for failure than success, especially when close scrutiny of their attributions and behaviours is anticipated (Arkin, Appleman, & Burger, 1980). In the same way that attitude neutrality is safe, modesty in attributions of responsibility is the most easily defensible presentation of self for shy individuals. Self-ratings of perceived competence are generally lower for the shy unless an external excuse that is patently obvious to observers is available (Snyder, Higgins & Stuckey, 1983; Snyder, 1986).
Consequences of Protective Self-Presentation

Like acquisitive self-presentation, the purpose of protective self-presentation is to control the conduct of others, especially their responsive treatment of the presenter (Arkin, 1981). However, this control, when sought through the safety afforded by protective self-presentation, has its costs.

A major cost is that the person engaged in protective self-presentation, as well as others, will use the presentation of self as a valid and reliable index of personal qualities (Bem, 1972; Weary & Arkin, 1983). The shy may avoid threatening signs from others that come with more assertive self-presentations. However, to the extent that a shy stance is accepted by others, the person will be relegated to a lower position in social relations and will sustain losses in future commerce with others; the presence of approval, and not merely the absence of disapproval, is associated with the exchange of desirable social rewards (Jellison & Arkin, 1977; Jones, 1964).

Additionally, this unwillingness to take risks in interpersonal relations may perpetuate the shy individual's uncertain self-concept, because an avoidance of challenges inherent in social interactions ensures that the competencies required for greater interpersonal effectiveness are not acquired. The delayed advantage of acquiring interpersonal competencies is exchanged for the
immediate advantage of avoiding possible disapproval and strain. Concerns over disapproval are maintained and result in a vicious cycle of personal degradation and reduced interpersonal effectiveness (Arkin, 1981).

A Critique of the Self-Presentation Theory of Shyness

The self-presentation model provides support for the argument that shyness is an exception to the rule that people attempt only to garner social approval. Arkin et al. (1986) have suggested that the shy are preoccupied with avoiding social disapproval and often adopt a protective self-presentation style (withdrawal to the fringes of social interaction, and the adoption of neutral or conforming attitudes, modest attributions, and self-handicapping strategies) to regulate feelings of social anxiety. The evidence reviewed also implies that when the shy are highly confident that there is nothing to lose in a social setting, an acquisitive self-presentation style may be adopted. In adopting an acquisitive self-presentation only when success is guaranteed, the shy individual has little opportunity to diagnose his/her true self-worth. Consequently, the self-doubts and precarious sense of self that characterize the shy individual are sustained.

The model has several possible advantages. It is parsimonious as only two self-presentation styles are offered to explain shyness and a nonreticent interaction pattern. Moreover, the theory has received empirical
support. The self-presentation framework also focuses upon different types of variables and generates hypotheses regarding the influence of target characteristics, personal attributes and contextual features that are associated with shyness and self-presentation. Finally, a motivational basis for shyness and protective self-presentation is clearly articulated. According to this approach, shy people are motivated to impress and seek approval from others but doubt their ability to project images of themselves that will produce satisfactory reactions from other people.

However, the self-presentation theory of shyness has several limitations. First, some of the literature suggests that shy people do not behave in an affiliative manner -- that they avoid interpersonal interaction. However, the findings that shy people migrate to the fringes of social interaction to better manage self-presentations, hold neutral or conforming opinions, and fear disapproval from others suggests that the shy actually do desire affiliation, although it is not apparent in their overt behaviour. The high correlation between shyness and constructs such as loneliness (e.g., Peplau & Perlman, 1982) and sociability (e.g., Bruch, Gorsky, Collins & Berger, 1989) also suggests a strong desire for interpersonal contact.

Perhaps the shy do not feel competent interpersonally and provide protective self-presentations to avoid disapproval, and to remain in contact with others, albeit in
a limited manner. Although the manifest behaviour of the shy can suggest that their shyness is associated with characteristics of schizoid personality disorder such as low interpersonal interest, it is proposed that the shy, in general, want to affiliate with others to a degree comparable to the nonshy but expect rejection from others to a much higher extent than the nonshy.

Moreover, theoretical discussions addressing the link between self-presentation and competencies in the interpersonal sphere (e.g., Arkin, 1981) imply that interpersonal competence is a stable unidimensional trait in which the shy are uniformly deficient. One can argue, however, that interpersonal competence is a heterogeneous group of skills comprised of many factors, some of which the shy may be quite skilled in employing (e.g., Leary, Knight, & Johnson, 1985; Natale et al., 1979). Leary et al. (1985) found that, in comparison to subjects scoring low in social anxiety, socially anxious subjects disclosed little about themselves but responded to a communication target through asking questions, giving helpful and friendly advice, and listening "reflectively" in an unstructured conversation. These findings suggest that the shy have more confidence with certain domains of interpersonal competence (e.g., listening skills, support provision) than with others (e.g., assertiveness, self-disclosure).
Third, the empirical links between shyness and protective self-presentation focus narrowly on the relationship between shyness and variables such as fear of disapproval. However, the theory provides little information regarding other correlates of shyness and self-presentation. Other expectations of the self, the target(s) of the interaction, and the interaction context may be correlated with the protective self-presentations of the shy.

Schlencker and Leary (1985) suggest that the socially anxious have unrealistically high self-standards which increase self-doubts regarding their abilities to perform successful self-presentations. The existence of dominance schema, containing representations of a critical and competitive social world, may turn such doubts into social anxiety and behavioural inhibition. This representation implies that only powerful dominance displays will succeed and that the consequences of failing are potentially catastrophic (Trower & Gilbert, 1989).

The self-doubts of the shy may be linked with expectations that they must perform exceptionally well in personal endeavours to garner the approval of themselves and others. Similarly, they may perceive the targets of their self-presentation as expecting exceptional performance from them in such ventures. Given the shaky self-confidence of the shy, they may feel that they are unable to meet these
expectations which could, in turn, reinforce their protective self-presentation.

With respect to the interaction context, there is some evidence suggesting that the shy generally perceive hostility and/or competitiveness in interpersonal situations (e.g., Arkin, 1981; Trower & Gilbert, 1989). As a result, they may have some difficulty trusting others, given the sense of threat and disapproval they expect from most interpersonal situations. An indirect link between shyness and trust can be found in psychotherapy research (e.g., Gilmore, 1973; Martin, 1983; Rogers, 1961) which indicates that self-disclosure is associated positively with client perceptions of trust within the therapeutic relationship. Conversely, one would expect perceptions of distrust to be associated with greater behavioural inhibition.

Finally, the self-presentation model views shyness solely as a deficit. However, Trower and Gilbert (1989) note that shyness is at least partially biologically appropriate in competitive/defensive environments and relationships insofar as it helps the individual survive (though hardly flourish). However, it may be biologically inappropriate in cooperative/safety environments and relationships. From this perspective, shyness is most maladaptive for the chronically shy who present themselves in a protective manner regardless of circumstance.

Purposes and Hypotheses
Using the self-presentation theory of shyness and some of its limitations as a foundation, the present study had several purposes. A desire to affiliate with others through a shy response style and an expectation of rejection for utilizing more acquisitive interaction strategies may be two fundamental motives associated with the self-presentation theory. Persons low in shyness, in contrast, may desire affiliation to a similar extent but may have lower expectations of rejection in interpersonal relationships. Therefore, they might be more inclined to employ approach strategies in interpersonal interactions.

The first objective of the study was to determine whether people who score high on a shyness measure differ significantly from individuals scoring low on this measure in terms of their desire for affiliation. It was expected, on the basis of previous studies (e.g., Natale et al., 1979), that shy and nonshy people would not differ significantly on this measure. It was hypothesized, however, that a high shyness group would have a significantly higher mean expectation of rejection in comparison with a low shyness group. While a nonsignificant correlation between shyness scores and desire for affiliation was expected for an entire sample of persons scoring either low, medium or high on the shyness measure, it was conjectured that there would be a significant
positive association between expectations of rejection and shyness for the sample.

The study also explored the relationship between shyness and diverse aspects of interpersonal competence. Following the lead of recent research (Buhrmester, Furman, Willenberg, & Reis, 1988; Leary et al., 1985), it was hypothesized that compared to nonshy people, very shy individuals would rate themselves lower on relationship initiation, self-disclosure, and assertion of displeasure with others' actions. No differences between these groups were expected on two other domains of interpersonal competence, the provision of emotional support and interpersonal conflict management. Within the high shyness group it was expected that mean levels of emotional support provision and conflict management would be significantly higher than the means for the other domains of interpersonal competence. Whereas negative correlations were expected between shyness and initiation, negative assertion and self-disclosure when an entire sample (and not only the extreme groups) was employed for analysis, nonsignificant associations were predicted between shyness and the two remaining domains of interpersonal competence.

Third, this research attempted to broaden the scope of variables implicated in the self-presentation explanation of shyness by assessing how aspects of perfectionism and interpersonal trust were associated with shyness. Based on
the comments of Schlenker and Leary (1985) regarding the excessive self-standards of the shy and their tendency to perceive a critical and competitive social world, it was predicted that very shy persons would report significantly higher levels of self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism and significantly lower levels of interpersonal trust compared to nonshy people. Moreover, perfectionism was expected to correlate positively and interpersonal trust negatively with shyness for an entire sample which consisted of nonshy, moderately shy and very shy persons.

In addition to these hypotheses, this investigation had three exploratory purposes. First, the combined impact of expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the domains of interpersonal competence, perfectionism and trust in correctly classifying very shy and nonshy individuals into high and low shyness groups was evaluated. Moreover, the unique contribution each variable had in classifying the shyness group membership of these individuals was examined.

Similarly, the amount of variability in shyness scores which could be accounted for by expectancies of rejection, desire for affiliation, the interpersonal competencies, perfectionism and interpersonal trust was assessed for the data obtained from all research participants, including nonshy, moderately shy, and very shy individuals. The relative contribution of each predictor to shyness was also
evaluated for an entire data set, as such information was potentially facilitative in increasing our understanding of key focal point(s) in interventions aimed at alleviating shyness.

Finally, although evidence regarding gender differences in the prevalence and severity of shyness remains inconclusive (Jones et al., 1986), surprisingly little research has been conducted to identify whether certain mediating variables are more strongly correlated with shyness for one gender as opposed to the other gender. An understanding of gender differences in possible moderators of shyness could have important implications for the treatment of shy individuals. Therefore, this study endeavoured to assess the relative importance of the variables discussed above in relation to shyness in women versus men. Because little previous research has been conducted on gender differences in moderators of shyness, no predictions were made. This facet of the research was also exploratory and was considered to be useful in generating future hypotheses.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects and Procedure

Questionnaires containing a statement of the general purpose of the study and measures representing the variables under investigation were distributed to students in 11 sections of the winter session of the introductory psychology course at the University of Windsor (see Appendix A). Subjects were volunteers given course credit for participation in the study. Written feedback (see Appendix B) disclosing the purposes of the study and the research findings was provided to them upon the completion of the data analyses.

Measures

Shyness. Cheek and Buss' (1981) Shyness Scale is a nine item measure assessing discomfort and inhibition in the presence of others. The scale is consistent with current definitions of shyness (Leary, 1986). Additionally, it reflects a narrower conceptualization of shyness than other shyness scales; related constructs such as introversion, self-esteem, loneliness, and communication apprehension are not as readily subsumed with this operationalization. The measure has high internal consistency, $\alpha = .82$, (Jones, Briggs, & Smith, 1986) and excellent eight-week retest reliability, $r = .89$ (Glass & Arnkoff, 1989).
The Shyness Scale has demonstrated associations with other measures of shyness and social anxiety (Jones et al., 1986) as well as fearfulness (Cheek & Buss, 1981). Moreover, it is significantly related to the sociability items of Eysenck's Personality Inventory and the Dyadic Anxiety Scale (Jones et al., 1986). Finally, the measure is related to social desirability but not to Eysenck's lie scale. One problem with the scale is that all of the items but one are worded in the affirmative direction. Therefore, acquiescence is a possible response bias.

Expectations of Rejection. Mehrabian's (1970, 1974) 24-item Sensitivity to Rejection Scale was employed to assess the tendency to expect others to be sources of rejection. The measure has high internal consistency, $\alpha = .82$, and four week test-retest reliability, $r = .92$. It is independent of the tendency to affiliate, $r = -.09$, but is correlated negatively with arousal-seeking, achieving, and dominance tendencies. These patterns of relations support the validity of the measure. Mehrabian and Ksionsky (1974) found that sensitivity to rejection is related only moderately to social desirability, $r = -.20$, despite the fact that traits related to sensitivity of rejection are not socially desirable.

Desire for Affiliation. Ten items from the Personality Research Form Need for Affiliation subscale (Jackson, 1974) and the Tendency to Affiliate Scale (Mehrabian, 1970) were
modified slightly to measure desire for affiliation. High scorers on these scales are described as persons who are eager to join a variety of social groups, who seek association with others, who value positive interpersonal relationships and who are actively social. The items on the scales reflect both social participation and need to affiliate. For the present study, however, a narrower operationalization of desire for affiliation was necessary. The groups under study behave in ways which overlap with these measures by definition. That is, most items on the scales reflect a tendency to behave in an inhibited or an uninhibited manner in interpersonal interactions rather than an attitude about the desire for affiliation. Therefore, some items were discarded and others were reworded slightly to reflect a narrower conceptualization of affiliative desires.

**Interpersonal Competence.** The Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire (Buhrmester et al., 1988), a 40-item measure assessing five domains of interpersonal competence (relationship initiation, disclosure of personal information, asserting displeasure with others, providing emotional support, and interpersonal conflict management) was used to assess interpersonal competence. Internal consistencies on the ICQ subscales range from $\alpha = .77$ to $\alpha = .87$ with a mean of $\alpha = .83$. Four week test-retest reliability correlations for each of the five scales are high:
Initiation, $r=.89$; Negative Assertion, $r=.79$; Disclosure, $r=.75$; Emotional Support, $r=.76$; and Conflict Management, $r=.69$. Buhrmester et al. (1988) have demonstrated that there is a meaningful differentiation between the ICQ subscales. In general, the domains have adequate convergent and divergent validity as evidenced by the fact that the initiation and negative assertion subscales were more closely associated with a cluster of instrumental traits and the self-disclosure, emotional support, and conflict management competencies were more closely related to expressive personality traits.

**Perfectionism.** The 15-item self-oriented and 15-item socially-prescribed perfectionism subscales of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Hewitt, Holigrocki, & Flett, 1988) assessed perfectionistic orientations. The internal consistency, $\alpha=.86$, and 12-week test-retest reliability, $r=.88$, of the self-oriented perfectionism scale, are excellent. The coefficient alpha, $\alpha=.87$, and test-retest reliability, $r=.75$, of the socially-prescribed perfectionism subscale are adequate. Self-oriented perfectionism tends to correlate with self-related constructs such as high self-standards, self-criticism and self-blame but not with other variables, thus indicating some convergent and divergent validity. Socially-prescribed perfectionism also appears to have good convergent and divergent validity, as it is associated with demand for
approval from others, locus of control, and fear of negative evaluation. Finally, there is little relation between the perfectionism scales and a measure of impression management (Flett & Hewitt, in press).

**Interpersonal Trust.** Macdonald, Kessel and Fuller's (1972) 10-item trust scale was employed to assess ratings of trust in oneself and the trustworthiness of others. The items that comprise the measure are correlated at least, $r = .40$, with the total scale and the internal consistency of the measure is very high, $\alpha = .86$. The convergent validity of this scale is demonstrated through its high positive correlation with Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust Scale.

**Social Desirability.** The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale short form (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Reynolds, 1982), a 13-item measure of the degree to which subjects report culturally desirable behaviours that are relatively unlikely to occur, evaluated social desirability. The scale has good internal consistency, $K-R\ 20 = .76$, and 6-week test-retest reliability, $r = .74$ (Zook & Sipps, 1982). Evidence for the validity of the measure is provided by its significant associations with the original Marlowe-Crowne Scale, $r = .93$, and the Edwards Social Desirability Scale, $r = .41$, but not with most of the MMPI clinical subscales (Reynolds, 1982).

**Personal Data.** Six items were included to facilitate a description of personal attributes and
background characteristics (gender, age, educational level, marital status, living arrangements, size of community of residence) of the respondents. Subjects were also required to complete one item concerning self-labelled shyness ("Would you consider yourself to be a shy person at present?"). Those who responded affirmatively were asked to complete two additional items regarding the length of their shyness (Cheek, Carpentieri, Smith, Rierdan, & Koff, 1986) and six contexts in which shyness occurs for them (Buss, 1986).

**Design and Data Analysis**

To facilitate between-groups comparisons, the mean on the Cheek and Buss' (1981) Shyness Scale was calculated and subjects with scores more than one standard deviation above or below the mean were placed into high and low shyness groups, respectively. Using the extreme ranges of the distribution on the Shyness Scale as an inclusion criterion better ensured that chronically shy individuals comprised the high shyness group which could be contrasted on other measures with persons for whom shyness was not likely a concern.

In all of the between-groups analyses, shyness group (high versus low) and gender (female versus male) were the independent variables and scores on measures of expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the five interpersonal competencies, perfectionism, and interpersonal trust were
the dependent variables. Between-groups differences were evaluated with a multivariate analysis of variance procedure.

The degree to which subjects scoring either high or low on the Shyness Scale could be classified correctly into high and low shyness groups by their scores on expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, domains of interpersonal competence, perfectionism and trust was also examined. For this analysis, total scale scores on expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the ICQ subscales, perfectionism, and interpersonal trust were the independent variables and shyness group (high versus low) was the dependent variable. The accuracy of the classification of these individuals was assessed with a discriminant function analysis procedure.

In considering the relationships between Shyness Scale scores and the measures of expectancies of rejection, desire for affiliation, the domains of interpersonal competence, perfectionism and interpersonal trust individually and as a group, the data from all the research participants (and not merely the two extreme groups) were used. This strategy was selected to maximize the use of the data acquired in the investigation and to avoid the artificial attenuation of the coefficients obtained from the analyses.

In these analyses, scores on expectancies of rejection, desire for affiliation, the ICQ subscales, perfectionism and
interpersonal trust were the independent variables and total score on the Shyness Scale was the dependent variable. The relationships between shyness and the independent variables were examined through correlation and multiple regression analyses.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted to describe the characteristics of the sample, to evaluate the assumptions of multivariate statistics, and to consider possible differences between the high and low shyness groups in terms of background variables. Additionally, because the number of individual comparisons required to assess shyness group and gender differences on expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the five interpersonal competencies, self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism, and interpersonal trust was large (i.e., 20), the probability that a significant difference could result from chance alone was substantially elevated. To allow for better control for this difficulty, shyness group and gender differences were evaluated initially on the entire set of dependent variables.

Sample Characteristics. Three hundred seventeen questionnaires were completed, of which 286 were suitable for the data analyses. Only data from subjects between the ages of 18 and 25 were selected for inclusion. The restricted age range allowed for greater homogeneity in the experiences, aspirations and developmental concerns of the sample. As a result of this criterion, 27 questionnaires were excluded from the research. In addition, the surveys
of four participants were not included in the analyses because of excessive missing information, possible response bias, and/or a failure to follow instructions properly.

With respect to sample characteristics, the mean age of the respondents was 19.96 years. The sample was comprised primarily of single (97.9%), first year university students (80.5%), living at home with parents (50.5%), and majoring in the social sciences (58.4%). Female participants (59.8%) outnumbered the male respondents (40.2%) by a substantial margin. The sample mean for the Shyness Scale (M=24.13) was very similar to the mean obtained in its validation study (Cheek & Buss, 1981). Sixty-three participants were included in the high shyness group while 67 subjects were placed into the low shyness group because their scores were more than one standard deviation from the sample mean (S.D.=5.55).

Table 1 provides descriptive information regarding the onset of shyness and contexts in which shyness was reported for respondents in the high shyness group. More than one-half of the subjects who completed these items recalled that their shyness was present before the beginning of elementary school. Contexts in which shyness was most apparent included novel situations, formal situations, and circumstances in which one felt uniquely different from others. More than 85% of these people reported shyness in at least four of the six settings described in the survey.
Table 1

Self-Reported Duration of Shyness and Shyness-Evoking Contexts for the High Shyness Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of shyness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As long as I can remember</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before beginning primary school</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On entering primary school</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During later primary school</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On entering jr. high school</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On entering high school</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On entering University</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of shyness</th>
<th>Percentage Yes</th>
<th>Percentage No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In new situations</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When intruded upon</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under perceived scrutiny</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In formal situations</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasions of privacy</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling uniquely different</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 52

Note. Eleven participants in the shy group did not rate themselves as shy. Consequently, they did not complete these items.
Data Screening. Data screening procedures (Helderson, 1987; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) revealed no threats to multivariate analysis in terms of linearity, normality, multicollinearity or singularity, and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Moreover, there was no indication of multivariate outliers in the data set.

Background Characteristics. Differences between the high and low shyness groups in terms of age, gender, years of university education, population of town/city of residence, and social desirability were tested with a series of univariate analyses of variance. Only one between-groups difference was obtained on the dependent measures. The low shyness group had a significantly higher mean score on the Social Desirability Scale in comparison with the high shyness group, $F(1,128) = 5.40, \ p < .01$.

The Dependent Measures as a Set. Differences between groups on the set of dependent variables (expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, initiation, negative assertion, self-disclosure, emotional support provision, conflict management, self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism and interpersonal trust) were evaluated in a 2 x 2 (Shyness Group x Gender) multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) with social desirability as a covariate. A significant main effect was obtained for shyness group, $F(1,126) = 21.83, \ p < .0001$, and a statistical trend was found for gender, $F(1,126) = 1.71, \ p$
However, the two-way (Group x Gender) interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1,126) = 1.19$.

**Primary Analyses**

**Rejection and Affiliation.** To test the hypotheses that the high shyness group would have a significantly higher mean level of expectations of rejection than the low shyness group but would not differ from the low shyness group on desire for affiliation, univariate analyses of variance were conducted (n=130). As predicted (see Table 2), the shy group reported a significantly higher mean level of expectations of rejection, $F(1,126) = 91.44$, $p < .0001$, than the nonshy group but did not differ significantly from the nonshy group in terms of desire for affiliation, $F = .25$.

Pearson correlation coefficients were acquired to test the hypotheses that there would be a significant positive correlation between expectations of rejection and shyness and a nonsignificant correlation between desire for affiliation and shyness when the entire data set (n=286) was included in the analysis. Table 3 indicates that these hypotheses were also corroborated; expectations of rejection was correlated to shyness, $r = .59$, $p < .0001$, and desire for affiliation was not related to shyness, $r = .10$.

**Interpersonal Competence.** In relation to the second objective of this research, it was hypothesized that the high shyness group would have significantly lower mean ratings on interpersonal competencies involving relationship
### Table 2

**Univariate Analyses of Variance for the Effect of Shyness Group on the Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Shy Group Mean</th>
<th>Nonshy Group Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc Des. (Covar)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perfect.</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.-Perfect.</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>91.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>144.57</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Assertion</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Provis.</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Mgmt.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n = 130**
Table 3

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Scores on the Shyness Scale and the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shyness Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interp. Trust</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perfection</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Perfect.</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. Rejection</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire Affilia.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel.Initiation</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Assertion</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion.Support</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Mgmt</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Desirabil</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 286

r > .15,  p < .01

r > .21  p < .001

r > .28  p < .0001
initiation, negative assertion and self-disclosure compared to the low shyness group and that the groups would not differ on two other dependent variables -- emotional support provision and conflict management. As predicted, the shy group had significantly lower mean ratings on relationship initiation, $F = 144.57, p < .0001$, negative assertion, $F = 41.64, p < .0001$, and self-disclosure, $F = 36.63, p < .0001$, compared to the low shyness group. However, contrary to predictions, the low shyness group reported significantly higher mean levels of competence in providing emotional support to others, $F = 10.33, p < .005$, and conflict management, $F = 7.67, p < .01$.

Two $t$-tests were performed to test the hypothesis that the mean levels on the dependent variables, emotional support provision and conflict management would be significantly higher than the highest mean of the remaining domains of interpersonal competence within the high shyness group ($n=63$). As expected, provision of emotional support was significantly higher ($M=31.9$) than negative assertion ($M=22.9$), $t (1,62) = 10.11, p < .001$. The mean difference between conflict management ($M=26.0$) and negative assertion was also significant, $t (1,62) = 3.24, p < .005$.

Finally, correlation coefficients were examined to assess the hypotheses that there would be significant negative correlations between shyness and initiation, negative assertion and self-disclosure and nonsignificant
associations between shyness and the two other domains of interpersonal competence when the data from all respondents were included for the analysis. Table 3 illustrates that as predicted, shyness was correlated negatively with initiation, \( r = -0.69, p < .0001 \), negative assertion, \( r = -0.45, p < .0001 \), and self-disclosure, \( r = -0.39, p < .0001 \); incompatible with hypotheses, however, shyness was also related negatively to both emotional support provision, \( r = -0.25, p < .001 \), and conflict management, \( r = -0.20, p < .001 \).

**Perfectionism and Interpersonal Trust.** Regarding the third purpose of the study, it was hypothesized that the high shyness group would report significantly higher levels of self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism and significantly lower levels of interpersonal trust compared to the low shyness group. As predicted, the high shyness group had a significantly higher mean level of socially prescribed perfectionism, \( F = 20.27, p < .0001 \), and a significantly lower level of trust, \( F = 12.52, p < .001 \), than the nonshy group. However, the groups did not differ on the measure of self-oriented perfectionism, \( F = .01 \).

Moreover, perfectionism was expected to correlate positively and interpersonal trust negatively with shyness when the data of the entire sample (n=286) was analyzed. Shyness was correlated significantly with socially-prescribed perfectionism, \( r = .28, p < .0001 \) and interpersonal trust, \( r = -0.20, p < .001 \), in the predicted
directions but was not associated with self-oriented perfectionism, $r = -.02, p < n.s.$

**Classification into Shyness Groups.** Concerning the first exploratory aim of the investigation, a discriminant function analysis was performed to ascertain the degree to which participants scoring either high or low on the Shyness Scale ($n=130$) could be classified correctly into high and low shyness groups by their scores on expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the domains of interpersonal competence, perfectionism and interpersonal trust. The relationship initiation, negative assertion, and self-disclosure subscales of the ICQ were excluded from the analysis because of their obvious similarities to the Shyness Scale.

One function was obtained from the analysis, with a Wilks' Lambda of $.476, p < .0001$. The overall percentage of "grouped" cases that were correctly classified was 85.38%. The rate of correct classification was slightly elevated for the shy cases (87.3%) in comparison with the nonshy cases (83.6%).

Table 4 provides a summary of results from the discriminant function analysis, including the correlations of the predictors with the function, the univariate F statistics and the pooled within-group correlations among the predictors. The loading matrix of correlations between the predictors and the discriminant function suggests that
### Table 4

**Discriminant Function Analysis of Independent Variable Prediction of Shyness Group Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Correlations of Predictors with Discriminant Function</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>P &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>.00004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perfectionism</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.8720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.-Perfectionism</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect. Rejection</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>95.92</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire Affiliation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.3070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Provision</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canonical R  .724
Eigenvalue  1.103

**Pooled within-group correlations among predictors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perfectionism</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.-Perfectionism</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations Rejection</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Affiliation</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Provision</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 130
expectations of rejection!s the most important predictor distinguishing between the very shy and nonshy groups. Socially-prescribed perfectionism, emotional support provision, conflict management, and interpersonal trust made moderate contributions in predicting group membership.

**Influence of Predictors on Shyness Scale Scores.**

Regarding the second exploratory purpose of this research, two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed to examine how much of the variability in scores on the Shyness Scale could be accounted for by scores on the independent measures (expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the domains of interpersonal competence, perfectionism and interpersonal trust) for the entire data set (n=286). Consistent with the discriminant analysis, the initiation, negative assertion, and self-disclosure scales of the ICQ were excluded from this analysis. Because social desirability was correlated significantly with shyness, \( r = -.15, p < .01 \), it was loaded into the equation initially so that its impact could be removed statistically. The other predictors were loaded into the equation in the second step and competed with each other for the remaining variance.

Results of an initial regression analysis suggested that desire for affiliation was a suppressor variable — an independent variable "suppressing" variance that is irrelevant to the prediction of the dependent variable, and increases the multiple \( R^2 \) by virtue of its correlations with
other independent measures -- because of its negative Beta weight and positive correlation with the Shyness Scale; therefore, a second analysis was performed with desire for affiliation removed from the equation. As there were no substantial differences between the results of the two equations, findings from the original analysis are presented.

Table 5 summarizes the results of the regression procedure. The $R$ for regression was significantly different from zero, $F(7, 268) = 24.7$, $p < .0001$. Altogether, 43% of the variability in Shyness Scale scores could be accounted for by the entire set of predictors. Over 40% of this variance in Shyness Scale scores was predicted by scores on the variables entered into the equation after social desirability. Expectations of rejection, $sr^2 = .51$, accounted for approximately 25% of the variance in shyness scores on its own, while three other IVs contributed very moderately to the prediction of shyness scores: socially-prescribed perfectionism, $sr^2 = .11$, provision of emotional support, $sr^2 = -.10$, and interpersonal trust, $sr^2 = -.08$.

Gender Differences. The final exploratory purpose of this research was concerned with gender differences on the dependent variables under investigation (expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, domains of interpersonal competence, perfectionism and interpersonal trust). As indicated in the preliminary analyses, a multivariate
Table 5

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on the Impact of the Independent Variables in the Prediction of Total Shyness Scale Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>sz²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soc. Desirability</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exp. Rejection</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Perfect.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emot. Support</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interper. Trust</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self. Perfect.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Mgmt.</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des Affiliation</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercept=15.09

R² = .43
Adj. R² = .41
Multiple R = .65
F = 24.71, p < .0001

n = 286
analysis of covariance revealed only a statistical trend for the main effect of gender. Consequently, a further analysis of specific gender differences on the dependent variables was not warranted.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Several interesting findings were obtained in this research. The evidence was supportive, in general, of the self-presentation view of shyness.

Rejection and Affiliation

Consistent with the general motive system postulated by self-presentation theory, shy people in the sample expected rejection to a greater degree than nonshy individuals but desired affiliation with others to a similar extent. These findings have some possible implications. First, the evidence indicates that very shy people do want to affiliate with others, although their overt behaviour suggests otherwise. Perhaps their expectations of rejection in interpersonal situations inhibit more direct approaches by the shy; this fear of aversive consequences may push the shy to the fringes of social interchange where they feel less threatened and more able to monitor their presentations of self with other people (e.g., Bernstein et al., 1983; Dykeman & Ries, 1979; Natale et al., 1979).

Although the very shy and nonshy did not differ in terms of their overall cravings for affiliation, it is possible that different factors operate in moderating affiliative desires. The very shy seem to feel more ambivalent or negative about affiliation given their strong expectations of rejection. In this manner, affiliation may
be associated with approach-avoidance tendencies where interpersonal interactions are both desired and feared (Asendorph, 1987; Cheek & Buss, 1981).

In contrast, the nonshy -- who do not generally worry about negative evaluation -- may wish for affiliation to a similar extent as a consequence of casual indifference or somewhat positive feelings toward social interaction. Interpersonal exchanges are not as threatening to these individuals so there is little need to brood over them. The nonshy are more likely and able to interact with others when they want such contact; as a corollary, affiliation may be more "matter of fact" for them. Future research should address the validity of this distinction between the very shy and nonshy in terms of their expectations and evaluations in associating with others.

**Interpersonal Competence**

The relationship between shyness and diverse aspects of interpersonal competence was also examined in this research. As expected, very shy individuals had lower mean ratings on measures of relationship initiation, self-disclosure, and assertion of displeasure with others' actions compared to the nonshy participants. The correlations between these domains and shyness were also in the predicted (negative) direction. These results are viewed best as supporting the convergent validity of both the Shyness Scale (Cheek & Buss, 1981) and the Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire.
(Buhrmester et al., 1988) because ICQ items for these subscales are very similar to items associated with behavioural inhibition on the Shyness Scale.

Within the very shy group, the mean levels of the emotional support provision and conflict management were significantly greater than the means for the other domains of interpersonal competence. However, contrary to our predictions but consistent with Arkin's (1981) contention that the shy perceive themselves to be generally less competent socially, the high shyness group had significantly lower ratings than the nonshy group on measures of both support provision and conflict management. In addition, the correlations between shyness and these competencies were negative for the data on all research participants.

These findings indicate that the very shy perceive themselves to be more adept in domains that reflect "passive" competencies that would go well with a safe self-presentation style (provision of support, avoidance of conflict) compared with realms of interpersonal competence associated with more assertive presentations of self (initiation, assertion, disclosure). Interestingly, even in interpersonal domains with which the very shy were comfortable and likely to engage, there was a perception that they were not competent in using these skills relative to the nonshy.
Although a defensive interactional style enables the very shy to relate interpersonally by placing the focus on the interaction target, this strategy takes a toll on shy students' self-confidence. In the process, views of social and personal inefficacy that are already self-evident to the very shy are perpetuated (e.g., Briggs & Cheek, 1988; Hill, 1989; Langston & Cantor, 1989).

**Perfectionism and Interpersonal Trust**

This research also broadened the range of variables implicated in the self-presentation explanation of shyness by assessing how perfectionism and interpersonal trust were related to shyness. Consistent with Schlenker and Leary (1985), very shy people reported significantly higher levels of socially-prescribed perfectionism and significantly lower levels of interpersonal trust compared to nonshy people. Furthermore, socially-prescribed perfectionism was correlated positively and interpersonal trust was related negatively to shyness for the entire data set.

These results appear to illuminate further how perceptions of interaction targets are associated with a shy self-presentation style. Beliefs that they cannot meet audience expectations of them and that others cannot be trusted seem to be connected with an inhibited style of relating in the very shy. These data are consistent with recent empirical work linking shyness and a pessimistic view of interactions with others, even when one's behaviour is
appropriate and successfully executed (Maddux, Leary & Norton, 1986).

However, inconsistent with predictions, the very shy group did not have significantly higher mean level of self-oriented perfectionism than the nonshy group. This outcome does not necessarily provide evidence against Schlencker and Leary's (1985) proposition that the shy have excessive self-standards; even if very shy and nonshy individuals have similar levels of self-oriented perfectionism, the shy repeatedly have been shown to have much lower levels of self-esteem (e.g., Kowalski & Leary, 1990; Wolfe, Lennox & Cutler, 1986). As a consequence, the gap between self-expectations and confidence in one's capacities to reach desired goals is likely far greater for the very shy than the nonshy.

This conclusion may be quite plausible in view of our other findings. Although a measure of general self-esteem was not included in the present investigation, Baumeister et al. (1989) have proposed that while self-esteem refers literally to an intrapsychic attitude, self-esteem scales often assess a self-presentation orientation.

High self-esteem scores are said to relate to the tendency to present oneself in a self-enhancing manner that is characterized by a willingness to accept risks and call attention to the self; low self-esteem scores may be associated with a tendency to present oneself in a self-
protective fashion which is characterized by an unwillingness to accept risks and reluctance to draw attention to oneself (Baumeister et al., 1989).

The pattern of results in the present study supports this distinction indirectly. The high shyness group was especially deficient in domains of interpersonal competence associated with risk (initiation, disclosure, assertion, conflict management) compared to the nonshy group and in comparison with an interpersonal strategy (i.e., emotional support provision) that probably would place them in a position that is less precarious. Nonetheless, a direct test of the relationships among self-esteem, interpersonal competence, self-standards and shyness is an important area of further inquiry that may shed more light upon these conjectures.

**Collective and Unique Contributions in Predicting Shyness**

The investigation also examined the collective and unique contributions of expectations of rejection, desire for affiliation, the interpersonal competence domains, perfectionism and perceived trust in predicting scores on the Shyness Scale through a discriminant function analysis on the extremes of the sample and a regression analysis for the complete data set. In general, this set of independent variables had very accurate classification rates for each group and accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in Shyness Scale scores for the entire sample.
Expectations of rejection from interaction targets was by far the most salient variable predicting shyness in both analyses. This finding is consistent with an extensive body of work on psychological correlates of shyness (e.g., Asendorph, 1987; Bruch et al., 1989; Smith, Ingram, & Brehm, 1983) as well as research indicating that the addition of cognitive restructuring focused on reducing expectations of rejection is more effective than exposure alone in the treatment of social phobia (e.g., Butler, Cullington, Munby, Amies, & Gelder, 1984; Mattick & Peters, 1988).

Perceptions of others as excessively demanding and untrustworthy and of the self as cynical and untrusting contributed moderately to the prediction of shyness scores. These results suggest that shyness treatments may be more efficacious if they include interventions aimed at reducing distortions concerned with others' social prescriptions and enhancing capacities for trust as auxiliaries in helping the shy to cope with anticipations of rejection. The efficacy of combining these strategies in treating shyness deserves further attention in future research.

Furthermore, the findings on the domains of interpersonal competence suggest that helping the very shy gain confidence and proficiency with specific interpersonal competencies (i.e., assertiveness and nurturance) can encourage greater social participation. This conclusion is consistent with research (e.g., Haynes-Clements & Avery,
1984) indicating that social skills training reduced social anxiety and increased treatment subjects' perceived ability to participate in social situations relative to waiting-list controls.

**Gender Differences**

Regarding the final objective of this research, only weak evidence (i.e., a statistical trend) was obtained for gender differences on the dependent measures studied in association with shyness. Therefore, factors which inhibit self-presentation seem to be similar for shy men and shy women (e.g., expectations of rejection, low perceived interpersonal competence) and divergent treatment strategies may be equally efficacious for either gender.

It must be noted, however, that gender differences on other correlates of shyness have been obtained in some previous research (e.g., Pilkonis, 1977; Snyder, Smith, Augelli & Ingram, 1985). As a consequence, conclusions regarding the treatment implications of gender differences on moderators of shyness are specific to the variables included in the present study. Future research should investigate the plethora of variables which may interact with gender in differentiating between the very shy and nonshy.

**Limitations of the Study**

While this research has contributed to our knowledge of shyness, it has limitations in terms of the sampling and
procedure, the measures, and the design which must be considered before making such appraisals. With respect to the sample, generalizations beyond populations similar in age and educational aspirations must be made with caution. There is evidence suggesting the comparability of results across diverse age groups on correlates of shyness such as fear of negative evaluation (see Jones, Cheek, & Briggs, 1986), but several variables in this investigation (i.e., desire for affiliation, perfectionism, trust) are not as readily generalizable simply because they have been studied very little in shyness research. Using the restricted age range controlled better for confounds associated with developmental concerns but this was done at the cost of acquiring information about these issues in relation to shyness. This issue is beyond the scope of the present inquiry, but merits future exploration in shyness research.

While most of the measures employed for this research have demonstrated reliability and validity, a measure of desire for affiliation had to be created to remove the behavioural tendencies present on existing scales of need for affiliation and social participation. The reliability and validity of the Desire for Affiliation Scale must be evaluated before sound conclusions regarding the relationship between shyness and desire for affiliation can be reached.
Moreover, the utility of a desire for affiliation construct is unclear at this juncture. While the scale does seem to be similar to Cheek and Buss' (1981) Sociability Scale in terms of face validity, a nonsignificant positive correlation was obtained in the present study between desire for affiliation and shyness and Cheek and Buss found a significant negative correlation between sociability and the same shyness measure on a similar population. Future research examining the relationships of theoretically related measures such as sociability, social participation, and loneliness with the Desire for Affiliation Scale may be fruitful in judging its validity and utility.

With respect to the design of the research, one issue that must be considered relates to the fact that participants scoring high on the Shyness Scale were treated as a homogeneous group. There is, however, some evidence indicating that such is not the case (Alden & Cappe, 1988; Bruch, Giordana, & Pearl, 1986; Buss, 1986; Pilkonis, 1977). It will be recalled, for example, that Buss (1986) distinguishes between fearful and self-conscious shyness, arguing that the development, course and conditions in which shyness is problematic may be different for each of the specific subtypes.

While a psychometrically sound measure which distinguishes between the fearful and self-conscious subtypes has not been developed, measures of shyness onset
and contexts of shyness were included to address possible differences between these groups on the dependent variables upon a reexamination of the data.

Biases common to the self-report format were controlled for by alternating positively-phrased items and negatively-phrased items and keeping the length of the survey tolerable (i.e., participants generally took between 25 and 40 minutes to complete the questionnaires). However, social desirability appears to have had a moderate effect on the findings, although its influence was controlled for statistically in the analyses. This outcome was to be expected, simply because of the characteristics of the people completing the research. One would expect nonshy individuals to have high social desirability scores, given that theory and research on shyness (e.g., Arkin et al., 1986) emphasizes the link between the acquisitive self-presentation style of people who are not generally shy and a high need for approval which the Social Desirability Scale measures (Reynolds, 1982).

Finally, the findings of this investigation cannot be generalized beyond research which relies on the self-report methodology; the results obtained might have been different if a different methodology (e.g., experiment, behaviour observation, behavioural simulation) had been employed. Because the findings of social scientists are constrained by the methodologies they employ and the biases inherent in
these approaches, the problems which they find appealing should be examined from as many different perspectives as possible; in this manner, consistencies and divergencies in findings can be assessed across methodologies and engaging new hypotheses can be generated when contradictions arise.

Conclusion

While we have learned a great deal about shyness in the past decade, much remains to be learned. This investigation has corroborated a large number of studies which illustrate a convincing positive relationship between shyness and expectations of rejection. The study also suggests that the relationship between shyness and constructs associated with affiliation is nebulous and warrants more rigorous investigation. Furthermore, our inquiry supports conjectures that shyness is related to deficits in social competence (Arkin et al., 1986), although such deficiencies may be more apparent for some domains of interpersonal competence than others. Finally, the research indicates that shyness is related moderately to variables that have not been widely studied in previous research: socially-prescribed perfectionism and interpersonal trust.

Through employing a wide variety of strategies and through testing an array of bold and innovative hypotheses, future research can further our understanding of shyness to an even greater extent. However, it is the nature of our discipline and the nature of science in general to discover
that where we believed we were standing on firm and safe ground, our knowledge is insecure and in a state of flux (Popper, 1959). As our knowledge of shyness increases, new hypotheses regarding its nature and relationships to other variables will arise.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
SELF-PRESENTATION SURVEY

I am a graduate student in the Clinical Psychology program at the University of Windsor. I am interested in learning about how people interact with each other. As part of my training, I am conducting a study which explores some factors that may be related to the ways that people present themselves to others in interpersonal relationships.

As part of this study, I am asking introductory psychology students to complete a series of questionnaires. It should take you about 45 minutes to finish the questionnaire packet, and you will receive course credit for your participation. These questionnaires are completely anonymous so please do not write your name on any of them.

When all the data have been collected, I will give your professor an information sheet describing the study in more detail. An announcement will be made at that time to inform you that you may pick up one of these information sheets after class.

Please remember that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If for any reason you would rather not take part in the study, you are free to leave at any time with no consequences whatsoever, except that you can be given credit for your participation only if you complete the entire questionnaire packet.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study or its results, please feel free to contact me or my advisor, Dr. Shelagh Towson, at the Psychology Department in South Windsor Hall.

Thank you for your participation. Your role in this research is essential, and very much appreciated.

________________________
Todd Jackson
Graduate Student
Psychology Department
University of Windsor
January, 1991
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the research described on the preceding page. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time, at my request, and that any concerns I have about this research should be directed to Dr. Shelagh Towson, Department of Psychology, University of Windsor, Dr. Robert Orr, Head, Department of Psychology, University of Windsor, or to Dr. James Porter, Chair, Ethics Committee, Department of Psychology, University of Windsor. I also understand that when this study has been completed, I will be able to obtain a written summary of the research findings from my TA in this course or from Todd Jackson, Department of Psychology, University of Windsor.

DATE__________________________

NAME__________________________

SIGNATURE______________________
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Age: ___ Gender: M F Marital Status: __________

What year of study are you in? : 1 2 3 4 Major: ________

What are your current living arrangements? (circle letter):

a) parents  e) on my own
b) other relatives  f) roommates
c) spouse  g) university residence
d) boy/girlfriend  h) other (specify): ______

What is the population of the town/city you have lived in for most of your life?

a) less than 4,999  e) 200,000 - 499,999
b) 5,000 - 49,999  f) 500,000 - 999,999
c) 50,000 - 99,999  g) over 1,000,000
d) 100,000 - 199,999

Would you consider yourself to be a shy person at present?

yes  no

If yes:

1) For how long have you been shy?

a) as long as I can remember  b) before starting elementary school
c) on entering elementary school  d) during later elementary school years
e) on entering junior high school  f) on entering high school
g) on entering college

2) When are you shy?

a) in new situations  b) when I feel intruded upon  c) when I think I'm being scrutinized
d) in formal situations  e) when my privacy has been breached  f) when I feel uniquely different from others

Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No
THE SHYNESS SCALE (Cheek & Buss, 1981)

Rate yourself on the following items, where 1 is **STRONGLY DISAGREE** (SD), 2 is **MODERATELY DISAGREE** (MD), 3 is **NEUTRAL** (N), 4 is **MODERATELY AGREE** (MA), and 5 is **STRONGLY AGREE** (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am socially somewhat awkward.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I don't find it hard to talk to strangers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel tense when I'm with people I don't know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When conversing I worry about saying something dumb.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel nervous when speaking to someone in authority.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am often uncomfortable at parties and other social functions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel inhibited in social situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have trouble looking someone right in the eye.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am more shy with members of the other sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENSITIVITY TO REJECTION SCALE (Mehrabian, 1970)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal characteristics and traits. Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree and to what extent. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE, circle 1; if you MODERATELY DISAGREE, circle 2; if you SLIGHTLY DISAGREE, circle 3; if you are NEUTRAL circle 4; if you SLIGHTLY AGREE, circle 5; if you MODERATELY AGREE, circle 6; if you STRONGLY AGREE, circle 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I sometimes prefer being with strangers rather than familiar people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I am not enjoying a party, I don't mind being the first person to leave.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would be very hurt should a close friend contradict me in public.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When a group is discussing important matters, I like my feelings to be known.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I tend to associate less with people who are critical.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I often visit people without being invited.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I don't mind going someplace, even if there are some people there who don't like me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I try to feel a group out before I take a definite stand on an issue.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When 2 of my friends are arguing, I don't mind taking sides to support the one I agree with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If I ask someone to go someplace with me and s/he refuses, I'm hesitant to ask again.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I am cautious about expressing opinions until I know people quite well.
12. If I can't understand what someone says in a discussion, I let it pass rather than interrupt.
13. I enjoy discussing controversial topics like politics and religion.
14. I feel uneasy about asking someone to return something s/he borrowed from me.
15. I criticize people openly and expect them to do the same.
16. I can still enjoy a party, even if I find I'm not properly dressed for it.
17. I sometimes take criticisms too hard.
18. If someone dislikes me, I tend to avoid him/her.
19. It seldom embarrasses me to ask someone for a favour.
20. I seldom contradict people for fear of hurting them.
21. I am very sensitive to signs that a person may not want to talk to me.
22. When I go somewhere where I know no one, I like to have a friend come along.
23. I often say what I believe, even if it alienates the person with whom I am speaking.
24. I enjoy going to parties where I don't know anyone.
DESIREE FOR AFFILIATION SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal characteristics and traits. Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree and to what extent. If you **STRONGLY DISAGREE**, circle 1; if you **MODERATELY DISAGREE**, circle 2; if you **SLIGHTLY DISAGREE**, circle 3; if you are **NEUTRAL**, circle 4; if you **SLIGHTLY AGREE**, circle 5; if you **MODERATELY AGREE**, circle 6; if you **STRONGLY AGREE**, circle 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It wouldn't bother me to go for days without seeing anyone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I seldom feel lonely when I'm left alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I rarely wish I had more friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wish I would affiliate with others more often.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I rarely desire others' company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I want stronger attachments to people more than having them regard me as witty and clever.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I long for more time with others and less time alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would be miserable if I didn't know a lot of people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I need the independence that comes from having fewer attachments more than the warm feelings that come with having closer ties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I yearn for more time by myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
(Buhrmester, et al., 1988)

Using a 5-point rating scale, circle the number that indicates best your level of competence and comfort in handling each of these situations:

1  "I'm poor at this; I'd feel so uncomfortable and unable to handle this situation, I'd avoid it if possible."
2  "I'm only fair at this; I would feel uncomfortable and would have lots of difficulty handling this situation."
3  "I'm okay at this; I'd feel somewhat uncomfortable and would have some difficulty dealing with this."
4  "I'm good at this; I'd feel quite comfortable and able to handle the situation."
5  "I'm extremely good at this; I'd feel very comfortable and could handle this situation very well."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>EG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Suggesting to someone that you get together and do something, e.g., go out together.

2. Telling a companion you don't like a certain way s/he has been treating you.

3. Revealing something intimate about yourself to someone you are just getting to know.

4. Helping a close companion work through his/her thoughts and feelings about a major life issue.

5. Being able to admit you were wrong when a disagreement with a close companion begins to build to a serious fight.

6. Finding and suggesting things to do with someone you find attractive.

7. Saying "no" when a date/acquaintance asks you to do something you don't want to do.

8. Confiding in a new friend and letting her/him see your more sensitive side.
9. Being able to patiently and sensitively listen to a companion "let off steam" about problems s/he is having.

10. Being able to put resentful feelings aside when having a fight with a close companion.

11. Introducing yourself to someone you might like to get to know.

12. Turning down an unreasonable request from a friend.

13. Telling a close companion things about yourself that you are ashamed of.

14. Helping a close companion get to the heart of a problem s/he is experiencing.

15. Really listening to the complaints of a close companion when having a conflict with her/him and not trying to read her/his mind.

16. Being an interesting and enjoyable person when first getting to know people.

17. Standing up for your rights when a companion has been neglecting you.

18. Letting a new companion know the real you.

19. Helping a close companion deal with family or roommate problems.

20. Being able to take a companion's perspective in a fight and really understanding her/his point of view.

21. Carrying on conversations with someone new whom you might like to get to know.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Telling a date/acquaintance that s/he is doing something that is embarrassing you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Letting down your protective outer shell and trusting a close companion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Being a good and sensitive listener for a companion who is upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Refraining from saying things that might cause a disagreement to build into a big fight.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Calling (on the phone) a new date/acquaintance to set up a time to get together and do something.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Confronting a close companion when s/he has broken a promise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Telling a close companion things that secretly make you feel anxious and afraid.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Being able to say and do things to support a close companion when s/he is feeling down.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Being able to work through a specific problem without resorting to global accusations (&quot;you always do that&quot;).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Presenting good first impressions to people you might like to be friends with (or date).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Telling a close companion s/he has done something to hurt your feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Telling a close companion how much you care for her/him.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being able to show genuine concern, even when a companion's problem is uninteresting to you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. When angry with a companion, being able to accept that s/he has a valid point even if you disagree with it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Going to parties/gatherings where you don't know people well to start up new relationships.  1  2  3  4  5

37. Telling a date or acquaintance that s/he has done something that has made you angry.  1  2  3  4  5

38. Knowing how to move a conversation with a date or acquaintance beyond superficial talk to really get to know each other.  1  2  3  4  5

39. When a close companion needs help and support, being able to give advice in ways that are well-received.  1  2  3  4  5

40. Not exploding at a close companion (even when it is justified) to avoid a damaging conflict.  1  2  3  4  5
MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERFECTIONISM SCALE (Hewitt & Flett, 1988)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal characteristics and traits. Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree and to what extent. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE, circle 1; if you MODERATELY DISAGREE, circle 2; if you SLIGHTLY DISAGREE, circle 3; if you are NEUTRAL circle 4; if you SLIGHTLY AGREE, circle 5; if you MODERATELY AGREE, circle 6; if you STRONGLY AGREE, circle 7.

1. When I am working on something I cannot relax until it is perfect.
   
2. One of my goals is to be perfect at everything I do.
   
3. I must always be successful at school or work.
   
4. I set very high standards for myself.
   
5. I must work to my full potential at all times.
   
6. I do not have to be the best at whatever I am doing.
   
7. I am perfectionistic in setting my goals.
   
8. It makes me uneasy to see an error in my work.
   
9. I demand nothing less than perfection from myself.
   
10. I strive to be the best at everything I do.
    
11. It is very important for me to be perfect at everything I attempt.
    
12. I seldom feel the need to be perfect.
13. I strive to be as perfect as I can be.  
15. I do not have very high goals for myself.  
16. I find it difficult to meet others expectations.  
17. People around me still think I'm competent, even if I make a mistake.  
18. People expect more from me than I am capable of giving.  
19. My family expects me to be perfect.  
20. My parents rarely expected me to excel in all aspects of my life.  
21. Although they may not show it, other people get very upset with me when I slip up.  
22. I feel that people are too demanding of me.  
23. Success means I must work even harder to please others.  
24. Others think I'm okay, even when I do not succeed.  
25. Others will like me even if I don't excel at everything.  
26. The people around me expect me to succeed at everything.  
27. Anything I do that is less than excellent will be seen as poor work by those around me.  
28. The better I do, the better I'm expected to do.
29. Those around me readily accept that I make mistakes too.

30. People expect nothing less than perfection from me.
THE TRUST SCALE (Kessel, et al., 1972)

Rate yourself on the following items, where 1 is STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD), 2 is MODERATELY DISAGREE (MD), 3 is NEUTRAL (N), 4 is MODERATELY AGREE (MA), and 5 is STRONGLY AGREE (SA) as the item pertains to you.

1. I expect other people to be honest and open. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I am less trusting than the average person. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I am cynical (pessimistic). 1 2 3 4 5
4. I have faith in human nature. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I am more trusting than the average college student. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Other people are out to get as much as they can for themselves. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I am less trusting than the average student in my area. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I am suspicious of others' intentions. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Other people can be relied upon to do what they say they will do. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I have faith in the promises of other people. 1 2 3 4 5
MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE SHORT FORM
(Reynolds, 1982)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE as it pertains to you personally.

1. I have never been irked when people have expressed ideas different from my own. T F

2. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. T F

3. On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought to little of my ability. T F

4. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. T F

5. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even when I knew they were right. T F

6. No matter who I am talking to, I am always a good listener. T F

7. There have been occasions where I took advantage of someone. T F

8. I am always willing to admit when I have made a mistake. T F

9. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. T F

10. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. T F

11. There have been times when I have been jealous of the good fortunes of others. T F

12. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. T F

13. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me. T F
APPENDIX B

FEEDBACK INFORMATION SHEET
SELF-PRESENTATION SURVEY

It is customary in research in psychology to provide participants with more details about the study they took part in after all the data have been collected. This helps participants to benefit more from the experience and increase their understanding of the discipline. Moreover, it might satisfy those who are curious about what specific hypotheses are being tested by the researcher.

My Master's thesis research addresses some of the factors that might be related to shy vs. nonshy styles of presenting oneself in interpersonal interactions. A survey of the literature in this area led me to hypothesize that very shy people expect that others will be rejecting of them in comparison to nonshy persons. I also hypothesized that even though shy people do not seek out others' company in an obvious manner, they desire affiliation with others to a similar degree that nonshy persons want affiliation. These hypotheses were confirmed, as shy and nonshy people in the research did desire affiliation with others to a similar degree by shy people expected others to be sources of rejection to a much greater extent.

A second aspect of my research relates to the relationship between shyness and various interpersonal skills. I hypothesized that nonshy participants would believe that they were more competent in initiating relationships, disclosing personal information about themselves, and asserting themselves in terms of complaints or criticisms when compared to shy persons. I also expected that shy and nonshy would not differ in terms of their beliefs that they were able to provide emotional support for others and manage conflicts with them. Finally, it was hypothesized that shy people would believe that they were better at providing support for others and managing conflicts than at initiating relationships, self-disclosing and asserting themselves negatively. The results indicate that the nonshy participants believed they were better in exercising all of these interpersonal skills compared to the shy respondents. The shy individuals did believe, however that they were better at support provision and conflict management compared to the other skills.

This research also explored how perfectionism and trust are associated with shyness. It was found that although shy and nonshy people did not differ in terms of their personal strivings for perfectionism, shy participants believed that others expected perfection from them to a much greater extent than nonshy persons. Moreover, shy individuals saw
themselves as less trusting and others as less trustworthy compared to the nonshy group.

Finally, I looked at which of the above factors was most strongly related to shyness. It was found that if one's expectations that others would be rejecting were high, one was likely to score high on a shyness scale. Higher ratings of others' demands for perfection in oneself and lower ratings of trust were also related to higher shyness scores.

While shyness is prevalent in our society, very little research had been done on the topic until about 15 years ago. I hope that the study you participated in will add to the knowledge in this area. Most of us are shy at one time or another in our lives but for some it is a chronic problem; as we learn more about shyness, we will become more able to implement intervention programs specifically designed to meet the special needs of those who experience overwhelming and debilitating feelings of shyness.

I would like to thank you again for your participation, and invite you to contact me or Dr. Shelagh Towson at the Psychology Department in South Windsor Hall if you would like further information about any aspect of this research. If you wish to pursue this topic on your own, 2 very good books on shyness can be found in the Leddy Library:


Todd Jackson
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