

2002

The Effect of Gender on the Perceived Shyness of Individuals

Summer A. Nacoste

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/honors_etd



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Running head: PERCEIVED SHYNESS

The Effect of Gender on the Perceived Shyness of Individuals

Summer A. Nacoste

Louisiana State University

Abstract

The experiment studied the effect of gender on perceived shyness. Each participant was given a hypothetical scenario about a man, a woman, or a person X who is shy. In the person X scenario, no references to gender were made. After reading about the individual, the participants were asked to rate the target individual on eight categories in terms of the perceived degree to which shyness effects the social behavior of the individual. In the scenario in which the target gender was unidentified, participants were also asked to state whether they thought the target was a male or female. Based on their scores on the B-FNE, participants were either defined as having high levels of apprehension when being negatively evaluated or defined as having low levels of apprehension. Results failed to find a significant difference between the three conditions based on the perception of impairment related to shyness. In addition, the study failed to find that participants were more likely to assume that the unidentified target was a female. Despite predictions, participants who were defined as having high levels of evaluation anxiety did not rate the target individuals significantly higher than participants who were defined as having low levels of evaluation anxiety in terms of impairment related to shyness.

The Effect of Gender on the Perceived Shyness of Individuals

Social phobia made its first appearance as an official disorder in 1980 in the third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-III).

Classified as a disorder for over ten years, social phobia has been commonly known as the “neglected anxiety disorder (Hazen & Stein, 1995; Rapee, 1995).” Although clinicians are beginning to gain an increasing interest in this disorder, a great deal of mystery still surrounds social phobia. One such issue that requires further research is the apparent gender differences in social phobia (Weinstock, 1999).

Social phobia is more common in women than men at the community level (Hartung & Widiger, 1998). Yet in clinical samples, men slightly outnumber women (Lang & Stein, 2001). This discrepancy may be due to the fact that men are more likely to seek treatment because they find the disorder to be more difficult to live with than do women (Lang & Stein, 2001). This difficulty may be a product of societal influence. For instance, our society expects males to be the aggressors in relationships, have higher career goals, and to be more assertive than females (Rapee, 1995).

In addition, prevalence rates tend to vary significantly from study to study (Lang & Stein, 2001). Furmark, Tillfors, and Everz (1999) did a careful review of the literature and found that estimates of lifetime prevalence rates range from 0.5% to 16.0%. A change in criteria may be a possible cause of this variability. The *DSM-III-R* and the *DSM-IV* require that the fear must lead to “interference or marked distress” to be considered as social phobia (Lang & Stein, 2001). The *DSM-III*, on the other hand,

required that the fear cause “significant distress (Lang & Stein, 2001).” The narrower criteria of the *DSM-III* resulted in lower prevalence rates than newer studies, which were based on the criteria of the *DSM-III-R* and the *DSM-IV* (Lang & Stein, 2001). For example, Pollard and Henderson (1988) found that twice as many women as men met the diagnostic criteria for social phobia without the added criterion of “significant distress.” When the criterion of “significant distress” was added, the proportion of women to men became more similar (Rapee, 1995).

Research shows that shyness and social phobia show a significant overlap (Rapee, 1995). For the most part, people who have been identified as “shy” are very similar to those who have been officially diagnosed with social phobia (Rapee, 1995). Over 40% of people consider themselves to be shy (Zimbardo, 1977). A survey by Zimbardo (1977) found that 25% of people consider themselves to be chronically shy. Chronically shy refers to people who are on the extreme end of shyness and have reported being shy for most or all of their lives (Zimbardo, 1977). Shyness appears equally in males and females, but shy males tend to suffer from more impairment as a result of their shyness (Gilmartin, 1987; Kamath & Kanekar, 1993). Therefore, studies on shyness help psychologists to gain more insight on social phobia and its underlying components.

Studies indicate that social phobia and shyness are often accompanied by functional impairment (Schneier et al., 1994). Schneier et al. (1994) reported that half of patients with social phobia had experienced at least a moderate impairment at some time in their

lives in such areas as education, work, and dating. Schneier et al. (1994) also found that socially phobic individuals tend to perceive that the impairment that they experience as a result of their disorders is more severe and handicapping than perceived by non-shy individuals. Antony, Roth, Swinson, Huta, and Devins (1998) found that the types of impairment most characteristic of individuals with social phobia are psychological functioning, educational/ occupational functioning, and interpersonal functioning.

Comorbid disorders are often associated with psychological impairment experienced by individuals suffering from anxiety disorders. Research by Sanderson, Di Nardo, Rapee, and Barlow (1990) reported that 70% of the individuals diagnosed with an anxiety disorder also meet the criteria for another *DSM-III-R* disorder, most commonly, an additional anxiety disorder. Approximately one-third of individuals diagnosed with anxiety disorders also met criteria for depression (Sanderson et al., 1990; Ross, 1993). Individuals who are diagnosed with a comorbid disorder are more likely to experience drug and alcohol dependence and more severe impairment (Schneier et al. 1994).

Likewise, suicidal ideation has been shown to have an effect on the psychological impairment of individuals suffering from social phobia. Overall, individuals with social phobia have a significantly higher rate of suicidal ideation than individuals who do not have a psychological disorder (Schneier, Johnson, Hornig, Liebowitz, & Weissman, 1992). The rate of suicide attempts is especially high at 15.7% in individuals who suffer from social phobia and a comorbid disorder (Schneier et al., 1992). Individuals with social phobia and a comorbid disorder have much higher suicide rates, suicidal thoughts,

and wishes to die than individuals with no psychiatric disorder (Katzelnick & Greist, 2001).

Social phobia and shyness tend to have a profound effect on educational functioning. Turner, Beidel, and Dancu (1986) reported that 85% of individuals suffering from social phobia according to the *DSM-III* criteria experienced impairment in academic or school functioning. Socially anxious individuals have poorer grades, a greater chance of being expelled from school, and a greater likelihood of running away from home (Davidson, Hughes, & George, 1994). Zimbardo (1977) reported that 42% of college students consider themselves to be presently shy. Yet, students and faculty usually are not aware of the ability of shyness to inhibit academic success (Zimbardo, 1977). A study by Maroldo (1986) found that shyness and boredom are positively correlated in college students. Yet, boredom and grade point average had an inverse relationship (Maroldo, 1986). As boredom increased, grade point average decreased (Maroldo, 1986).

Moreover, shyness may be a major factor in explaining problems in career development (Hamer & Bruch, 1997). Hamer and Bruch (1997) reported that shy college students, as compared to non-shy college students “engaged in less career information-seeking, were more undecided, and expressed less interest in interpersonally oriented career fields (p. 384).” Shy college students, who tend to feel confused as to where they fit in the work field, are less likely to participate in serious career exploration and planning (Hamer & Bruch, 1997). These behaviors carry on into the adult careers of shy individuals. Caspi, Elder, and Bem (1988) did a thirty-year longitudinal study on childhood shyness. Shy males were more likely than non-shy males to delay getting a

stable job, under-achieve in their job performance, and be more unstable in their careers during midlife (Caspi et al., 1988). Shy females, on the other hand, engaged in a more traditional role than non-shy females by getting married, having children, and becoming housewives (Caspi et al., 1988). As compared to non-shy females, shy females were also 56% less likely to reenter the workforce after having children (Caspi et al., 1988).

Overall, males tend to experience more occupational impairment than females due to shyness (Weinstock, 1999). Also, in men and women a strong association exists between social anxiety disorder and the receipt of welfare or disability payments (Katzelnick & Greist, 2001).

Social phobics and shy individuals experience a great deal of impairment in their social and romantic relationships. In social settings, men with social phobia are most concerned about eating and writing in public (Weinstock, 1999). Women with social phobia tend to be the most concerned with speaking in front of an audience and using the bathroom in public (Weinstock, 1999). Individuals with social phobia tend to have fewer friends than they desire and they often avoid certain activities because of their fear of social situations (Schneier et al., 1994). Shy women are no more likely to be psychologically disturbed than non-shy women, whereas shy men are more likely to suffer from psychological problems than non-shy men (Gilmartin, 1987). Shy men often have difficulty initiating relationships, which causes a delay in marriage and family (Caspi et al., 1988). Shy females are more likely to work harder at improving problems in relationships than shy men, who would rather end the relationship when problems arise (Johnson, Aikman, Danner, & Elling, 1995). Furthermore, in American society shyness

tends to be socially accepted in females (Gilmartin, 1988). Shyness in males, on the other hand, is seen as undesirable and abnormal (Gilmartin, 1988). Our societal norms allow a woman to choose between assuming a passive or assertive role whereas men are required to be assertive in all facets of life (Gilmartin, 1988). In terms of marriage, social phobia is highly correlated with an increased risk of marital problems and never being married (Katzelnick & Greist, 2001). Research shows that shy women are not delayed in getting married or having children when compared to non-shy women (Caspi et al., 1988). In contrast, both socially phobic and shy men are significantly older when they get married and have their first child (Caspi et al., 1988).

The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of gender on the perceived degree to which shyness effects an individual's social life. Overall, it is hypothesized that participants will rate the male target higher than the female target in terms of the effect of shyness on their social lives. Since shyness is seen as abnormal in males, participants will view his behavior as more dysfunctional and impairing. When the gender of the individual in the scenario is not specified, it is predicted that participants will be more likely to assume that the individual is female. Since shyness has been found to be more socially acceptable for females than for males, participants are expected to identify the target as female.

In addition, the B-FNE, which stands for Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation, will be administered to assess the degree of anxiety a person feels when he thinks that he is being negatively evaluated. Leary (1983) created this scale as a shortened version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE). In this study, B-FNE will be employed to distinguish

participants with either high or low apprehension levels when they are being negatively evaluated. It is predicted that both the male and the female participants with high levels of apprehension will rate the shy individuals depicted in the scenario higher in terms of the degree to which shyness effects their social life. This prediction is based on the tendency of individuals who are high in anxiety to over-estimate levels of impairment.

Method

Participants

Participants consisted of 143 undergraduate students of varying ethnic backgrounds at Louisiana State University who are enrolled in a psychology class. Participants were tested in a classroom setting, allowing for several participants to be tested at one time. Students were required to sign a consent form, informing them that they can choose to withdraw from the study at anytime and they can choose not to respond to any question. Students received extra credit in exchange for volunteering to participate in the study.

Materials

The hypothetical scenario used in this study was developed through a series of pilot studies. These pilot studies were randomly given to LSU undergraduate students. At first, students were given an entire scenario about a male target, a female target, or an unidentified target to read. The material in the scenario was consistent with the dependent variables used in the study. They were asked to rate the target on the degree to which shyness effected each of the eight dependent variables. The scale ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). There was specific information about the target's social behavior in the scenario that enabled the students to assess how each dependent variable

was effected by shyness. Since everyone seemed to be rating the target high regardless of gender, the experimenter decided to separate the scenario into sentences to determine which items were causing the students to rate the individuals high on the rating scale. In the second phase of the pilot study, students were asked to rate each sentence in terms of the target's shyness. In this phase of the study, the gender of the target was unidentified and the scale was extended to 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). Based on their ratings, the scenario was refined. The refinement process continued until the ratings given by the students became more variable and less concentrated in the upper portion of the scale.

Each participant was given a hypothetical scenario to read involving a shy individual (Appendix A), a rating scale (Appendix B-C), the B-FNE (Appendix D), and a form to gather demographic information from the participant (Appendix E). Using random assignment, participants were assigned to one of three groups. Each participant either read about a man, a woman, or a person X who is shy. The scenario consisted of several incidents that describe the social behavior of the target individual. In the scenario involving person X, the gender of the target individual was not identified. Aside from gender, the hypothetical scenarios were exactly the same.

On the rating scale (Appendix B), participants were asked to rate the male and female individuals in the scenario on eight different categories on a scale from 1 to 7, 1 meaning not at all and 7 meaning extremely. Six of the eight categories (job, family relationships, marriage, friend relationships, everyday activities, and suicide) were categories of impairment featured in the Disability Profile by Schneier et al. (1994). The Disability Profile was used by clinicians to rate the level of impairment in individuals with social

phobia. The other two categories (shyness and abnormal) were chosen by the experimenter. Participants based their answers on the degree to which they felt shyness effected the specific categories of the target individual's social life. The rating scale for the unidentified target condition (Appendix C) was exactly the same except participants were also asked to state whether they thought the unidentified target is a male or female.

The B-FNE (Appendix D) consists of twelve sentences in which participants are asked to rate themselves based on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 meaning not at all characteristic of me and 5 meaning extremely characteristic of me. This information was used to determine whether or not apprehension levels of the participants effected how they rated the target individuals. The demographics form allowed participants to fill out personal information about themselves that enabled the experimenter to determine whether or not participants' ratings differ significantly based on gender.

Design and Procedure

This study compared three conditions: a male target, a female target, and a target in which the gender was not identified. In addition, B-FNE scores of each individual was classified on two levels, high scores and low scores, to test the second part of the hypothesis.

Participants were tested in a classroom setting. At the beginning of the session, the participants were told by the experimenter that they will be given a hypothetical scenario to read carefully. After reading the scenario, they were asked to rate the individual based on the degree to which they felt shyness effected the target's social behavior. The

participants circled their answers on the forms provided by the experimenter. Next, the participants were asked to fill out the B-FNE questionnaire and the demographics form.

Results

It was hypothesized that all participants, regardless of gender, would rate the male target higher than the unidentified target and the female target in terms of effect on social life. For each of the dependent means, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was run to test if the unidentified, male, and female targets differed in terms of their perceived effect on social life. Table 3 displays the mean ratings and F values of the impairment ratings. The order of the means for the evaluation of the targets' shyness (Unidentified $M = 6.2069$, Male $M = 6.3673$, Female $M = 6.2083$), everyday activities (Unidentified $M = 5.6522$, Male $M = 5.7551$, Female $M = 5.5625$), and suicide (Unidentified $M = 3.1522$, Male $M = 3.3469$, Female $M = 2.7917$) were consistent with the hypothesis. For these measures, the perceived effect of shyness was greater for a male target than for the other two conditions. Yet, these differences were not significant.

For ratings of the remaining categories of social behavior, the direction of the means were not consistent with the hypothesis. The unidentified target was rated higher than the male and female target for job (Unidentified $M = 5.3261$, Male $M = 4.8980$, Female $M = 4.8958$), family relationships (Unidentified $M = 5.7391$, Male $M = 5.4082$, Female $M = 5.2083$), marriage (Unidentified $M = 5.9130$, Male $M = 5.7143$, Female $M = 5.2708$), friend relationships (Unidentified $M = 6.1304$, Male $M = 5.8980$, Female $M = 6.0000$), and abnormal (Unidentified $M = 4.9348$, Male $M = 4.6939$, Female $M = 4.7552$). These differences, however, failed to be significantly different from one another.

To analyze for a possible effect of the participants' gender on the dependent variables, the study used a between subjects 2 x 3 design. The gender of the participants had two levels: male and female. The gender of the target individuals had three levels: unidentified, male, and female. The mean ratings of the target for each condition by participant gender can be seen in Table 1. A 2 x 3 ANOVA was run for each of the dependent variables to determine if there was an effect of participant gender and/or gender of the target. Results, as shown in Table 2, failed to find a significant main effect or interaction for any of the dependent variables.

A repeated measures analysis was run to test if the dependent variable as a whole differed based on condition. The eight categories were used as the within subjects factor and the target conditions were used as the between subjects factor. Results failed to find a significant difference between conditions, $F(2, 140) = 1.981, n.s.$

In the condition in which the gender of the target was not identified, it was predicted that the participants would be more likely to say that the individual is female. In actuality, the proportion was opposite of predictions. Results showed that twenty-nine of the participants thought that the individual was male and only seventeen of the participants thought that the individual was female. However, the deviation from a proportion of .5 was not significant, $z = -1.79, n.s.$

In addition, it was hypothesized that participants with high levels of evaluation anxiety, as assessed by the B-FNE, would rate the target individuals, regardless of gender, higher than participants low in evaluation anxiety in terms of degree to which shyness affects their social behavior. Consistent with protocol used by Leary (1983), participants who

scored above 35.7 were defined as high B-FNE, while those who scored below 35.7 were defined as low B-FNE. Sixty-five participants were defined as having high levels of anxiety when being negatively evaluated and 78 participants were defined as having low levels of anxiety. Table 4 shows the mean ratings and *t* scores for each of the dependent variables for participants who scored high and low on the B-FNE. A two sample independent *t*-test was run to determine if any of the measures on the effect of shyness differed significantly based on level of apprehension. Consistent with the hypothesis, participants who had high levels of anxiety when being negatively evaluated rated the targets higher in terms of shyness (Low *M* = 6.167, High *M* = 6.415), family relationships (Low *M* = 5.423, High *M* = 5.477), friend relationships (Low *M* = 5.949, High *M* = 6.077), everyday activities (Low *M* = 5.526, High *M* = 5.815), suicide (Low *M* = 3.077, High *M* = 3.123), and abnormal (Low *M* = 4.679, High *M* = 4.846). However, none of these paired means were significantly different from one another.

Opposite of the hypothesis, participants who were defined as having low levels of apprehension when negatively evaluated rated the targets higher on the job (Low *M* = 5.038, High *M* = 5.031) and marriage (Low *M* = 5.654, High *M* = 5.600) categories. Yet, these differences were not significant.

Discussion

Since shyness is seen as undesirable and abnormal in males, it was hypothesized that the effect of shyness on social behavior would be greater for the male target than for female or unidentified targets. Consistent with the hypothesis, the male target was rated higher than the female and unidentified target in three of the categories. In the remaining

five categories, however, the unidentified target was rated higher than the male and female target. Yet, none of these results were significant.

It was predicted that when the gender of the target was not identified, participants would be more likely to assume that the individual was female because shyness is socially accepted in females. For the unidentified target the results, although not significant, were opposite of the prediction. Participants were more likely to say that the individual was male than female.

In terms of the level of anxiety a person feels when being negatively evaluated, it was hypothesized that participants with high levels of anxiety would rate the target individuals higher than participants with low levels of anxiety. Consistent with the hypothesis, in six of the eight categories participants who were defined as having high levels of anxiety when being negatively evaluated rated the target individuals higher in terms of the degree to which shyness effects their social behavior. Participants defined as having low levels of anxiety rated the target individuals higher on the two remaining categories. The means, however, were not significantly different from one another.

Although the direction of some of the means was consistent with the hypotheses, none of the means were significantly different from one another. The failure to find a significant result may be due to several limitations within the study.

After examining the ratings made by participants, there seems to have been a ceiling effect. Regardless of gender, the target individuals were all rated high in terms of the effect of shyness on their social behavior. It is possible that the study failed to find a significant difference between conditions because the scenario resulted in a restriction in

the range that limited the ratings participants were able to give. The target was always perceived as being shy, regardless of gender, and the effect of this shyness on their social behavior was seen as severe.

Likewise, there was an insufficient amount of information about the target that was unrelated to shyness in the scenario. The study could be improved by adding more unrelated information to the scenario describing the target individual. This would allow the participant to be less focused on the shyness of the target individual. Also, the scenario may have provided too much shy information and resulted in the participants focusing only on the target's shyness. If more ambiguous information had been used in the scenario, participants would be able to make more general inferences based on what they read and their underlying beliefs.

It is possible that the participants were not representative of the population. All the participants were enrolled in the same psychology class. There could have been a unique characteristic about this class that caused them to rate the target individuals higher. However, the sample of participants represented a wide range of majors, classifications, and ethnic backgrounds. Thus, the students appear to be comparable to any undergraduate psychology class, or maybe any college sample.

In addition, the study may have failed to find results consistent with previous studies because male and female college students were used. Gilmartin (1988), for example, used only men as participants in his study. He, and several other researchers, chose to study only men because shyness has proven to be more damaging to their social behavior. Also, Gilmartin specifically sought out shy men to be in his study and they had to meet

several criteria. He did not limit himself to only college students and he used non-shy college students as a comparison group. If a sample of only men who had been pre-screened for shyness had been used, it is possible that this study would have yielded significant results.

References

- Antony, M. M., Roth, D., Swinson, R. P., Huta, V., & Devins, G. M. (1998). Illness intrusiveness in individuals with panic disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, or social phobia. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 186(5), 311-315.
- Caspi, A., Elder G. H., Jr., & Bem, D. J. (1988). Moving away from the world: Life-course patterns of shy children. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(6), 824-831.
- Davidson, J. R., Hughes, D. C., & George, L. K. (1994). The boundary of social phobia: Exploring the threshold. *Archives of General Psychology*, 51, 975-983.
- Gilmartin, B. G. (1987). *Shyness and love*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hamer, R. J., & Bruch, M. A. (1997). Personality factors and inhibited career development: Testing the unique contribution of shyness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 382-400.
- Hartung, C. M., & Widiger, T. A. (1998). Gender differences in the diagnosis of mental disorders: Conclusions and controversies of the DSM-IV. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123(3), 260-278.
- Hazen, A. L., & Stein, M. B. (1995). Clinical phenomenology and comorbidity. In M. B. Stein (Ed.), *Social phobia: Clinical and research perspectives* (pp. 3-41). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Johnson, J. E., Aikman, K. G., Danner, C. C., & Elling, K. A. (1995). Attributions of shy persons in romantic relationships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51(4), 532-536.

- Kamath, M., & Kanekar, S. (1993). Loneliness, shyness, self-esteem, and extraversion. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 133*(6), 855-857.
- Katzelnick, D. J., & Greist, J. H. (2001). Social anxiety disorder: An unrecognized problem in primary care. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 62*(suppl 1), 11-15.
- Lang, A. J., & Stein, M. B. (2001). Social phobia: Prevalence and diagnostic threshold. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 62*(suppl 1), 5-10.
- Leary, M. R. (1983). A brief version of the fear of negative evaluation scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*(3), 371-375.
- Maroldo, G. K. (1986). Shyness, boredom, and grade point average among college students. *Psychological Reports, 59*, 395-398.
- Rapee, R. M. (1995). Descriptive psychopathology of social phobia. In R. G. Heimberg, M. R. Liebowitz, D. A. Hope, & F. R. Schneier (Eds.), *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 41-66). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ross, J. (1993). Social phobia: The consumer's perspective. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 54*(12, suppl), 5-9.
- Schneier, F. R., Heckelman, M. D., Garfinkel, R., Campeas, R., Fallon, B. A., Gitow, A., Street, L., Del Bene, D., & Liebowitz, M. R. (1994). Functional impairment in social phobia. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 55*(8), 322-331.
- Schneier, F. R., Johnson, J., Hornig, C. D., Liebowitz, M. R., & Weissman, M. M. (1992). Social phobia: Comorbidity and morbidity in an epidemiologic sample. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 49*, 282-288.

- Turner, S. M., Beidel, D. C., & Dancu, C. V. (1986). Psychopathology of social phobia and comparison to avoidant personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 95, 389-394.
- Weinstock, L. S. (1999). Gender differences in the presentation and management of social anxiety disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 60(suppl 9), 9-13.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1977). *Shyness*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Appendix A-Unidentified Gender

The scenario is exactly the same for the other two conditions, except X is replaced with Mark when the target is male and X is replaced with Sandra when the target is female.

Directions: Please read carefully the following description of X. When you are finished, answer the questions on the next page concerning X's behavior.

X is a salesperson at a large clothing store that is two miles from X's home. The clothing store is famous for its wide selection of high quality men's, women's, and children's clothing. Although it takes 10-15 minutes to find a parking spot, X would rather drive to work alone rather than ride the bus with several other co-workers even though the bus passes right in front of X's house. X is in charge of a particular section of the clothing store. X seldom interacts with customers at work because X tries to position X's self in areas where customers are not likely to be browsing.

X divides time between work and family. X personally does all of the grocery shopping. X tries to buy a wide selection of nutritional foods and snacks for X's family. X only goes shopping during the early morning hours when less people are in the stores. X and X's spouse have two children, ages 9 and 18. X and X's kids enjoy watching television together and playing board games during their free time. X's youngest child plays soccer but X has never attended any of the games. X thinks that sitting in the crowded bleachers with other spectators would interfere with X's enjoyment of the game.

X's oldest child recently played at a concert as part of the school orchestra. X's child plays the violin. X intended to go to the concert but X decided against it at the last minute because X didn't want to have to sit next to someone that X didn't know. X's children often argue over whose turn it is to do the daily chores. X usually relies on X's spouse to discipline their children because X doesn't like being involved in confrontations with them.

Aside from time at home with the kids, X and X's spouse rarely spend time together. X's spouse invites X to office parties and family gatherings but X seldom agrees to go. When X does attend these events, X usually stands off from the group and doesn't initiate conversation and interaction with others. Even when X's spouse tries to compromise with X by going to quiet, intimate restaurants for dinner, X rarely accepts the invitation because X feels uncomfortable around the other strangers in the restaurant. X's spouse also encourages X to spend time out of the house with X's friends, but X usually has a reason why X can't spend time with them.

Appendix B-Rating Scale for Mark and Sandra

Please answer the following questions about the individual's social behavior. Give a rating from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) based on the degree to which you think the individual's social behavior affects the following categories. Place your rating in the space provided.

Not at all Moderately Extremely

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

- _____ 1. Based on your judgment, how shy is this individual?
- _____ 2. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's job?
- _____ 3. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's family relationship?
- _____ 4. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's marriage?
- _____ 5. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's relationship with friends?
- _____ 6. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's everyday activities?
- _____ 7. How likely do you think it is that this individual will commit suicide?
- _____ 8. How abnormal is this person's behavior?

Appendix C-Rating Scale for X

Please answer the following questions about the individual's social behavior. Give a rating from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) based on the degree to which you think the individual's social behavior affects the following categories. Place your rating in the space provided.

Not at all Moderately Extremely

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

- _____ 1. Based on your judgment, how shy is this individual?
- _____ 2. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's job?
- _____ 3. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's family relationship?
- _____ 4. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's marriage?
- _____ 5. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's relationship with friends?
- _____ 6. To what extent does this shyness effect the individual's everyday activities?
- _____ 7. How likely do you think it is that this individual will commit suicide?
- _____ 8. How abnormal is this person's behavior?
- _____ 9. Is this person a male or a female? Male Female (circle one)

Appendix D- B-FNE

Read each of the following statements carefully and indicate how characteristic it is of you according to the following scale. Circle a number to indicate how characteristic the statement is of you.

1=**Not at all** characteristic of me
 2=**Slightly** characteristic of me
 3=**Moderately** characteristic of me
 4=**Very** characteristic of me
 5=**Extremely** characteristic of me

| | Not at all | Slightly | Moderately | Very | Extremely |
|--|------------|----------|------------|------|-----------|
| 1. I wonder about what other people will think of me even when it doesn't make a difference. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I am unconcerned even if I know people are forming an unfavorable opinion of me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I am frequently afraid of people noticing my shortcomings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I rarely worry about what kind of impression I am making on someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I am afraid that others will not approve of me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I am afraid that people will find fault with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Other people's opinions of me do not bother me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. When I am talking to someone, I worry about what they may be thinking of me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Sometimes I think that I am too concerned with what other people think of me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I often worry that I will say or do the wrong things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Appendix E

Please provide us with the following information about yourself.

Sex: (circle one) Male Female

Date of Birth: ____/____/____ **Age:** ____

Year in School: (circle one)

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

Ethnic Background: (circle one)

White African-American Asian or Asian-American

Hispanic Native American Other: (please specify) _____

Marital Status: (circle one)

Single (never married) Married Divorced/Separated Widowed

Table 1

Ratings of Targets Based on Participant Gender

| Category | Ratings made by male participants | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|
| | Unidentified | Male | Female |
| Shyness | 6.1667 | 6.2381 | 6.3182 |
| Job | 4.8333 | 4.5238 | 5.1364 |
| Family relationships | 5.6667 | 5.1429 | 5.3636 |
| Marriage | 5.5000 | 5.3333 | 5.2273 |
| Friend relationships | 5.5833 | 5.8571 | 5.9091 |
| Everyday activities | 5.3333 | 5.4286 | 5.5000 |
| Suicide | 3.1667 | 2.8095 | 2.2273 |
| Abnormal | 5.1667 | 4.7619 | 4.4091 |

| Category | Ratings made by female participants | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| | Unidentified | Male | Female |
| Shyness | 6.3125 | 6.4643 | 6.1154 |
| Job | 5.5000 | 5.1786 | 4.6923 |
| Family relationships | 5.7188 | 5.6071 | 5.0769 |
| Marriage | 6.0625 | 6.0000 | 5.3077 |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Friend relationships | 6.3125 | 5.9286 | 6.0769 |
| Everyday activities | 5.7188 | 6.0000 | 5.6154 |
| Suicide | 3.0938 | 3.7500 | 3.2692 |
| Abnormal | 4.8437 | 4.6429 | 4.8462 |

Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Impairment Variables

| Source | df | MS | F |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| 1. Shyness | | | |
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | .113 | .086 |
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | .242 | .184 |
| A X B | 2 | .607 | .462 |
| Error | 136 | 1.314 | |
| 2. Job | | | |
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | 1.426 | .741 |
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | 1.079 | .561 |
| A X B | 2 | 4.610 | 2.396 |
| Error | 136 | 1.924 | |
| 3. Family relationships | | | |
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | .681 | .417 |
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | 2.279 | 1.398 |
| A X B | 2 | 1.691 | 1.037 |
| Error | 136 | 1.631 | |
| 4. Marriage | | | |
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | 3.052 | 1.829 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | 3.162 | 1.895 |
| A X B | 2 | 1.140 | .683 |
| Error | 136 | 1.669 | |

5. Friend relationships

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | 1.867 | 1.083 |
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | .120 | .070 |
| A X B | 2 | 1.216 | .706 |
| Error | 136 | 1.723 | |

6. Everyday activities

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | 2.767 | 1.445 |
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | .449 | .234 |
| A X B | 2 | .627 | .328 |
| Error | 136 | 1.915 | |

7. Suicide

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | 6.926 | 3.516 |
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | 3.548 | 1.802 |
| A X B | 2 | 3.650 | 1.853 |
| Error | 136 | 1.970 | |

8. Abnormality

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------|------|
| A-Gender of Participant | 2 | 6.411 | .000 |
|-------------------------|---|-------|------|

Effect of Gender 31
(Table 2 cont.)

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-------|------|
| B-Gender of Target | 2 | 1.546 | .776 |
| A X B | 2 | 1.664 | .836 |
| Error | 136 | 1.991 | |

Table 3

Mean Ratings and F Values of Impairment Variables

| Category | Unidentified | Male | Female | F (df) |
|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|-----------------------------|
| Shyness | 6.2069 | 6.3673 | 6.2083 | .248 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Job | 5.3261 | 4.8980 | 4.8958 | 1.473 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Family relationships | 5.7391 | 5.4082 | 5.2083 | 2.080 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Marriage | 5.9130 | 5.7143 | 5.2708 | 3.044 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Friend relationships | 6.1304 | 5.8980 | 6.0000 | .375 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Everyday activities | 5.6522 | 5.7551 | 5.5625 | .236 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Suicide | 3.1522 | 3.3469 | 2.7917 | 1.834 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Abnormal | 4.9348 | 4.6939 | 4.7552 | .572 (2, 140), <i>n.s.</i> |

Table 4

Ratings Based on B-FNE Scores

| Categories | Low-B-FNE | High B-FNE | t(df) |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------------|
| Shyness | 6.167 | 6.415 | 1.316 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Job | 5.038 | 5.031 | -.033 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Family relationships | 5.423 | 5.477 | .249 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Marriage | 5.654 | 5.600 | -.243 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Friend relationships | 5.949 | 6.077 | .585 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Everyday activities | 5.526 | 5.815 | 1.258 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Suicide | 3.077 | 3.123 | .188 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |
| Abnormal | 4.679 | 4.846 | .710 (141), <i>n.s.</i> |