AGE- AND GENDER-RELATED DIFFERENCES IN CHILDREN'S
PERCEPTION OF SHYNESS

by

Monique T. Bussiere, B. A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
November 27, 1996
© copyright
1996, Monique T. Bussiere

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your fee - votre référence

Our fee - notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

—

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

—

ISBN 0-612-19468-X

Name MARILYN BISSONNETTE

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

PSYCHOLOGY

SUBJECT TERM

0525 UMI

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0439
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0723
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0723
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0728
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0729
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0525
Ancient 0535
Belgian 0527
Scandinavian 0714
Soviet 0533
Social Science 0534
Sociology of 0340
Spanish 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocal 0747

LITERATURE

General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0324
Anthropology 0326
Archaeology 0327
Cultural 0310
Physical 0272
Business Administration 0770
General 0454
Accounting 0338
Banking 0385
Management 0501
Marketing 0503
Canadian Studies 0505
Economics 0508
Finance 0509
History 0510
Labor 0511
Theory 0358
Folklore 0366
Gerontology 0351
History 0578
General 0579

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0798
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and Relations 0617
Public Administration 0614
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
Criminology and Penology 0938
Demography 0631
Ethnic and Social Studies 0628
Individual and Family Studies 0629
Industrial and Labor Relations 0630
Public and Social Welfare 0700
Social Structure and Development 0344
Theory and Methods 0709
Transportation 0999
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology 0304
Biology 0287
Anatomy 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0329
Ecology 0333
Entomology 0369
Genetics 0793
Limnology 0410
Microbiology 0307
Molecular 0317
Neuroscience 0416
Oceanography 0433
Physiology 0821
Radiation 0778
Veterinary Science 0472
Zoology 0786
Biophysics 0760
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0776

Geology 0370
Geophysics 0372
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleontology 0426
Palaogeography 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Paleobotany 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Hospital and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Osteoarthritis and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Safety 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiation 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
General 0486
Analytical 0487
Biochemistry 0488
Nuclear 0737
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0739
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0548
Materials Science 0549
Mechanical 0551
Metallurgy 0552
Mining 0553
Nuclear 0554
Packaging 0555
Petroleum 0556
Sanitary and Municipal 0557
System Science 0558
Geotechnology 0559
Operations Research 0560
Plastics Technology 0561
Textile Technology 0562
Psychology 0621
General 0384
Behavioral 0622
Clinical 0620
Developmental 0623
Experimental 0624
Industrial 0625
Personality 0989
Physiological 0349
Psychobiology 0632
Psychometrics 0451
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

AGE- AND GENDER-RELATED
DIFFERENCES IN CHILDREN'S PERCEPTION
OF SHYNESS

submitted by Monique T. Bussiere, B. A.
In partial fulfillment of the requirements of
the degree of Master of Arts of Psychology

Chair

Department

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner (Ph.D.)

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

Date: January 9/97

Abstract

Controversy still remains as to whether childhood shyness in general is a problem. Breaking shyness into Buss and Asendorpf's fearful, self-conscious, and social-evaluative subtypes may help to clarify this issue. To determine whether children understand these subtypes, and whether these subtypes are related to the problematic status of shyness, 222 children in grades 1, 3, 5, and 7 described their shy peers' behaviors, motivations, and the situational precursors of shyness and stated whether shyness is a problem. Twenty-seven percent of these children believed that shyness is problematic. Fearful shyness became less salient as grade increased, but remained salient to older children. References to self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness increased predictably across grade level. Gender-related differences in the salience of the shyness types were found only for social-evaluative shyness, with girls describing this type more than boys. Finally, only social-evaluative shyness was associated with the view that shyness in general is problematic.

Acknowledgments

Over the past two years, several important individuals have emerged as critical to the completion of this project. They have either helped me along the way with the technical aspects of this report or have provided me with the support and patience that I often needed. I would like to express my appreciation to the following people:

Dr. Alastair Younger for the provision of the data set that made this project possible, for the volunteer and undergraduate students who served as research assistants, and for agreeing to act as a member of my committee;

Dr. Tina Daniels for her patience over the years, for her valuable supervision, and for her continuous optimism that allowed me to enjoy this project even after working on it for so long;

The members of my committee, Dr. Bob Hoge and Dr. Robert Coplan for their much needed and much appreciated comments about this project;

Theresa Raposo, an undergraduate volunteer who asked for an opportunity to help in any way and who performed a great deal of data coding at the expense of her own free time, and who helped my other research assistants complete their tasks without complaint;

Serge Comeau and Marieke Roberts, two undergraduate fourth-year students who helped with the coding of the data and who provided me with many opportunities to refine my coding system;

Vanessa Lybanon, my friend and peer, who has been there all along to offer her support and advice concerning seemingly difficult or impossible aspects of this project,

Finally, Darryl Millson for helping me to create a theory-laden coding scheme that is understandable, for listening to my ramblings about the various theories, for lending me a shoulder to cry on when I needed one, for being there for me, and for believing in me when I thought I had no brain cells left to write another word.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Introduction	1
The Shyness Research Controversy	3
The Perspectives of Buss and Asendorpf	6
Fearful/Temperamental Shyness (Type 1)	7
Type 1 Shyness: Research Evidence	9
Self-conscious Shyness (Type 2)	11
Type 2 Shyness: Research Evidence	12
Social-evaluative Shyness (Type 3)	15
Type 3 Shyness: Research Evidence	17
The Type 3 Controversy	19
Fearful Shyness and Fears of Negative Evaluation	19
Fears of Negative Evaluation and Self-conscious Shyness	21
The Type 3 Controversy: Conclusion	24
Gender-related Differences in Shyness Types 1, 2, and 3	25
Childhood Shyness: Shyness as a Problem	27
Shyness as a Problem: Non-normative	29
Shyness as a Problem: Peer Rejection	31
Shyness as a Problem: Gender Differences	34
Shyness as a Problem: Conclusion	36
Relationship Between Shyness Type Concepts and View That Shyness is a Problem	36
Conclusion: Which Shyness Type May Be The Most Problematic?	46
The Present Study	47
Method	56
Subjects	56
Procedure	57
The Interview Process	57
Transcription and Coding of the Interviews	59
Coding for Questions i) Through vii)	59
Coding for Question viii)	62

Results	65
Descriptive Information - Shyness Types	65
Development of Concept of Shyness Types Across Grade and Gender	69
Intercorrelations Among Shyness Types Across Grade and Gender	73
Shyness as a Problem: Developmental and Gender-Related Differences	76
Relationship Between Shyness in General as a Problem and Shyness Type Scores	82
Discussion	86
The Development of the Shyness Type Concepts	86
The Social-evaluative Shyness Controversy	97
Conclusion: The Type 3 Controversy	103
Shyness as a Problem: Grade and Gender Differences	104
Conclusion: Shyness as a Problem	109
Relationship Between Shyness Types and View of Shyness as a Problem	110
Theoretical Implications	118
Limitations and Future Directions	123
References	128
Appendices	145

List of Tables

Table 1:	Mean Shyness Type Scores Across Grade	66
Table 2:	Mean Shyness Type Scores Across Gender	68
Table 3:	Pearson Correlations Among Shyness Type Scores Across Grade and Gender	74
Table 4:	Distribution of Shyness as a Problem Responses Across Grade and Gender	77
Table 5:	Observed and Expected Frequencies of Shyness as a Problem Responses	79
Table 6:	Mean Shyness Type Understanding Scores Across Shyness as a Problem Response	83

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Permission Form	145
Appendix 2: Shyness Types and Descriptions	147
Appendix 3: Coding Form: Shyness Types	151
Appendix 4: Coding Dictionary: Shyness as a Problem	152
Appendix 5: Coding Form: Is Shyness a Problem?	155

Age- and Gender-Related Differences

In Children's Perception of Shyness

As early as the first year of life, children smile, vocalize, and reach out to each other (Hay, 1985). These emerging behaviors signify the onset of a child's interactions with his or her peers. If these early behaviors continue to be performed by the child and received by the peer without mishap, the child is likely to develop adequate peer relationships during his or her later years.

Healthy and effective peer relationships are associated with positive or beneficial effects in other aspects of a child's life. The cognitive development perspective, for example, has linked good relationships within the peer group to a child's perspective-taking ability (Hartup, 1983; Rubin & Mills, 1988), conflict resolution ability (Piaget, 1926, 1932), moral judgment, and negotiation skills (Youniss, 1980). Social learning theorists, on the other hand, believe that peers serve to control a child's behavior by punishing or ignoring non-normative actions while at the same time reinforcing age- and culture-appropriate behaviors (Hartup, 1983; Lamb & Roopnarine, 1979). Within the context of the peer group, children also benefit in such areas as the control of aggressive impulses (Chandler, 1973; Hartup, 1978), the development of altruistic tendencies (Staub, 1975), and the learning of effective social skills (Damon, 1983; Hartup, 1978). Most importantly, friends and the peer group are a child's principal source of happiness, pleasure, and personal recognition (Freedman, 1978). They are, as a result, viewed as a necessary social support network which acts as a buffer against life's major stressors (Phillips, 1967).

Unfortunately, not all children relate to their peers in positive, prosocial ways. A significant body of research has found that poor relationships with peers are related to concurrent emotional difficulties, such as depression (Overholser & Freiheit, 1994; Vosk, Forehand, Parker, & Rickard, 1982) and loneliness (Asher, Hymel, & Renshaw, 1984; Hymel, 1983). Unpopular children often view themselves as lacking in social competence and are dissatisfied with their social relationships (Asher, Hymel, & Renshaw, 1984; Hymel, Woody, & Bowker, 1993). These children suffer academically, often being rated by their teachers as performing in school at a level inferior to that of their classmates (Vosk et al., 1982). In addition, they are more likely than their non-aggressive peers to be undisciplined at school, to be placed on academic probation or into remedial education programs, or to drop out of school early (Coie & Dodge, 1988; Kupersmidt, Coie, & Dodge, 1990; Lambert, 1972; Parker & Asher, 1987). Finally, there is some evidence that poor peer relationships during the childhood years predict adulthood neuroticism (Roff, 1963; Roff & Wirt, 1984) and a greater likelihood of being treated at a psychiatric institution at some point later in life (Cowen, Pederson, Babigian, Izzo, & Trost, 1973; Janes & Hesselbrock, 1978; Janes, Hesselbrock, Myers, & Penniman, 1979).

The two most common forms of maladjustment within the peer group during the childhood years are shyness and aggression (Quay, 1986; Ross, 1980). A great deal of attention has been given to aggression, as this pattern of behavior has significant and often negative short- and long-term consequences (Parker & Asher, 1987). Whereas aggression coincides with the presence of overt, problematic behavior, less impetus has been given to the study of shyness due to its "lack" of overt and disruptive behavior (Buss, 1984).

The Shyness Research Controversy

Due to the recent emergence of shyness as an area of study, controversy still remains as to whether shyness during childhood is a cause for concern. This controversy is compounded by the most pervasive problem within the shyness research, namely the existence of a multitude of definitions that are attributed to this term. Pilkonis and Zimbardo (1979) stated that shyness is a "fuzzy concept that defies simple definition" (p. 133). Many other researchers have tried to provide meanings for this term, as Leary (1986) noted the existence of at least fourteen separate definitions of shyness within the research. With all of these definitions in hand, Leary proposed a fifteenth definition of shyness. He stated that "shyness is an affective-behavioral syndrome characterized by social anxiety and interpersonal inhibition that results from the prospect or presence of interpersonal evaluation" (p. 30).

Since Leary's time, several researchers have introduced additional shyness definitions. Cheek and Briggs (1990), for example, stated that shyness is "a term used to label the emotional state of feeling anxious and inhibited in social situations" (p. 316). Leary and Schlenker (1981) also defined shyness from an emotional point of view, stating that shyness is, in effect, the anxiety that results from the possibility of interpersonal evaluation in real or imagined settings. Pilkonis (1977b), however, focused exclusively on the behavioral aspects of shyness. In his paper, he stated that shyness involves a tendency to avoid social interactions and to fail to participate appropriately in social situations. Asendorpf (1989), for his part, combined emotional components with the behaviors that

are associated with shyness to form his own definition. He believed that shyness is a set of feelings and behaviors that occur during the avoidance of any social behavior that would be necessary to initiate or to continue a social interaction. Though this definition includes both emotional and behavioral components, it is still non-specific and obscure.

All of these examples typify the difficulties that are associated with assigning one universal definition to the concept of shyness, namely that they are limited to describing only one or some of the many aspects of this concept, which include behaviors, emotions, cognitions, and situational precursors. Among the above-mentioned and other definitions of this concept, the behavioral and emotional aspects are the most frequently included (Crozier, 1981; Jones, Briggs, & Smith, 1986).

In one of the most comprehensive definitions of shyness to date, Vandermolen (1990) included a set of criteria that address the cognitive, affective, behavioral, and situational aspects of this construct. He proposed that first, shy individuals must consider themselves to be shy and that they cannot be shy unless they believe that they are. Consequently, those who do not consider themselves to be shy are not. He also stated that the thoughts of shy individuals are often self-derogatory. In addition, included in his definition are feelings of tension, inhibition, and timidity that result in behavioral difficulties within the context of a social interaction. This definition encompasses all of the key aspects of shyness. Even so, it does not seem sufficient to extract the basic nature of this "fuzzy" concept. For, as later sections will suggest, shyness can develop into a multifaceted entity within the same individual. Unfortunately, due to the large number of facets related to this characteristic, little agreement can be reached as to which ones are

relevant to all of its definitions. In addition, as long as over twenty different definitions of shyness are the norm, it is likely that researchers will continue to find that any number of different, and even conflicting, outcomes of shyness are possible during childhood and later in life. Therefore, until this issue can be resolved, little consensus will occur among researchers about the status of childhood shyness as a risk factor for current or future difficulties.

To further compound the problem, the term shyness is often used interchangeably with over twenty other terms. Once again, the “synonyms” of shyness can be grouped according to which aspect of the shyness concept a particular researcher prefers to study. Terms such as social withdrawal (Rubin, 1993; Rubin & Mills, 1988), social isolation (Rubin & Asendorpf, 1993), and behavioral inhibition (Kagan, Reznick, & Gibbons, 1989; Kagan, Snidman, & Arcus, 1993) focus primarily on the behavioral correlate of shyness, namely being alone. Other researchers who are interested in the emotional aspect of shyness have used such terms as fearfulness (Buss, 1984; Cheek & Melchior, 1990), speech reticence (Evans, 1987), or interaction anxiousness (Leary, 1983) in their studies.

The American Psychiatric Association (1994) has also included several childhood diagnoses that are frighteningly similar to severe forms of shyness in the latest version of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV). The DSM-IV states that Avoidant Disorder (AD) children are highly anxious and withdraw in the presence of strangers, and have evidenced very disturbed peer relationships. At the same time, these children maintain healthy relationships with familiar family members, desiring no more than love and affection from these people who are important to them. Separation Anxiety Disorder,

the second of these disorders, is similar to Avoidant Disorder, as it entails debilitating fears of both strangers and unfamiliar surroundings, as well as persistent worries about the whereabouts and well-being of attachment figures. Finally, children with Social Phobia fear any situations in which the child might be seen as foolish, and thus evaluated negatively, by others.

Unfortunately, despite their clear diagnostic criteria, these disorders are the least used of all the terms that are used interchangeably with shyness. By far, the most frequently used terms are those that are only partially synonymous with shyness and are, therefore, limited in their utility as predictors of shyness-related outcomes. In light of this limitation, combined with the large number of definitions that have been attributed to the term shyness, it is hardly surprising that controversy exists within the research in this field.

The Perspectives of Buss and Asendorpf

The controversy within the shyness research is not limited to the vast array of terms and definitions that have been associated with this concept. To further compound the issue, there are several contrasting theories regarding the development of shyness over the life course (Leary, 1986; Rubin, LeMare, & Lollis, 1990), each of which purports to have discovered the nature of this ambiguous characteristic. These theories overlap somewhat, yet also disagree on a number of key issues.

Both Buss (1980, 1986) and Asendorpf (1989, 1990, 1993) have presented two such theories, the comparison of which exemplifies this problem. In reality, these theories

are so similar that they could easily be confused with one another. The dilemma occurs, however, in the fact that there are several areas within these theories, one of which is central to them both, that are the focus of some disagreement. Indeed, both of these researchers suggest that shyness at an early age takes the form of fear and avoidance of strange social situations (fearful shyness), whereas the later-emerging form of shyness is characterized by self-consciousness within social interactions (self-conscious shyness). The dilemma occurs, however, in the fact that a crucial aspect of shyness, namely a fear of negative evaluation (social-evaluative shyness), is embedded conceptually by Buss within the fearful classification, whereas Asendorpf would liken it to the self-conscious subtype. In addition, these two theorists disagree as to the evolution of these three shyness subtypes across the childhood years. Each of these forms of shyness will be discussed in greater detail in the sections that follow.

Fearful/Temperamental Shyness (Type 1)

Both Buss (1984, 1986) and Asendorpf (1989, 1993) would agree that fearful/temperamental shyness emerges during the first year of life. The central characteristic of this form of shyness, they report, is a fear of strangers or unfamiliar social situations. Due to its early appearance, Type 1 shyness has been likened to wariness and inhibition in the work of Kagan and his colleagues (Kagan, 1989; Kagan, Reznick, Snidman, Gibbons, & Johnson, 1988). Wariness and inhibition, states Kagan, also appear during the early years of life. These characteristics differ from shyness, however, in that they are not limited to

social novelty. Indeed, many wary or inhibited infants tend to become distressed in response to any unfamiliarity (Kagan, Reznick, Clarke, Snidman, & Garcia-Coll, 1984).

Type 1 shyness, however, occurs only in unfamiliar social situations. Indeed, to be classified as fearfully shy, an infant or toddler must display distress in the presence of an unfamiliar person. When confronted with social novelty, fearfully or temperamentally shy children typically seek to escape from the stranger or novel social situation in one of two ways. Primarily, these shy children withdraw physically from the threatening individual or situation. This withdrawal is typically accompanied by the child's seeking comfort, or physical closeness to, an object or person with whom he or she is familiar (Gersten, 1989). In effect, this person or object takes on the role of a security blanket for the fearful child.

The second method of escape that is used by Type 1 shy children who are faced with social novelty is a set of body language that indicates retreat, even when the child does not physically withdraw from the perceived threat. This body language includes such elements as shrinking back from the threatening person and a closed, defensive body posture. Many shy children also often avert their gaze and keep their heads down so that the novel person is out of view and therefore less threatening (Asendorpf, 1989). Finally, these outward signs are often accompanied by what Buss (1986) has called a "cry-face", which is defined as the sad facial expression or pouting that precedes and occurs concurrently with crying.

Buss (1984) states that fear is the primary emotion that is associated with Type 1 shyness. In the extreme, this fear can be magnified into panic if the social novelty becomes too intrusive or seems to be inescapable. This strong sense of fear is often translated into

ambivalence about the safety of social situations. Indeed, many shy young children worry that they will become separated from the attachment figure if they risk interacting with an unfamiliar individual (Buss, 1984; Crozier & Burnham, 1990). Finally, these concerns and emotions are typically accompanied by heightened sympathetic nervous system activity, which is experienced as an elevation of heart rate and feelings of tension (Buss, 1984).

To reiterate, fearful/temperamental shyness typically occurs in the presence of a stranger or within the context of an unfamiliar social setting. In these circumstances, these shy children will either withdraw from the novel social situation or assume a defensive body posture due to their high levels of fear and uncertainty toward the social novelty.

Type 1 Shyness: Research Evidence. A review of the research in this area suggests that fears of social novelty appear as early as eight months of age (Sroufe, 1977) and remain relatively stable across the early childhood years (Asendorpf, 1990, 1993). Buss (1986) suggests that, as children mature, the fear of strangers associated with this type of shyness wanes until, after approximately eight years of age, its incidence decreases to a small minority of children. The work of other researchers, and even the work of Asendorpf himself, clouds this issue with controversy. In his earlier work, Asendorpf (1989) observed 121 shy and non-shy university students in dyadic interactions with strangers and familiar peers. He then asked the students about their subjective level of anxiety within each experimental condition and the reasons underlying their shyness. A content analysis of these responses revealed that a fear of unfamiliar individuals or novel social situations was rarely mentioned as a cause of their shyness. In fact, social novelty was mentioned only twice out of the total 142 reasons that were provided. This finding

lends support to Buss' position that fearful shyness is not prevalent among adults. In contrast, the students' self-rated scores on a shyness scale indicated that they felt stronger feelings of shyness in the company of strangers than with a friend or acquaintance. This divergent supports the view that shyness due to social novelty may continue into early adulthood. Despite these self-contradictory findings, Asendorpf concludes in this (1989) and a later theoretical paper (Asendorpf, 1993) that teenagers and adults do not experience shyness with strangers or in novel social settings. In this later paper, Asendorpf attributes the elevated stranger-elicited shyness scores not to the presence of the stranger himself, but simply to an awkwardness that is caused by the later-appearing form of shyness, which involves a concern regarding being evaluated negatively by the stranger (this other form of shyness will be discussed in a later section).

An evaluation of the development of Type 1 shyness that is based solely on the work of Buss and Asendorpf is not sufficient to create any proper conclusions. Crozier and Burnham (1990) interviewed sixty children aged between 5 and 11 years and reported that the number of children's references to fearful shyness remained relatively constant as grade level increased. Furthermore, researchers who have observed the behavior of shy adolescents and adults and who have assessed subjective levels of shyness across various situations report that shyness during interactions with strangers and in novel social situations is common among these groups (Cheek, Carpentieri, Smith, Rierdan, & Koff, 1986; Russell, Cutrona, & Jones, 1986). In fact, approximately 75 percent of adults and adolescents report that strangers elicit feelings of shyness, while novel social situations are considered to be shyness-eliciting for 25 to 50 percent of those interviewed (Russell et al.,

1986; Zimbardo, 1977a). It would appear, therefore, that much of the research in this area indicates that Type 1 shyness does not fade with age.

Self-conscious Shyness (Type 2)

According to both Buss and Asendorpf, the nature of shyness evolves during the later childhood years from fears of social novelty to a strong sense of self-consciousness. At approximately 5 years of age, children begin to see themselves as social objects, in that they understand that they are subject to the scrutiny of others. At this time, they become increasingly sensitive to being the focus of attention (Asendorpf, 1990; Buss, 1986). Children who suffer from self-conscious shyness, for example, are particularly sensitive to being stared at by several other people at once (Buss, 1984). This distressing conspicuousness may be brought about by several factors, one of which is that the shy child is noticeably different in some way from his or her peers, either in skin color, style of dress, or simply being in a location where one feels out of place. Buss (1986) suggested that self-conscious shyness is likely to occur, for instance, when a shy boy is sitting in a lingerie store and waiting for his mother to try on a few items. In this situation, the boy is likely to be stared at by several female patrons of the store. Though these stares may be brief, the boy would feel that all of the women in the store are watching his every move.

A second situational antecedent to self-conscious shyness is formality within a social setting. Many social encounters, such as church mass or elementary school classrooms, inherently entail vast numbers of rules which dictate proper behavior. In these contexts, a violation of these rules would be noticed by others and cause them to stare or

look to see what is disrupting the status quo. A huge sneeze during an exam, for example, is such a disruption. The average person would soon forget the incident in the stress of writing the exam. For the very shy child or adult, however, the resulting glances from others taking the exam would seem to be minutes in length. It is important to note that, for the Type 2 shy individual, the aspect of this situation that is difficult to endure is the scrutiny of others that results from the sneeze, and not the disruption of routine.

The behaviors or external signs that are associated with this form of shyness differ from those that accompany Type 1 shyness. Typically, when self-conscious shy individuals feel conspicuous as a result of public scrutiny, their most common reaction is to blush. They also tend to experience behavioral disorganization when they are in front of others. Most often, this disorganization takes the form of fidgeting, fumbling, or stuttering.

These outward behavioral signs indicate the presence of an underlying pattern of emotions and thoughts that go hand in hand with embarrassment, which is the central emotional state of this form of shyness. Self-conscious shy persons who are at the center of others' attention experience intense feelings of awkwardness, foolishness, and vulnerability. They are constantly aware of public scrutiny and, when it occurs even minimally, they ruminate over what they have done to warrant all of the undesired stares. In many cases, these shy individuals do not know why others are, in their own opinion, staring too much. This uncertainty about the motives of others leads to an overwhelming concern on the part of shy individuals that they will do something foolish in front of them.

Type 2 Shyness: Research Evidence. As stated earlier in this section, before children may experience any of these thoughts or feelings, they must be able to conceive

of themselves as social objects (Buss, 1986). According to the literature on social cognition, this ability does not appear prior to 6 or 7 years of age (Shantz, 1983). At this time, Piaget (1932) believes that the mental state of egocentrism declines and a child is finally able to understand social cues and acknowledge the existence of others' perspectives. According to Piaget (1926/1967), egocentrism is defined as the attribution of one's own knowledge, viewpoint, and feelings to the others around oneself. During infancy, egocentrism is profound. This state is so strong that an infant rarely, if ever, recognizes the separate existence of others when they are out of view or out of reach. During the preschool years, a child's egocentrism declines slightly. A child of four years of age, for example, understands that others exist when he or she is not experiencing them directly, but is unable to comprehend that these others have perspectives and opinions that are different from their own. By six to seven years of age, a child becomes much less egocentric. It is only from this point forward that a child begins to recognize that other people have unique and private thoughts, feelings, and wishes. Once children understand that others are forming their own opinions about the world, they come to realize that others must form opinions about themselves as well. They begin to see that others are monitoring and judging them based on their actions and words. Once this level of perspectivism has been reached, a child begins to conceive of his or her role in the eyes of others as a social object. From this point forward, the combination of this new social reality and the shy child's extreme sensitivity to public scrutiny will result in feelings of self-consciousness, embarrassment, and vulnerability.

After seven years of age, the state of egocentrism declines steadily. At the same time, children are increasingly able to comprehend that others are developing their own opinions about their own social behavior. It is not surprising, therefore, that this cognitive maturity is also accompanied by an increase in self-conscious shyness among children.

Researchers examining the development of self-consciousness over the childhood years have found that this form of shyness may begin to occur among children as early as five years of age (Cheek et al., 1986). In addition, Simmons, Rosenberg, and Rosenberg (1973) found that self-consciousness takes on an increasing prominence in the world of shy children as they grow older. In their work with self-conscious children, Elkind and Bowen (1979) expressed their agreement with this view. These authors administered a measure of self-consciousness to elementary school children in grades 4, 6, 8, and 12 and found that as grade level increases, so do their overall self-consciousness scores. Interestingly, these authors also reported that feelings of self-consciousness among children are strongest at approximately 12 years of age and remain very high during early adolescence. These results suggest that self-consciousness is the norm for young adolescents. For the shy twelve-year-old, however, these feelings are particularly intense at this time and could, therefore, be highly stressful.

Cheek and his colleagues (1986) argue that the timing of this peak in self-consciousness is due to several factors. Initially, older children move beyond infantile egocentrism, and are fully cognizant of others' perceptions of themselves as social objects. During early adolescence, the combination of a new form of egocentrism with the realization of the social self typically result in the development of the imaginary audience,

by which most teenagers believe that everyone is observing their every move and manner. Among shy teens, the imaginary audience phenomenon is very strong, as these teenagers are much more sensitive than their peers to being scrutinized in any way. For most teens, the imaginary audience fades and many of these feelings of conspicuousness disappear. For the shy teen and adult, however, feelings of self-consciousness abate only slightly with the disappearance of the imaginary audience, yet remain sufficiently strong during their adulthood years to cause them distress during encounters which include social elements.

Social-evaluative Shyness (Type 3)

Buss (1980, 1986) includes shyness due to fears of being evaluated negatively by others within the fearful/temperamental subtype. Asendorpf (1993), on the other hand, believes that Type 3 shyness is more similar conceptually to self-conscious shyness. He also believes that both shyness Types 2 and 3 should be included into one subtype, which he labels social-evaluative shyness. For the purposes of this study, the shyness that occurs due to fears of negative evaluation will be discussed as a category that is separate from the others, so that it might become possible within the methodology of this research to resolve which of the first two shyness subtypes is more closely linked to Type 3.

According to Buss (1980, 1986) and Asendorpf (1989), social-evaluative shyness occurs in such situations as speeches, first dates, or peaking to authority figures. In these situations, shy individuals feel that they are being subjected to actual or anticipated evaluation. During a speech, for example, speakers often feel that listeners are implicitly evaluating them through their choice of topic, speaking style, and overall presentation.

Conversations with authority figures such as teachers or in-laws are also evaluative in nature, as the lower-status individual must make a positive impression on authority figures by acting and speaking appropriately in order to gain their favor.

First dates and other similar instances, such as support group meetings, possess a slightly different evaluative component. Typically, participants must engage in significant amounts of self-disclosure for the interactions to be successful. For everyone involved, the disclosure of very personal information is full of risks to self-esteem, as such openness entails the presentation of one's innermost "self" to others and leaves open the possibility for rejection or ridicule by others if the self is not perceived as socially desirable or ideal. For the Type 3 shy individual, the exposure of the self is extremely difficult due to what Asendorpf (1986) and Zimbardo (1977a) would call the approach-avoidance conflict. Shy persons who experience this conflict are motivated to make a favorable impression on those with whom they interact, yet also tend to avoid disclosure and evaluative situations because they fear that they will impact negatively on these others.

Buss (1986) suggests that this concern regarding negative social evaluation is based on the belief of shy individuals that they are physically unattractive, unfriendly, or socially unskilled. In fact, Type 3 shy people are particularly sensitive to the rules that apply to social conduct. If they break one of these rules, and therefore make a social error, the central focus of their concern is that others will view them as less worthy (Asendorpf, 1993). These thoughts, which monopolize the time of many shy children and adults, are accompanied by both nervousness and anxiety, both of which are typically experienced as butterflies in the stomach and bodily tension.

Finally, when they feel that they are being evaluated by others, shy individuals respond outwardly with social cautiousness. In other words, they say very little during their interactions. When they do speak, they do not risk themselves by disclosing the intimate details of their lives (Buss, 1980, 1986).

Both Buss and Asendorpf suggest that fears of negative evaluation occur only among older children and adults. The failure of a social "test", or being evaluated by others, they believe, can occur only among those of a sufficient mental age to understand the social consequences of inappropriate, or a lack of appropriate, social behavior. Since research that examines the development of social norms would indicate that young children do not think in terms of "normal" and "abnormal" behavior (Shantz, 1983), it is likely that Asendorpf and Buss are correct in their assumption that Type 3 shyness occurs only among older children and adults who have been exposed to a wide variety of socially evaluative contexts and who know, therefore, the consequences of social failures.

Type 3 Shyness: Research Evidence. Several researchers would concur with the two theorists' opinion that interactions with authority figures are causes of shyness during adolescence (Cheek et al., 1986), during the college years (Zimbardo, 1977a), and into adulthood (Schalling, 1975). Speeches and public performances have also been deemed stressful (Russell et al., 1986), particularly for shy adults (Pilkonis, 1977b), who experience a much higher degree of subjective anxiety than others while speaking.

Interestingly, Hartman (1983) also found that many shy adults exhibit the cautious interpersonal style postulated by Buss and Asendorpf. Those who are highly conscious of social evaluation are continually trying to monitor their own social performance and the

reactions and evaluations of those with whom they interact. In fact, says Hartman, typical shy individuals are so occupied with this social monitoring process that they often lose the ability to participate fully in the interactions. Their social performance tends to suffer as a result. Indeed, Pilkonis (1977a) reported that shy college students rarely initiate or structure conversations, speak less, and engage in fewer prosocial behaviors, such as smiling or gazing, than more outgoing students. As a result, these shy persons are often viewed as unfriendly and lacking in speaking talent (Jones, Cavert, & Indart, 1983).

As a result of shy adults' apparent lack of friendliness and their reluctance to disclose any intimate information, they typically have a less satisfying and cohesive pattern of social relationships than others (Jones & Carpenter, 1986). Jones and Carpenter reported that while shy individuals desire more and much larger networks, they also feel that their friends are distant, uncaring, and offer their support less often than is desirable. Type 3 shy individuals do not blame their friends for this emotional distance. By far, they believe that the largest cause of their personal problems is their own perceived lack of social skills, unattractiveness, or deficient personality.

Unfortunately, all of the above-mentioned studies are limited to samples of adolescents and/or adults. In addition, several PsychLit searches unearthed no studies in which children were sampled and which examined the developmental changes in shyness that is due to a fear of negative evaluation. Evidence supporting the first two types of shyness was readily accessible, however it is likely that the controversial placement of Type 3 shyness within the theories of Buss and Asendorpf has caused researchers in this area to avoid this topic of study.

The Type 3 Controversy

As stated earlier in this section, Buss (1980, 1986) includes Type 3 shyness under the umbrella of fearful (Type 1) shyness. Asendorpf (1989, 1993), on the other hand, feels that fears of negative evaluation are more similar conceptually to self-conscious shyness and seeing oneself as a social object. It is the purpose of this section to argue that social-evaluative, or Type 3, shyness is a separate entity from both Types 1 and 2 shyness.

Fearful Shyness and Fears of Negative Evaluation. For several reasons, fearful shyness and shyness due to fears of negative evaluation should be considered separately. Developmentally, shyness Types 1 and 3 evolve differently across the lifespan. As mentioned in the previous sections, fearful shyness begins during infancy. Its early appearance suggests that this form of shyness may be genetically mediated and that it does not require a mature mental framework to be present in a child. Though the findings of the related research are mixed concerning the course of Type 1 shyness later in life, the prevailing view among researchers is that the early-appearing fearfulness does not fade, but continues into adulthood. Type 3 shyness, by contrast, emerges only later during childhood, at which time a child begins to understand that others have unique perspectives and that there are standards that dictate proper social behavior. Finally, these children must come to realize that others are likely to be evaluating their behavior based on these norms. Though social-evaluative shyness, like fearful shyness, continues into adulthood, the differences in their early development would suggest that they are not the same.

Shyness Types 1 and 3 also differ in the nature of their core, defining elements. Fearful shyness, on the one hand, is essentially a fear or anxiety that results from the

presence of social novelty - either a stranger or a novel social situation. The shyness that occurs as a result of social evaluation, on the other hand, involves a recurring, and often debilitating, preoccupation with the shy individual's impact on those around them. Even though both of these forms of shyness may coexist within one individual at once, their fundamental difference is that Type 1 is an intense emotional and physiological state, while Type 3 is a cognitive state that occurs in the form of self-monitoring and negative self-perceptions.

The shy individual's subjective reactions to each of these states are similar to one another, yet they also differ sufficiently to suggest that Types 1 and 3 shyness are separate entities. It was noted earlier in this section that fearful shyness is associated with an outward physical reaction that takes the form of shrinking back or avoidance. Fearfully shy persons will, for example, assume a closed body posture, keep their heads down, and avert their gaze. In extreme situations, they remove themselves from the stressful novelty via flight. When individuals are shy due to social-evaluative concerns, however, they display symptoms that are more internal in nature and that are typical of anxiety. As stated previously, these symptoms include sweating and butterflies in the stomach. When the differences between the core natures of these two shyness types are considered, it should not be surprising that they are also accompanied by different physical reactions.

Additional evidence for the independence of these two shyness types comes from the work of Asendorpf (1990), who observed the inhibition of 99 preschool and first grade children under several different conditions. Children's levels of stranger-related inhibition (i.e., fearful/temperamental shyness) was assessed using parents' ratings and an adaptation

of the Strange Situation procedure first introduced by Ainsworth and Wittig (1969). By contrast, their inhibition within familiar peer groups (i.e., social-evaluative shyness) was measured via teachers' ratings and behavioral observations in the classroom setting. Synchronic correlation analyses revealed that the indicators of stranger-related inhibition and those of inhibition within familiar groups were not significantly related to one another. These results suggest that the fearful and social-evaluative shyness types that are related to these forms of inhibition can be induced separately and are, therefore, independent.

In his earlier work, Asendorpf (1989) found that the independence of Types 1 and 3 shyness is not limited to the childhood years, but also continues into adulthood. During interviews with 70 university students, Asendorpf systematically varied the familiarity of interaction partners and the students' anticipation of social evaluation. During interactions with unfamiliar partners, subjects experienced shyness due to the partner's unfamiliarity, but did not report a strong fear of being evaluated. Within the situations which required mutual evaluations by both partners, subjects reported that, while they became more shy due to fears of negative evaluation, they were much less concerned with the partner's unfamiliarity. When these findings are combined with the results from Asendorpf's work with young children, and with the obvious differences between fearful and social-evaluative shyness, it is strongly suggested that these two forms of shyness are separate dimensions.

Fears of Negative Evaluation and Self-conscious Shyness. In Asendorpf's (1990) opinion, social-evaluative shyness is synonymous with self-conscious shyness due to the similarities in the timing of their development and their common required social-cognitive

precursors. Much of the research in this area indicates that both of these shyness types begin to appear at five to eight years of age. At this point in time, children become aware of themselves as social objects. They realize that others may stare at them and that others have their own perspectives and evaluations of the shy child and the world. Once this social-cognitive hurdle is overcome, shy children become increasingly aware of public scrutiny and of violations of social norms. As a result, the degree to which shy children become self-conscious shy or experience concern over negative evaluation may increase as the child approaches adulthood. As stated in previous sections, this appears to be the case.

However, the fact that Types 2 and 3 shyness develop in a similar fashion across the lifespan is not, in itself, sufficient to indicate that they are one and the same. In fact, when each of these forms of shyness is described in terms of its core elements and the situations that elicit them, it becomes more than obvious that these similar subtypes are sufficiently different from each other to warrant their separate classification.

As stated previously, social-evaluative shyness involves, essentially, a rumination on the shy child's part about being evaluated negatively by others during a social encounter. Self-conscious shyness, by contrast, is characterized by feelings of anxiety that result from being stared at or from being conspicuous in some way. Fears of being evaluated socially may also occur when one is being stared at, however it is possible that a person who is being scrutinized does not care what others think and simply enjoys being the focus of attention. A very outgoing child, for example, may enjoy being the life of a party and entertaining other children with witty jokes and stories.

It is also possible to experience fears of negative social evaluation while not being concerned about the scrutiny of others. Such a combination is likely to occur when a new student is speaking to a prospective thesis or graduate advisor. In this case, the student wants to be stared at and attended to, for an inattentive professor could indicate a lack of interest in the student. While the professor is attending to the student, however, he or she is also subjectively evaluating the student for his or her desirability to supervise. The student knows that evaluation occurs during such interviews and, while not embarrassed, is concerned that he or she will do or say something wrong that may offend the professor, thus decreasing the likelihood of working with the professor. Under these conditions, the student is content to be scrutinized, and yet fears being evaluated negatively.

Situations which involve irregularities in appearance may also elicit feelings of self-consciousness independently of social-evaluative concerns. Such feelings may occur, for example, while a shy teenager is leaving a hair salon after having had her hair done in a style which she believes does not suit her. When she walks out of the salon, she feels that all eyes are on her and her "terrible" hairdo. Under these circumstances, the girl is not likely to be concerned about the observers judging her as an individual. By far, she would feel a greater amount of anxiety just because she thinks that they are staring at her.

Though Types 2 and 3 shyness may occur independently, it is also possible that they can occur simultaneously. Public speaking can, for example, elicit both of these types of shyness. As a rule, shy children become extremely anxious when they are the focus of attention. When they are standing in front of a group, they are being scrutinized by others. This public attention is, in itself, anxiety-provoking. At the same time, shy children may

also want to impress the group of listeners with their wit and public speaking ability. If one of the listeners yawns or snickers to a colleague, shy speakers are likely to become preoccupied with the thoughts that the others find the social performance uninteresting or trivial. In many cases, shy children would interpret the yawn as a lack of interest or as a critical evaluation of themselves as individuals. In this situation, both self-consciousness and a fear of negative evaluation are being elicited.

Though both shyness Types 2 and 3 can occur concurrently, Wolpe and Lang (1964) provided evidence that these two forms of shyness are independent from one another. These authors developed the Fear Survey Schedules, which were questionnaires that required subjects to rate how fearful or anxious they would be in a wide range of different situational contexts. From their analysis of subjects' responses, Wolpe and Lang discovered that two separate factors were produced for these scales. The first factor, a fear of negative evaluation, loaded on those items that described a fear of being criticized by others or of being evaluated by them. The second factor, which included items describing being in social situations with the opposite sex and speaking in front of a large group, was labeled a fear of lacking social competence. Interestingly, this second independent factor is surprisingly similar in content to the Type 2 shyness that is described in the present paper. These results provide strong evidence for the independence of these two forms of shyness.

The Type 3 Controversy: Conclusion. Based on the arguments of this section, two critical points have been made. First, fearful shyness occurs independently from social-evaluative shyness. A careful examination of the core elements of these shyness types,

their development over time, and the arguments presented by Asendorpf (1993) suggest that this independence is highly probable. The second critical point made in this section is that a similar comparison between social-evaluative shyness and self-conscious shyness reveals that these, too, may be independent categories. In order to determine the validity of these suggestions, it would be useful if additional research efforts were directed toward examining the development and the relationships among these various forms of shyness.

Gender-Related Differences in Shyness Types 1, 2, and 3

Surprisingly little research has been devoted to the study of the gender-related differences in the development and occurrence of shyness in children and infants. In fact, several searches of various psychological databases unearthed no studies that investigated the effect of gender on the development of fearful shyness. However, due to the early appearance of this form of shyness and its adaptive basis, it is not likely that one gender would be more fearful toward strangers and novel social situations than the other.

On a more positive note, a small group of studies has examined the relationship between gender and the development of self-consciousness shyness among children and adolescents. Elkind and Bowen (1979), for example, administered a shyness scale, which was based on Buss' definition of self-conscious shyness, to children in grades 4, 6, 8, and 12. These authors were ultimately interested in the incidence of self-conscious shyness across grade level, however they also examined their data for gender effects.

Interestingly, Elkind and Bowen found that there was a gender by grade interaction. More specifically, as the age of the children increased, so did the self-conscious shyness scores

of the girls in their sample. The boys' self-conscious shyness scores increased to a much lesser degree across grade. By early adolescence, or age 12, the girls were experiencing markedly higher levels of self-conscious shyness than the boys.

In a similar study, Simmons and Rosenberg (1975) confirmed these results, finding that girls become significantly more self-conscious shy than boys in early adolescence. These authors also found that this divergence in Type 2 shyness levels occurs at 11 years of age. These findings are not surprising when one considers that the development of the imaginary audience, or the "everyone is looking at me" phase of early adolescence, is strongest at approximately the same time that self-conscious shyness peaks (Hauck, Martins, & Wetzel, 1986). Finally, according to Gray and Hudson (1984), self-conscious shyness also remains higher among girls throughout adolescence than among boys.

Unfortunately, as with fearful shyness, no conclusive research concerning gender differences in the development of social-evaluative shyness could be found. However, it is likely that this form of shyness develops more strongly in girls due to its similarity to self-conscious shyness and to the similar social cognitive antecedents that they share. Elkind's (1967) concept of adolescent egocentrism, which is embodied by the imaginary audience, has been linked to the emergence of the social perspective-taking abilities on the part of shy children. As indicated in previous sections, these abilities allow adolescents to think about how others will perceive them and react to their behavior (Jahnke & Blanchard-Fields, 1993). It follows, therefore, that shy adolescents who are more concerned with the imaginary audience would also be overly preoccupied with how others regard them. This excessive preoccupation with social evaluation appears to occur more strongly among

adolescent girls, and is thought to be linked closely to their increased self-consciousness during this portion of their lives (Gray & Hudson, 1984; Rosenberg, 1985). Additional research in this area is required before any definitive conclusions may be made, as the literature concerning this gender effect is theoretical in nature and deals with the thoughts that accompany the imaginary audience, and not Type 3 shyness, *per se*.

Out of the three types of shyness discussed, it appears that only self-conscious shyness has been studied in relation to gender. According to the cited research, adolescent girls tend to suffer from higher levels of self-conscious shyness than boys. Based on what is known concerning shyness Types 1 and 3, it is predicted that no gender effect would be found in relation to fearful/temperamental shyness, while girls would be more likely to experience concern over negative social evaluation than would boys.

Childhood Shyness: Shyness as a Problem

Childhood shyness have been linked to a number of concurrent difficulties that can range from fearfulness (Jones, Briggs & Smith, 1986) to self-consciousness (Cheek et al., 1986) during their interactions with others. Some of these children may also suffer from internalizing problems that range from depression and loneliness to low self-esteem (Cheek et al., 1986; Hymel et al., 1990; Rubin, Hymel, Mills, & Rose-Krasnor, 1991; Schmidt & Robinson, 1992). Many shy children are seen as unfriendly by their peers and are often the victims of bullying (Gilmartin, 1987; Jones & Russell, 1982; Pilkonis, 1977b; Zimbardo, 1977b).

However, it must be stressed that not every shy child develops any or all of these problems. In fact, many researchers discount the impact of shyness on a child's development, stating that shy children are simply a quiet, and otherwise normal, group of children (Asher, Markel, & Hymel, 1984; Briggs, 1986; Gough & Thorne, 1986). As a group, these researchers suggest, therefore, that there is no link between childhood shyness and negative outcomes, either concurrently or predictively. Indeed, a review of the studies in this area found that, for every three to five studies that support the risks associated with childhood shyness, there is on average one or two studies that refute this view.

As stated earlier in this paper, this lack of agreement within the shyness research is due to the large number of definitions applied to the global concept of shyness in the past, as well as to the wide array of terms that have been used synonymously with this concept. Indeed, many of the negative outcomes that were previously thought to be associated with shyness during childhood are, in fact, correlated with its synonyms. Two of these synonyms, namely social withdrawal and behavioral inhibition, for example, have been studied extensively for their link to anxiety (Rubin & Mills, 1988), feelings of social incompetence (Gottman, 1977; Rubin, 1985), the attribution of social failures to stable and internal causes (Hymel, 1983), and extreme discomfort when disclosing personal information or entering into social situations (Gottman, 1977). Withdrawn and inhibited children also have few friends (Ladd, 1983), are often victimized by their peers (Kaplan, 1980; Olweus, 1978; 1979; 1993) and experience academic difficulties (Ledingham, 1981; Masten, Morrison, & Pellegrini, 1985; Rubin, 1982). Finally, withdrawal during

childhood has been found to predict obsessive-compulsive behavior among adults (Quay & LaGreca, 1975). With this body of research in mind, and due to the interchangeability of withdrawal and inhibition with the term shyness, the confusion within the literature in this area is almost inevitable.

In order to discover if, and how, childhood shyness becomes associated with the above-mentioned group of problematic outcomes, researchers have relied on the attitudes of the shy child's peer group toward the shy child and their behavior to provide a link. One group of these researchers has investigated whether shyness is common, or normal, among various ages of children, while a second group has employed sociometric techniques in their attempts to resolve this issue.

Shyness as a Problem: Non-normative

During the infancy and preschool years, solitary and non-social activity appears to be the norm (Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983; Rubin & Mills, 1988). In fact, Rubin (1982) reported that social and interactive play are much less likely to occur at this age than at any other. Therefore, shyness, which by its very nature is a self-imposed avoidance of social interactions, is likely to be seen by young children as usual and normative. As a result, it is doubtful that these children would consider shyness to be a problem for this reason.

As children enter into elementary school, they play alone less and less often (Greenwood, Todd, Hops, & Walker, 1982; Rubin & Mills, 1988). In fact, at this time, children become increasingly sociable with age, desiring more and more contact with their

agemates (Ellis, Rogoff, & Cromer, 1981; Greenwood et al., 1982). As most children engage in increasing interactions with their peers, it becomes more and more likely that a shy, solitary child becomes more noticeable among the peer group (Rubin, 1982).

Prior to the second grade, the peer group does not consider shyness-related solitude to be abnormal. At the age of seven to eight years, however, children begin to compare one another's behavior with respect to social norms (Ruble, Boggiana, Feldman, & Loebe, 1980). These norms constitute the standards within our culture according to which individuals are judged to be "normal" or "abnormal". According to Hall and Beil-Warner (1978), the prevailing social norm within the North American culture is that everyone be as sociable and as assertive as possible. As children age, they internalize this norm, and thus begin to view any violations of this norm as deviant or problematic. This internalizing process appears to be complete by ten years of age (Shantz, 1983), at which time solitary behavior begins to be considered non-normative and inappropriate (Bukowski, 1990). Since, as suggested previously, shy children spend much of their time in solitude, the overall abnormality of this behavior as children age is likely to cause older children to view their shy peers more negatively.

In an earlier study, Coie and Pennington (1976) investigated the hypothesis that shy and withdrawn behavior was considered to be non-normal, and thus problematic during childhood. These authors asked children in grades 1, 4, 7, and 11 to provide examples of children who are different from the others. They also asked each child why he or she thinks the different child acts in an unusual manner. According to these authors, children in the first grade were the only ones who did not refer significantly to shy, socially

withdrawn behavior as abnormal. In addition, the perceived abnormality of shyness and social withdrawal displayed a significant age effect. More specifically, no child at the grade one level suggested that shy, withdrawn behavior was deviant while in the eleventh grade, this type of behavior was perceived as deviant by over thirty percent of those interviewed. This finding clearly supports the position that the self-imposed isolation that is typical of shy children is viewed increasingly as a violation of social norms, and therefore more problematic, as age increases.

Shyness as a Problem: Peer Rejection

A second group of researchers has attempted to discover the link from childhood shyness to problematic outcomes using sociometric techniques, which involve asking children of various ages to nominate their most- and least-liked classmates. Children who receive many "like most" nominations and few "like least" nominations are considered popular. Those who receive many "like least" and few "like most" nominations constitute the rejected group. The neglected group of children receive few nominations of any kind. Controversial children, by contrast, receive many "like most" and "like least" nominations. Finally, those children who receive an average number of nominations of both kinds are considered to be in the average group.

Of these groups, shyness has been linked predominantly to both rejected and neglected status in children due to the interchangeability of the term shyness with such concepts as social withdrawal (French, 1988; Younger, Gentile, & Burgess, 1993) and inhibition (Kagan, Snidman, & Arcus, 1993). The use of the term social withdrawal for

shyness, for example, is misleading to researchers due to its two subcomponents. Active withdrawal, on the one hand, is linked to aggression, hostility, and acting out behavior, and involves the outright rejection and dislike of the aggressive child by his or her peers, who are unable to cope with such noxious displays of behavior (French, 1988; Hymel & Rubin, 1985). The rejected status of this group of children appears very early during development and continues into the later childhood years (Younger & Piccinin, 1989). Passive withdrawal, on the other hand, occurs when an unsociable child withdraws from the peer group due to a lack of interest in them or due to shyness. According to various researchers, passive withdrawal becomes associated with peer dislike and rejection as grade level increases (French, 1988; Younger, Gentile, & Burgess, 1993) and as children become aware of social norms and the deviance of children who violate them (Shantz, 1983). When both of these very different types of withdrawal are combined and used as one concept (i.e., withdrawal), the results are likely to be misleading (cf. Rubin, 1993).

The earlier literature concerning the attitudes of the peer group suggests that shy children fall within the neglected group. Coie, Dodge, and Coppotelli (1982), for example, examined the social preferences of children in grades 3, 5, and 8 using sociometric nominations. These authors found that the third and fifth grade peer groups rarely indicated preference or dislike for those children whom they had previously nominated as shy using a class play format. The shy children were therefore considered to be part of the neglected group, in that they had few friends, as indicated by the low number of positive nominations they received, and that they rarely disrupted or annoyed their peers, as indicated by few negative nominations. Overall, shy children in these grades

appear to be simply overlooked by their peers due to their unobtrusiveness. Coie and his colleagues also asked children at the grade 8 level concerning the likeability of their withdrawn peers and found that there was a slight, yet significant, negative correlation between liking and shyness ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$). Within eighth grade classrooms, therefore, shy children no longer remain unnoticed. Despite their increased conspicuousness and their slightly lower desirability as friends, however, shyness was not related significantly to the number of negative nominations received.

More recently, researchers have discovered that shyness-related isolation during childhood is much more strongly related to peer rejection than Coie and his colleagues reported. This dislike may also be evidenced much earlier than these authors reported, perhaps as early as the second or third grade (Hymel, Freigang, Franke, Booth, Bream, & Borys, 1983; Rubin & Mills, 1988), although there is some dissension on this issue (Rubin, 1985). Once children reach the fourth to sixth grades, however, shy children clearly become disliked. In fact, the correlations between shy, socially isolated behavior and peer dislike are quite strong, ranging from .28 to .67 (Bukowski et al. 1995; Rubin & Mills, 1988) for these age groups.

When children attain the later elementary school grades and approach adolescence, their dislike for their shy and timid peers increases (Parkhurst & Asher, 1987; Williams & Asher, 1987). In the same vein, Younger and Piccinin (1989) found that withdrawn children become less desirable as friends as grade level increases. Groups of children in grades 1, 3, 5, and 7 were presented with three hypothetical characters, which were aggressive, withdrawn, and non-maladjusted. When children in the first grade were asked

if they would want the withdrawn character as a friend, their reactions were positive. In fact, at this grade level, this character was almost as well-liked as the non-maladjusted character. By the seventh grade, however, the withdrawn character was no longer desirable as a friend. In addition, this character was viewed as much less likable than the non-maladjusted character. This group of findings suggests that shyness-related withdrawal and isolation become increasingly noticeable and associated with peer dislike as children age. It is entirely possible that the combination of these factors is precisely what may cause many shy children to suffer from the debilitating cycle of negative self-perceptions and frequent social failures that were mentioned previously.

Shyness as a Problem: Gender Differences

Very little research has focused on the differences between boys' and girls' opinions concerning the problematic nature of shyness, as it is related to either social norms and typical childhood behavior or to sociometrics. In one of the first studies in this area, Yarrow and Campbell (1963) asked children to describe examples of non-normative behavior by their peers that they had witnessed. These authors found that boys are more likely to include withdrawn, isolated behavior in their descriptions of abnormality than are girls due to its conspicuousness as a non-typical male social behavior. The results of this study suggest that boys would consider shyness-related isolation to be more of a problem than girls.

In a later study, LaGreca (1981) asked teachers to rate their third, fourth, and fifth grade students' level of shyness, while the students were asked to indicate the classmates

they preferred as friends. In contrast to the Yarrow and Campbell (1963) study, LaGreca found that shyness is more strongly related to negative peer status among girls. These findings suggest that girls react more critically to shy, withdrawn behavior than do boys.

To further complicate this issue, Younger and Piccinin (1989) found that the desirability of socially withdrawn peers is characterized by a "gender-cross". More specifically, boys regarded withdrawn girls as less likable than withdrawn boys, as well as less likable than both withdrawn boys and girls as rated by girls. In other words, withdrawn girls who were rated by boys were viewed as the least desirable as friends. These findings are reasonable when one considers the division of the sexes at this age and their mutual dislike during the elementary school years. This finding suggests that, of all shy children who withdraw from the social circle, the isolated girls are the least liked by both male and female peers.

Taken together, these findings permit few clear conclusions to be made. In their work, Yarrow and Campbell (1963) suggest that boys view withdrawn behavior more harshly than girls, while LaGreca's (1989) results support the opposite view. The results of the Younger and Piccinin (1989) study serve both to shed light on and complicate this issue through their suggestion that both the gender of the rater and of the rated child must be known to determine whether the socially isolated behavior that is associated shyness is problematic due to conspicuousness or peer dislike. Due to the self-contradiction within this small number of studies, it appears that additional research is required before any conclusions may be made on this issue.

Shyness as a Problem: Conclusion

This review suggests that shyness among children has been linked by researchers to a variety of concurrent difficulties. Both the abnormality and conspicuousness of shyness-related isolated behavior in the later childhood years and the rejected status of those exhibiting such behavior are large contributors to the negative outcomes associated with this characteristic. As indicated earlier, however, many of the relationships between shyness and these problematic outcomes have been challenged by various researchers, who insist that shyness is not a risk factor and is therefore not problematic (Asher et al., 1984; Gough & Thorne, 1986). Therefore, if one is interested in examining the risk associated with shyness during childhood, it would be much more useful to ask children directly if they believe that shyness at their age is a problem and why they feel the way they do.

Relationship Between Shyness Type Concepts and View That Shyness is a Problem

As suggested in previous sections, a large body of research has attempted to link shyness in childhood to a wide variety of problematic outcomes. Perhaps the difficulty in making this link lies in the use of shyness as a global concept as the predictor variable. Indeed, if there are, in reality, various shyness subtypes, it follows that they may in turn be associated with different outcomes across the lifespan. Therefore, asking whether shyness as a whole is problematic may not be a sufficiently specific query. In fact, doing so is similar to asking whether a round, red berry that was found on the ground is poisonous. Without inquiring as to the type of berry, one can only make assumptions regarding its

toxicity. In the same vein, one cannot discover whether shyness is problematic without breaking this construct down further. It makes much greater sense to determine which, and whether, any negative outcomes occur as a result of each of Buss' (1984, 1986) and Asendorpf's (1990, 1993) three proposed shyness types. Somewhat discouragingly, however, very little empirical research has determined whether each of the shyness types has a negative, and therefore problematic, impact on the shy child.

Over the course of development, the problematic nature of fearful shyness appears to fluctuate somewhat. In early childhood, a fear of social novelty is normative (Rubin & Mills, 1988) and adaptive due to its self-protective function (Izard, 1984; Izard & Hyson, 1986) of retreat and avoidance of the unknown, potentially threatening situation or individual. As mentioned previously, Buss (1984) suggested that fearfully shy youngsters are anxious when meeting new people or entering into novel social situations for fear of being separated from the attachment figure. This fear can, and often does, result in increased nervous system activity and feelings of tension. Asendorpf (1993) argues that while these distressing feelings occur, this form of shyness is not a problem because it occurs among young children only when they are faced with social unfamiliarity. Indeed, he states that fearful shyness is problematic because "...except for life transition phases, such as entrance into a new peer group or moving to another place of residence, meeting strangers is the exception and interacting with familiar people is the rule for children" (p. 1072). Therefore, children who exhibit fearful shyness should be relatively unencumbered by negative social or emotional outcomes.

The sole researchers to test this theory among children to date, Asendorpf and van Aken (1994) were interested in the long-term outcomes that are associated with the various forms of shyness during childhood. After following groups of shy and non-shy preschoolers for periods ranging from 2 to 4 years, these authors found that fearful shyness in preschool was unrelated to children's levels of social self-esteem during the middle years of childhood. This result suggests, albeit tentatively, that this form of shyness may not be a risk factor for concurrent problems during the childhood years.

As children mature toward adulthood, however, fearful shyness becomes associated with a variety of problematic outcomes. In a study comparing the seriousness of fearful and self-conscious shyness, Bruch and his colleagues (1986) asked groups of young college students with these traits about their current levels of adjustment. These authors found that, of the shy groups, fearful individuals reported feeling more tense and more inhibited, and experiencing greater levels of avoidance behavior. Schmidt and Robinson (1992) also found that fearful shy college students report lower levels of self-esteem than other shy and non-shy individuals. These results lend support to the increasingly problematic status of fearful shyness as children approach young adulthood.

On the other hand, Bruch and his colleagues reported that their sample's fearful and self-conscious shy subgroups were comparable in many areas of current adjustment. In fact, despite the few differences mentioned previously, no significant differences occurred between these groups on self-reported physical attractiveness, knowledge of appropriate social skills, academic prowess, or occupational interests and exploration. In

light of these few findings, it is possible to conclude only that fearful shyness is a slightly greater risk factor for adjustment difficulties among adolescent and adults.

To date, Bruch and his colleagues (1986) are the sole researchers to examine the differential effects of fearful shyness on the two genders. However, their findings are generalizable only to college-age populations. These authors found that no differences exist between fearful shy males and females in such areas as anxiety-related cognitions or physical tension. Fearful males, however, were more likely than females to be behaviorally inhibited. Therefore, it can be assumed that fearful shyness is slightly more problematic among adult males. Unfortunately, these results constitute the entire body of research concerning the effects of Type I shyness on either gender at any point in the lifespan.

Based on this series of findings, it can be concluded that shyness due to fears of social novelty is not problematic among children in terms of the development of their self-esteem. Little else is known, however, about the differential effects of this shyness type during this period. In addition, the evidence is mixed concerning the status of this characteristic during late adolescence and early adulthood. Finally, no large overall adjustment differences occur between fearful shy male and female college students. The sole difference to occur was that females were less behaviorally inhibited than males.

To date, much of the literature concerning the problematic outcomes of self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness has treated these two forms of shyness as the same. Though it has been difficult to separate these subtypes in the literature due to a lack of descriptive information in each study, an attempt will be made to examine their unique outcomes without referring to the other.

Few researchers have examined whether self-conscious shyness is a risk factor for negative consequences during the lifespan. Buss (1984) has stated that individuals who experience this form of shyness feel vulnerable and naked under public scrutiny. Since these feelings and their underlying cognitive awareness do not develop until middle childhood (Shantz, 1983), it can be assumed that any problems that are associated with Type 2 shyness cannot appear before that time. In their 1994 article, for example, Asendorpf and van Aken found that children who were inhibited in their contact initiations with familiar peers were also the most likely to experience low social self-esteem at the second to fourth grade level. Since, according to Asendorpf (1993), this form of inhibition encompasses both of shyness Types 2 and 3 as defined by the present study, it can be inferred that either or both of these forms of shyness are related to the lower levels of self-esteem observed among the shy children.

As children approach early adolescence, the self-conscious feelings and the imaginary audience of Type 2 shy children begin to intensify (Cheek et al., 1986; Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Simmons, Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1973). This intensification of awareness of others is stressful for all children. Among shy children, it is likely that the imaginary audience would only compound their discomfort, as they intensely dislike being scrutinized by others, and with the onset of this phenomenon, they feel that they are being scrutinized almost constantly. This perception of continual surveillance is in turn likely to be more stressful for the shy child than for the more outgoing children of the peer group. Somewhat discouragingly, no researchers have looked at this or other possible concurrent difficulties that may be linked to self-conscious shyness specifically in the late childhood

years. It can only be assumed, however, that self-conscious shyness becomes increasingly stressful for children as they approach the early adolescent years. As these children pass through adolescence, their difficulties are likely to become very intense, subsiding somewhat only as they approach adulthood, as they become cognitively able to deal with their feelings, and as their perception of the imaginary audience fades somewhat.

These assumptions have merit, for Bruch and his colleagues (1986) found that self-conscious shy college students were less likely to feel tense and were behaviorally less inhibited than their fearful shy peers. No differences were found between these groups in the levels of anxious thoughts, physical self-esteem, social skills, or academic knowledge. Self-conscious shy students were also no more likely to be limited vocationally. During this period of development, therefore, this evidence suggests that self-conscious shy young adults are likely to experience fewer problematic outcomes than fearful shy individuals.

Interestingly, no authors to date have examined the effects of gender on the status of self-conscious shyness as detrimental to development. Since past research has shown that older girls experience stronger feelings of self-consciousness and feel the imaginary audience more than boys (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984), it can be assumed that girls would in turn experience more negative outcomes. These outcomes could include having lower levels of self-esteem or avoiding situations in which they would be conspicuous in any way. However, this assumption is tenuous at best.

Also discouragingly, only one study has attempted to discover whether this form of shyness is more problematic among young adult men or women. In their attempts to contrast the problems that are associated with the various shyness types, Bruch and his

colleagues (1986) found that no gender differences were apparent in such outcomes as anxious thoughts or avoidance, behavioral inhibition, self-esteem, social skills and academic knowledge acquisition, or vocational decisions. These authors concluded that Type 2 shyness is equally problematic for men and women, who were similarly dysfunctional when they were compared to a non-shy group in these diverse areas of adjustment. It is likely that the equalization of difficulties associated with this form of shyness occurs during the middle to late years of adolescence as the imaginary audience decreases in intensity among girls to a level that is comparable to that of adolescent boys.

In sum, shyness within the familiar peer group has been linked to low social self-esteem during middle childhood. As children approach adolescence, the combination of self-conscious shyness, self-consciousness, and the imaginary audience is likely to produce elevated feelings of tension. Unfortunately, no research exists to support or refute this effect. During the early years of adulthood, self-conscious shyness appears to be slightly less of a problem than shyness of a fearful nature, although these two groups are similar in many ways. These groups are, however, more likely to see themselves as less physically attractive and to consider fewer occupations than are non-shy college students. Finally, while no one has examined the effect of gender on the outcomes of Type 2 shyness during childhood, it can be predicted that girls will suffer more from negative outcomes as they reach early adolescence. As their heightened sense of the imaginary audience abates, the difficulties experienced by both male and female self-conscious shy young adults will decrease to a level that is relatively comparable to that of their fearful shy peers.

As indicated previously, social-evaluative shyness has often been combined in the literature with Type 2 shyness, making it difficult to examine the effects of these forms of shyness independently. Since the results of the present study argue for the independence of these two shyness types, the consequences of social-evaluative shyness will also be discussed separately. This section will include the consequences of traits that are typical of Type 3 shy children and adults such as "self-concealment" (Ichiyama et al., 1993) and "fears of negative evaluation" (Turner et al., 1992) in order to provide sufficient theoretical and empirical information on this issue to permit predictions in this area to be made.

How, then, do children who suffer from this type of shyness fare over the course of development? As with self-conscious shyness, most children are unable to experience any negative outcomes due to social-evaluative shyness until it begins to develop at eight years of age (Buss, 1986). At this time, these children become increasingly sensitive to how their social behavior and appearance can affect the opinions of others around them (Asendorpf, 1993). They also ruminate in excess over the imaginary negative impact they have on these others and the unfriendly responses they are inevitably going to receive (Arkin, Lake, & Baumgardner, 1986; Buss, 1986). This real or imaginary unfavorable input from others in turn affects the emotional well-being of Type 3 shy children, who then often develop low levels of self-esteem (Asendorpf & van Aken, 1994; Hymel et al., 1993), feel that their social initiations will fail (Boivin, Thomassin, & Alain, 1989), and feel that they are therefore worthless as individuals and as friends (Arkin et al., 1986; Asendorpf & van Aken, 1994). Taken as a group, these findings suggest that shyness due

to fears of negative evaluation can indeed be debilitating for a developing child, particularly as these feelings combine with the imaginary audience and increased self-consciousness that typify the approach to and the onset of adolescence. They also suggest that the consequences of this form of shyness may be more severe than those associated with either shyness Type 1 or Type 2 at this age level.

A child's fears of negative evaluation can and often do continue into the later years of life. Indeed, Buss (1984) has suggested that, from late childhood, these shy individuals develop long-lasting concerns that they are not attractive, not friendly, or that they do not possess adequate social skills, which will, in their minds, lead to rejection from their peer groups.

The difficulties that occur among these older children and adults also include an increased sensitivity to potential or actual breaches of privacy or to normal amounts of self-disclosure (Asendorpf, 1993). Buss (1984) and Ichiyama and his colleagues (1993) suggest that Type 3 shy individuals do not easily disclose personal information, feelings, embarrassing experiences, fears, or negative self-evaluations for fear of being rejected by their interaction partners as a result. Among older children and adolescents, in particular, teasing can also be the result of such disclosures. To the vulnerable youngster, these peer group attacks on, from their own viewpoint, their worth as an individual, can be highly devastating (Buss, 1984). In some cases, the teasing and peer rejection experienced by these shy teens can lead to such disorders as paranoia or social phobia, of which fears of negative evaluation are the central element (Turner et al., 1992).

No empirical articles concerning the gender differences in this form of shyness could be found. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that the research regarding the difficulties experienced by these genders would also be non-existent. As with self-conscious shy children, however, it can be assumed that female older children and adolescents would be more likely to experience difficulties as a result of Type 3 shyness than their male peers. Indeed, their higher levels of self-consciousness and adolescent egocentrism, combined with their greater sense of the imaginary audience, can often produce larger threats to the self-worth of these young girls. Assumed to be related to this deficit in self-esteem are the various consequences that were mentioned in this section.

In their discussion of self-concealment in college, Ichiyama and his colleagues (1993) suggested that girls of all ages are more likely to experience problematic outcomes due to their fears of negative evaluation because they are socialized to place much importance on personal relationships as a source of their identity development (McGuire & McGuire, 1982). They are also socialized to divulge larger amounts of information than boys in order to develop and maintain these relationships (Tannen, 1990). A social-evaluative shy girl, therefore, would feel that she must disclose to her peers or lose these all-important interactions with other girls. When she cannot do so, her peers may isolate her, at which point her self-esteem and self-perceptions will suffer (Ichiyama et al., 1993).

According to Ichiyama and his colleagues (1993), Gilligan (1982) found that relationships of boys and young men are based not on self-disclosure, but on common interests and shared activities. Therefore, if a shy male child discloses embarrassing personal information, he may be teased initially, however he will still be considered by his

peers as a member of the group if he still enjoys the same activities as the rest of his peers (Ichiyama et al., 1993). Therefore, while boys' peer relationships are primarily activity-based, those of girls revolve around mutual self-disclosure, an act which social-evaluative shy children would find very threatening, and would therefore not perform. As a result, it is likely that girls would suffer more than boys as a result of their social-evaluative shyness at this age level.

To conclude, the evidence tentatively suggests that social-evaluative shy older children and young teens are the most likely to suffer threats to their self-esteem and social development of all shy children and young adults. It is also likely that girls will experience higher levels of maladjustment due to their greater sense of the imaginary audience and self-consciousness after middle childhood and due to the deeply intimate nature of their personal relationships, in which they are afraid to disclose to others for fear of being rejected by their peers.

Conclusion: Which Shyness Type May Be The Most Problematic? This section has revealed that fearful shyness becomes problematic only during late adolescence as shy teens avoid making new friends due to their fear of entering into the many novel situations they encounter. In addition, with the exception of increased behavioral inhibition among male adults, no overall gender differences were found in the severity of the consequences of this form of shyness. During childhood, it is also likely that no such differences exist.

Both self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness, in contrast, become problematic during the middle years of childhood as they become threats to children's self-esteem. Research suggests that this threat peaks in early adolescence. Interestingly, as children

approach adolescence and adulthood, self-conscious shyness appears to become less problematic than fearful shyness, while social-evaluative shy adolescents and adults tend to experience many more problematic outcomes than either of these groups.

Finally, due to the importance of self-disclosure in girls' intimate relationships, and to their higher levels of self-consciousness in late childhood and early adolescence, it is likely that Type 2 and 3 shy girls will experience more negative outcomes as a result of their shyness than boys.

The Present Study

In the previous sections, a literature review has been provided in order to indicate that several areas within the shyness research require further study. More specifically, there is a controversy as to whether childhood shyness is a risk factor for current or later maladjustment. A large body of cited research suggests that shyness during the early years of life may be a cause for concern. However, a vocal and insistent group of researchers believes that this is not the case. Through various methods, childhood shyness has been examined for its relationship to a wide variety of consequences, however children are rarely asked directly for their opinions of their shy peers.

The principal reason for this fact is that young children are considered to be unable to form a cohesive mental concept of shyness itself. Indeed, researchers who apply social-cognitive principles and methods to the study of children's perceptions of shyness have found that this concept is not well-defined prior to 8 to 10 years of age. Most researchers

who have examined the development of the shyness concept among children have asked children of all ages to recall previously-presented characteristics of hypothetical withdrawn (and shy) peers or to nominate their peers for shyness-related roles in a play.

A typical "hypothetical peer" study involves asking children to listen to descriptions of peers of different social statuses and later testing their recall of these descriptions. These descriptions, which portray aggressive, socially withdrawn, and non-maladjusted peers, are placed within a school setting in order to provide a context that is relevant to the children. A child's understanding of a concept is tested by changing some of the descriptive items and asking them which of them were presented before. If a child can recall all of the previously-presented items for a characteristic and is able to discern which are new, the child is said to have acquired the mental concept for that characteristic. If, however, the child cannot decide which items are novel and which ones are not, it is believed that the child does not possess a concept for that characteristic, which otherwise would have facilitated recall of the concept-consistent items (Cantor & Mischel, 1979). Studies which have employed the hypothetical peer method have found that children's recall for socially withdrawn items becomes more accurate as grade level increases. The younger grades appear to have difficulty recalling which items were previously presented and, therefore, it is said that they have not yet developed the withdrawal concept. The number of items successfully recalled rises steadily as grade level increases and finally levels off between the fifth and seventh grades, suggesting that the concept for this behavioral correlate of shyness is achieved by this grade level (Younger & Boyko, 1987; Younger & Piccinin, 1989).

A second set of studies has examined the development of children's concept of shyness by administering peer nomination measures which assess sociability, aggression, and shyness/withdrawal, such as the Revised Class Play (Masten, Morrison, & Pellegrini, 1985) or the Pupil Evaluation Inventory (Pekarik et al., 1976), to children and their teachers. The results of these administrations are transformed into structure ratios which correspond to each factor of these measures. These ratios are statistical values which represent, at once, the cohesiveness of schema-common items to one another and the distinctiveness of these groups of items from those that load on other factors. The structure ratios are then represented graphically, with the more similar items being located near to one another and the less similar items being farther apart. These inter-item distances represent children's ability to nominate their withdrawn peers consistently for withdrawal items. Younger, Schwartzman, and Ledingham (1985, 1986) reported that, as grade level increases, the withdrawal items move closer to each other, and thus more cohesive as a group and as a concept. At the same time, this group of items also begins to move away from the other factors' item groups, suggesting that withdrawal as a concept becomes distinct from other social status concepts as children become older. These changes in the structure ratios and the above-mentioned changes in children's recall of withdrawn items suggest that the concept for social withdrawal (which includes some shyness items) develops between the third and fifth grades, or at eight to ten years of age. It is not surprising, therefore, that researchers who are interested in the development of children's perceptions of their shy peers have been wary to ask preschoolers and early elementary school children for their opinion on this topic.

Despite these limitations, the perceptions of children of all ages concerning their shy peers may prove to be a source of information regarding the social consequences of this characteristic that is more valuable than those of teachers or other adult observers. For, as several researchers have noted, a shy child's peers are much more sensitive than adults to the norms and rules that govern the social behavior of their age group. Therefore, they are also more likely to be aware of instances of non-normative shy behavior when it occurs (Coie, Dodge, & Kupersmidt, 1990; Yarrow & Campbell, 1963). In addition, regardless of their age level, the peer group is also more likely than adults to be exposed to the shy child's recurring pattern of isolation and withdrawal due to the large amount of time that they spend together during school and while at play. Adults, on the other hand, have many opportunities to observe the shy child's behavior, however they are in no way able to observe his or her behavior as frequently or for as long as is the peer group (Hymel & Rubin, 1985). Other children, therefore, may have much more insight than adults concerning the behaviors, motivations, and feelings of their shy peers. As a result, it is intuitive that if one is interested in the social behavior and feelings of shy children, one should take advantage of the unique perspective offered by the children of the peer group who, in effect, create the social norms and who have many opportunities to observe the shy child's non-normative behavior (Rubin & Coplan, 1994). Finally, due to this unique, and possibly more accurate, perspective concerning the shy child's behavior, the peer group's assessments of the shy child are reported to be much better predictors of psychological disturbances later in life than those of adult raters (Cowen et al., 1973).

Regardless of these advantages, researchers remain reluctant to ask young children for their opinions concerning this apparently troublesome characteristic. Those who have employed sociometric techniques and normative information, however, have found that children begin to view their shy peers as more abnormal and less likable as they get older. Little else is known about what children of different ages think of their shy peers. In addition, whether shyness is viewed as more problematic among boys or among girls is also subject to debate. One of the purposes of the present study, therefore, is to ask male and female children of various ages whether they believe that shyness in general is a problem. Based on the review of the literature that was presented in the previous sections, it is hypothesized that children will come to view shyness as more problematic as grade level increases. In addition, due to the contradictory and sparse nature of the literature concerning any gender-related differences in children's views of shyness as a problem, it is inappropriate to propose at this point that any such differences exist.

One source of the often contradictory results within the shyness research is the array of unclear or often contradictory terms, definitions, and theories that are applied to this concept in the literature. Two theories which exemplify this difficulty are those proposed by Buss (1980, 1986) and Asendorpf (1989, 1993). While Buss believes that fearful/temperamental shyness fades during childhood, Asendorpf (1989) and other researchers suggest that a fear of strangers and novel social situations is evident even among adults. To further complicate this issue, even the work of Asendorpf himself in this area is self-contradictory. However, based on the predominance of evidence supporting the continuation of fearful/temperamental shyness into adulthood, it is likely

that the salience of this form of shyness will remain at a constant level as grade level increases. Due to a noticeable lack of studies concerning the differences in the development of fearful shyness between boys and girls, the present author is unable to predict whether shyness due to fears of social novelty will be more salient among children of one gender than among the other.

In addition, both Buss and Asendorpf report that self-conscious shyness appears at approximately five years of age and accompanies the development of the social self. The social cognition literature, however, suggests that a child's social self and perspective-taking abilities do not develop prior to seven years of age. Furthermore, neither of these authors consider in great detail the development of Type 2 shyness during the early teen years when the occurrence of this form of shyness should peak. Thus, it appears that both Buss and Asendorpf have overlooked this critical portion of the lifespan when self-conscious shyness should be at its highest level. Researchers who have investigated the development of the related characteristic of self-consciousness, and not self-consciousness shyness itself, have found that self-consciousness peaks at 12 to 14 years of age and that it appears more strongly among girls. The development of self-conscious shyness, by contrast, has not been adequately researched. It would be useful, therefore, to examine the relationship between Type 2 shyness, grade or age level, and gender. With the findings of the research concerning self-consciousness during childhood in hand, it is hypothesized that self-conscious shyness will appear only rarely in children's responses at seven years of age, or at the grade 1 level, and its mention will increase markedly as grade

level increases. It is also proposed that this form of shyness will be much more salient among the girls in the sample, particularly at the older grade levels.

Finally, Asendorpf and Buss would agree that shyness due to fears of negative evaluation, or Type 3, occurs only among older children and adults. Due to its similarity to self-conscious shyness, and to their common social-cognitive prerequisites, it is likely that Type 3 shyness also develops at approximately 7 or 8 years of age. Unfortunately, all of the studies which have focused on fears of negative evaluation have been of limited use to child psychologists due to, as stated previously, their exclusive use of adolescent and adult subjects. In addition, no studies which have evaluated the development of social-evaluative shyness in relation to gender could be found. Due to the noted lack of research concerning the development of this and the other two types of shyness, the second purpose of the present study is to address the development of children's perception of shyness Types 1, 2, and 3 among children of various ages and across gender. As this form of shyness has the same social-cognitive prerequisites as self-conscious shyness, it is likely that social-evaluative shyness will be mentioned by few children at the younger grades. It is also likely that this form of shyness will be mentioned by increasing numbers of children as grade level increases. Finally, since girls tend to experience the imaginary audience phenomenon more strongly than boys, and since this phenomenon is related to the experience of social-evaluative shyness, it is predicted that girls will mention this form of shyness more frequently than do boys, particularly within the older grades.

The third purpose of this study is to determine which of the shyness Types 1 and 2 concepts is more similar to the concept for Type 3 shyness. According to Buss (1980,

1986), social-evaluative shyness falls within the fearful/temperamental aspect of this characteristic. Asendorpf (1989, 1993), on the other hand, believes that Buss is incorrect in this view. On the surface, it appears that Asendorpf is correct, in that both shyness Types 2 and 3 require a mature mental framework to occur, whereas Type 1 shyness does not. In addition, these two forms of shyness appear to develop similarly over time. When they are examined in greater detail, however, it becomes apparent that their core elements and situational antecedents differ from each other. Perhaps Wolpe and Lang (1964) are correct in their finding that these two forms of shyness constitute independent factors. Perhaps, therefore, Asendorpf is also incorrect. However, until these three forms of shyness are defined according to the definitions provided by both Buss and Asendorpf, the theoretical discrepancies between these two researchers will remain unsolved. It is hoped that the present study will indicate that the relationship between self-conscious shyness and social-evaluative shyness, while not significant, is stronger across grade and gender than the relation between fearful and social-evaluative shyness, due to the similarities in the development and in the common prerequisites of the former pair.

The final purpose of this study is to determine which of the three shyness type concepts - fearful, self-conscious, or social-evaluative - is associated with the view that shyness is a problem. As the research to date concerning the problematic nature of shyness (in general) has often been self-contradictory, and since the shyness concept may be defined in terms of subtypes, it was deemed interesting to break down the global shyness concept into subtypes in an attempt to answer this question. A small body of theoretical and research evidence suggests that fearful/temperamental shyness is not a risk

factor for concurrent difficulties because it is adaptive, it occurs rarely among children, and it is not a threat to a child's self-esteem, no matter the gender of the child. Self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness, on the other hand, are more likely to be related to problematic outcomes among female and older children as they begin to suffer from strong feelings of self-consciousness, to experience the imaginary audience, and to suffer threats to their self-esteem as a result. Of these two shyness types, it is likely that social-evaluative shyness is the greater risk factor due to the belief among these shy children that they are unworthy as friends or as individuals as a result of their own social ineptitude.

The global purpose of the present study is to examine the age- and gender-related differences in children's conception of three shyness types and whether they see shyness as a problem. To this end, 222 children in grades 1, 3, 5, and 7 were asked to describe their shy peers in terms of behaviors, emotions/thoughts, and situational causes. These children were also asked whether shyness in general is problematic and the reasons for their opinions. The interviews were first scored for the extent of children's understanding of fearful shyness (Type 1), self-conscious shyness (Type 2), and social-evaluative shyness (Type 3). Each child's three obtained shyness type scores were then used to determine the course of development of the three shyness concepts across grade level and gender. These scores also provided the necessary data to examine the relationships among the concepts for shyness Types 1, 2, and 3, according to children of various ages and of both genders. Finally, the prevalence of affirmative, negative, or ambivalent responses to the questions concerning the problematic nature of shyness will be contrasted across gender and grade level and subsequently examined for their relationships to the various shyness type scores.

Method

Subjects

The present sample included a total of 222 predominantly Caucasian children in grade 1 (n = 50, ages 6-7), grade 3 (n = 56, ages 8-9), grade 5 (n = 58, ages 10-11), and grade 7 (n = 58, ages 12-13) from three middle-class elementary schools in the suburbs of a moderately-sized city with a population of approximately 700,000 inhabitants. Of the 222 children, 106 were male, while the remaining 116 were female. Several combined classes contained children from more than one grade (e.g., both 2 and 3). In these cases, only those children from the target grades were asked to participate so that any overlap in the ages of the children in each grade level could be avoided. These children were initially recruited to take part in a study concerning children's perceptions of the behaviors that are associated with shyness among their peers (Younger and Schneider, 1995).

First contact was initiated by a research assistant in order to introduce the project to all grade 1, 3, 5, and 7 classes at the three schools and to distribute information and permission forms to the children (see Appendix 1 for a copy of this form). The research assistant returned to the schools twice over the next two weeks to collect the returned permission forms. Any child who brought back a permission form was awarded a certificate of appreciation on behalf of the research team. All children, regardless of whether they returned a permission form, were awarded certificates of appreciation at the end of the recruitment period in order to avoid any negative feelings associated with the extra attention afforded those who did do so.

In order to participate in this study, a child was to have his/her parent sign the permission form and to indicate consent. In addition, the children were to sign the form and decide whether to take part independently from their parents' decision.

Procedure

The Interview Process

Each child spent approximately 15 to 25 minutes in an individual, audio-taped interview with the research assistant. In order to give each child some time to feel comfortable with the research assistant and with the interview situation, every interview began with a brief 5 to 10 minute warm-up session. Even though the interviewer had been introduced to the children on several occasions in the classroom and had responded to their questions about the project prior to the interview phase, she engaged them in age-appropriate introductory interactions early in the interview so that an adequate level of rapport between them could be achieved. This introductory activity included informing children about what to expect within the context of the interview, having the interviewer speak briefly about herself, and asking the children about their family life, their favorite subjects at school, or their extracurricular activities. In order to receive additional cooperation from the children, the interviewer stressed to each child that his or her participation was entirely voluntary, and that the session could be terminated whenever the child desired.

The remainder of each interview was directed toward obtaining responses to the following questions: i) "Do you know someone who's shy? How can you tell?", ii) "How

do you think they feel?", iii) "Why do you think they feel the way they do?", iv) "When do they feel that way?", v) "What do you think they are thinking?", vi) "When do you think they think that way?", vii) "Why do you think they think that way?", and viii) "Do you think that it's a problem in your grade to be shy?" These questions were asked in order to elicit each child's perceptions of the shy child's behavior, thoughts, and feelings, as well as the situations in which shyness typically occurs, and whether shyness is perceived as problematic during childhood.

A vital and often overlooked consideration when one is conducting semi-structured interviews with young children involves determining if the children possess an adequate knowledge of the topic being discussed and are not simply repeating what they have overheard. Therefore, in order to assess the limits of each child's understanding, the interviewer asked several additional probe questions per topic that was being discussed. These probes were asked in a casual, conversational tone, following up on those utterances by each child that required clarification. This method of questioning, known as the Clinical Method, "analyzes down to its ultimate constituents the least little remark made by the young subjects... It does not give up the struggle when the child gives incomprehensible or contradictory answers, but only follows closer in chase of the ever-receding thought, pursues it and tracks it down until it can...dissect it and lay bare the secret of its composition" (Piaget, 1951, xiv).

Finally, if subjects' responses involved descriptions of shyness that were non-verbal in nature such as overt behavior, body posture, or facial expressions, the research assistant described the action verbally in order to accommodate the audio-recording and to

confirm with the child that the verbal description was an accurate one before proceeding. In addition, at any point the research assistant could either attempt to elicit further descriptions from each child or terminate the interview, depending on how comfortable the child appeared in the interview situation.

Transcription and Coding of the Interviews

Once all of the interviews were completed, the tapes were transcribed. All marks identifying each child's name, grade, school, and gender were removed in order to keep all raters blind to these variables.

Coding for Questions i) through vii). For questions i) through vii) requesting information about the subjects' perceptions of their shy peers, two independent female raters, one an undergraduate student and the other the present researcher, decided on the basis of each child's responses whether the child perceived shyness in a fearful/temperamental (Type 1), self-conscious (Type 2), or social-evaluative manner (Type 3). The coding categories available to the raters included the behaviors, thoughts and emotions, and situational factors that are associated with each type of shyness, based on the combined theories of Buss (1980, 1986) and Asendorpf (1989, 1990, 1993) (See Appendix 2 for a description of these categories). Included under the category of behaviors were physiological reactions to stress, such as blushing and sweating, and any overt behaviors, such as stuttering and gaze aversion. Any references to the subjective states of the shy child, such as fears of being separated from the attachment figure, were coded under emotions/thoughts. Finally, the category for the situations that elicit shyness

included any description of the circumstances in which shyness occurs (e.g., while making speeches in front of the class or when meeting someone new).

Each of the shyness type categories was coded when any aspect of the shyness type was mentioned by each child (See Appendix 3 for an example of the coding form). If a child mentioned, for example, that a shy child will run away from strangers, the response was coded as fearful (Type 1) shyness: behaviors. If a child indicated that their shy peers are normally shy when they are meeting someone new, the response was coded under fearful (Type 1) shyness: situations.

Each of these subcomponents (behaviors, emotions/thoughts, and situations) was scored from 0 to 2. Children were given a score of 0 if they did not provide any examples of a subcomponent in response to questioning at all during their interview. A score of 1 was awarded for a particular subcomponent if that subcomponent was mentioned one time only (e.g., one situation in which self-conscious shyness occurs). This score was designed to reflect a partial, yet still incomplete, understanding of the concept in question, as even with prompting, the child was unable, or unwilling, to produce another such example that would convince the interviewer that he/she understood. Children received a score of 2 for a subcomponent if they were able to provide two or more verbal examples of that subcomponent over the course of the entire interview. For example, if they mentioned three distinct examples that were related to self-conscious shyness emotions, they were given a score of 2 for Type 2: emotions/thoughts.

The maximum score of 2 for a subcomponent was considered to be adequate evidence that children's concept of that subcomponent was well-developed. These scores, which ranged from 0 to 2 for each of the three subcomponents (behaviors, thoughts/emotions, and situations), were then combined to produce a total score of 0 to a possible 6 for each shyness type. As a child's score for a shyness type increased, it was assumed that the child's concept for that type possessed more breadth and depth.

In the next sections, the mean shyness type scores obtained at each grade level and for each gender will be reported. The effects of grade and gender on shyness type concept development will be examined using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), while t-test analyses will be performed in order to provide an estimate of the relative salience of Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3 shyness in each of the four grades and within each gender. In addition, each child's social-evaluative shyness type score will be correlated (Pearson correlation coefficients) separately with his or her other two shyness type scores so that the magnitude and direction of the relationships among the types of shyness can be demonstrated. These correlations will be calculated separately for each grade level and across gender, so that the changes in the pattern of interrelationships among the three shyness types that may occur across grade level and gender can be shown. It is this set of correlations that will indicate which of shyness Types 1 or 2 is the most similar conceptually to Type 3 shyness among boys and girls and among children at all grade levels.

In order to ensure that the interrater reliability of the coding of this section remained at an acceptable level, two raters, the principal researcher and an undergraduate

student, were required to practice coding on several protocols (these interviews were not included in the final reliability analyses) during four two-hour sessions. During these sessions, the two coders also met to discuss the categories in which the responses were to be classified before coding begun. The reliability of the coding system was verified by having the undergraduate rater code approximately 25 percent ($n = 54$) of the interviews. The overall percentage of agreement between this rater and the principal researcher was .91, while the average Kappa, which is the more sensitive of the reliability measures due to its consideration of the number of coding categories used, was .85. The Kappa values for the coding of the three shyness types were based on the 0 to 6 system for each type and were high, ranging from .81 to .89. Any discrepancies in the coding between the two raters were discussed and an appropriate code assigned to the discrepant response.

Coding for Question viii). For question viii) concerning each child's indication of whether being shy at his/her grade level is a problem, two independent undergraduate raters assigned each child's responses into one of 5 separate categories. These categories were coded hierarchically and included the following: 1) Yes - shyness is a problem, 2) No - shyness is not a problem, 3) Yes - shyness is a problem in some situations - and No - in others it is not a problem, 4) Don't Know - the child does not know if shyness is a problem at their age level, and 5) Uncodable (See Appendix 4 for more information on these categories). Each child's response was first considered for inclusion in either of the first two categories, and subsequently rejected as eligible for these, before being considered for any of categories 3, 4, or 5. In addition, categories 3 and 4 were considered before an Uncodable classification became applicable. Therefore, a response

was coded as Uncodable if and only if both raters were unable to classify it easily into one of the first four categories (See Appendix 5 for an example of the coding form.). It should be noted at this point that interviews coded as Uncodable and Don't Know were excluded from subsequent analyses.

The frequency with which the yes, no, and yes/no categories appear at each grade level for males and females are reported in the next sections and the differences among them examined for significance using loglinear and chi-square analyses. The view that shyness is a problem was then examined for its relationship to children's shyness type understanding scores across grade and gender using SPSS-MANOVA in order to determine which of children's shyness type concept scores is the highest among those children who support the view that shyness is a problem.

Two raters met to discuss the coding system and to clarify any confusing coding instructions and situations. In addition, several protocols were coded initially with the principal researcher and the resulting ratings agreed-upon. Finally, each of the two raters was asked to code 10 randomly-assigned interviews, which were then verified by the principal researcher before coding continued. Due to their small number and to the high levels of agreement achieved even at this early stage, these ten interviews were included in the final calculation of reliability.

The two raters for this question, one male and one female, were fourth-year psychology students whose theses were derived from this coding procedure. Each of these raters coded all of the remaining 182 interviews so that the reliability of the coding system could be maintained and their interpretations could be verified with each other.

Once again, any responses on which these two raters disagreed were discussed between them. If they were unable to reach an agreement, the present researcher made the final decision regarding the categorical placement of the response. These raters agreed on 93 percent of their ratings. The value of Cohen's Kappa for these ratings was high at .86.

Results

Descriptive Information - Shyness Types

Of the three shyness types, fearful (or Type 1) shyness was described in the most detail by the children sampled. In fact, the mean fearful shyness score among the entire sample was 4.55 out of a possible 6. Children's references to self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness, by contrast, were much less detailed ($t = 14.97$, $df = 221$, $p = .000$; $t = 4.52$, $df = 221$, $p = .000$), with the mean scores for these shyness types being 1.22 and 3.38, respectively (See Table 1 for this information).

The responses presented by children in grade 1 were dominated by descriptions of fearful (Type 1) shyness ($F_{(2, 48)} = 137.79$, $p = .000$). Indeed, the average fearful score received by the youngest children sampled was 5.34. In contrast, these children made significantly less detailed references to either of shyness Types 2 or 3 during their interviews (self-conscious mean = .56, $t = 15.58$, $df = 58$, $p = .000$; social-evaluative mean = 1.16, $t = 11.80$, $df = 58$, $p = .000$), suggesting that their mean level of understanding of the fearful shyness concept was greater than that of the other two shyness types.

Among third-graders, fearful shyness was also mentioned most frequently ($F_{(2, 54)} = 44.65$, $p = .000$), with the children in this grade receiving an average fearful score of 4.71. Their references to social-evaluative shyness were somewhat less detailed (mean = 2.96, $t = 3.43$, $df = 55$, $p = .001$), while their descriptions of self-conscious shyness were, in comparison, undeveloped (mean = .70, $t = 5.40$, $df = 55$, $p = .000$).

Table 1Mean Shyness Type Scores Across Grade

Group	N	Shyness Type			F
		Fearful	Self-conscious	Social-Evaluative	
Entire Sample	222	4.55 (2.14)	1.22 (2.09)	3.38 (2.66)	138.54***
Grade					
1	50	5.34 (1.49)	0.56 (1.58)	1.16 (2.15)	137.79***
3	56	4.71 (2.24)	0.70 (1.65)	2.96 (2.74)	44.65***
5	58	4.59 (2.08)	1.67 (2.28)	4.02 (2.35)	31.43***
7	58	3.66 (2.31)	1.83 (2.38)	5.07 (1.71)	39.45***
F		1077.91***	76.50***	469.00***	

Note. The values in brackets are standard deviations.

* = $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$. *** = $p < .001$.

Among fifth-graders, references to fearful shyness still dominated (mean = 4.59), however the social-evaluative shyness concept was only slightly (and non-significantly) less salient among this group than fearful shyness (mean = 4.02, $t = 1.24$, $df = 57$, $p = .220$). Like the younger children, the descriptions of self-conscious shyness among children at this grade level were much more vague, with these children receiving a much lower average Type 2 shyness score of 1.67, $t = 6.61$, $df = 57$, $p = .000$).

Finally, the responses provided by seventh graders were more varied. Interestingly, the social-evaluative shyness concept was the most completely described among this group (mean = 5.07) ($F_{(2, 56)} = 39.45$, $p = .000$). By comparison, fearful shyness assumed a lesser importance to these children ($t = 3.43$, $df = 57$, $p = .001$), as their average score for this form of shyness was lower, at 3.66, while their self-conscious shyness understanding was also significantly poorer ($t = 4.02$, $df = 57$, $p = .000$), as indicated by their Type 2 shyness average score of 1.83.

Among boys, references to fearful shyness dominated their descriptions ($F_{(2, 104)} = 61.97$, $p = .000$). (See Table 2). Indeed, the mean score for the boys sampled for this form of shyness was 4.57, while their descriptions of social-evaluative and self-conscious shyness were less detailed in comparison (social-evaluative mean = 2.80, $t = 4.59$, $df = 105$, $p = .000$; self-conscious mean = 1.16, $t = 10.58$, $df = 105$, $p = .000$).

Like the boys, the girls in this sample possessed a well-developed concept of fearful shyness (mean = 4.53). Their grasp of the concept of social-evaluative shyness was only slightly and non-significantly lower ($t = 1.81$, $df = 115$, $p = .073$), as evidenced by

Table 2Mean Shyness Type Scores Across Gender

Gender	N	Shyness Type			F
		Fearful	Self-conscious	Social-Evaluative	
Males	106	4.57 (2.15)	1.16 (2.07)	2.80 (2.61)	61.97***
Females	116	4.53 (2.14)	1.27 (2.11)	3.91 (2.60)	78.91***
t		.14	-.38	-3.17**	

Note. The values in brackets are standard deviations.

* = $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$. *** = $p < .001$.

their average score of 3.91 for this form of shyness. Finally, their average score of 1.27 for self-conscious shyness suggests that girls were able to present even less adequate descriptions of Type 2 shyness than they were of Type 3 ($t = 9.90$, $df = 115$, $p = .000$).

Development of Concept of Shyness Types Across Grade and Gender

In order to determine if children's mean level of understanding differed by shyness type across grade and gender, a repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed ($F_{(2, 429)} = 134.61$, $p = .000$). Gender, grade level, and shyness type discussed (a within-subject variable of 3 different scores for each child) were the independent variables used in the analysis, while the dependent variable included each child's understanding scores (entered as a within-subjects variable). Overall, the shyness type by grade by gender interaction was not significant ($F_{(6, 215)} = 1.02$, $p = .423$). The two-way interaction between grade and gender was also not significant ($F_{(3, 214)} = 1.85$, $p = .140$). Therefore, while the grade by type ($F_{(6, 215)} = 15.79$, $p = .000$) and the gender by type interactions ($F_{(2, 219)} = 4.63$, $p = .010$) were significant, the lack of an interaction between grade and gender allows for the separate examination of the main effects of grade and gender on children's understanding of the three forms of shyness.

Since the grade by shyness type interaction was significant, post-hoc tests were performed in order to determine where children's shyness understanding scores differed across grade level. In order to do so, the simple effect of grade within each shyness type was performed using MANOVA. Encouragingly, the simple effects analyses performed in SPSS-MANOVA automatically incorporate Scheffe's post-hoc test, which increases the

magnitude of F-critical against which all of the obtained F values are compared, thus creating a more conservative test of the null-hypotheses and controlling the family-wise error rate.

The simple effect of grade within the fearful shyness type was performed, as mentioned previously, in order to determine whether children's mean fearful shyness scores differed significantly across grade level. This effect was found to be significant ($F_{(1, 218)} = 1077.91, p = .000$). Therefore, the between-grade differences in fearful shyness means could be explored further.

In order to determine whether the differences in the means between adjacent grade levels were significant, t-tests (with the Bonferroni correction for alpha level resulting in a critical alpha of $.05/4 = .0125$) were performed. These analyses revealed that between the first to third ($t = 1.67, df = 104, p = .097$), third to fifth ($t = .32, df = 112, p = .752$), and fifth to seventh ($t = 2.28, df = 114, p = .024$) graders, the differences in the mean scores received for fearful shyness were not statistically significant. Since the overall grade effect was significant, it follows that the mean levels of understanding of this form of shyness among children in the first and seventh grades were significantly different from one another ($t = 4.42, df = 106, p = .000$).

The simple effect of grade within self-conscious shyness was also of a significant magnitude ($F_{(1, 218)} = 76.50, p = .000$), therefore the between-grade differences in the means for this form of shyness could be examined in greater detail. More specifically, the mean self-conscious shyness scores among the younger children sampled were .56 for first graders and .70 for third graders, while the children in grades 5 and 7 received average

means of 1.67 and 1.83, respectively. Because the F-ratio for the relevant simple effect was significant, t-test analyses were performed on these results in order to determine where significant inter-grade differences existed with respect to the development of children's descriptions of self-conscious shyness. No significant differences were found between the means in the scores for this form of shyness for children in grades 1 and 3 ($t = .43$, $df = 104$, $p = .666$), nor did the means for children in grades 5 and 7 differ significantly ($t = .36$, $df = 114$, $p = .721$). A significant change in the development of children's conception of self-conscious shyness did occur, however, between the third and fifth grades ($t = 2.61$, $df = 112$, $p = .010$), where the mean score increased from .70 to 1.67. It is important to note at this point that this increase remains significant, even with the Bonferroni criterion for rejection of the null hypothesis, which would, in this case, change the critical alpha level to $.05/3$, or $.017$ for the three above-mentioned comparisons.

Like the other two shyness types, the simple effect of grade within social-evaluative shyness was found to be significant ($F_{(1, 218)} = 469.00$, $p = .000$). Like Type 2 shyness, children's mean scores for social-evaluative (Type 3) shyness also increased overall with grade level. Few first graders possessed a well-developed grasp of this concept, as evidenced by their mean social-evaluative shyness score of 1.16. As a group, the third-graders sampled described this type of shyness in significantly greater ($t = 3.74$, $df = 104$, $p = .000$) detail than their younger schoolmates, obtaining an average score of 2.96. When compared to the third graders, a non-significantly greater level of detail

($t = 2.20$, $df = 112$, $p = .030$) was seen in the descriptions among the children in grade 5. A second jump in the awareness of children ($t = 2.76$, $df = 114$, $p = .007$) regarding the social-evaluative shyness concept occurred between fifth and seventh grade children, who received average scores of 4.02 and 5.07, respectively.

In the original MANOVA, the interaction between gender and children's understanding of the three shyness types was significant ($F_{(2,219)} = 4.63$, $p = .010$). Therefore, in order to determine where the genders differ with respect to their average shyness type scores, and because there are only two groups (boys and girls) in this analysis, t-tests with the Bonferroni correction were conducted. With respect to gender, there were no significant differences between the boys and girls sampled in their mean scores for fearful shyness ($t = .14$, $df = 220$, $p = .889$). Indeed, the average scores for the genders were almost identical, with boys scoring, on average, 4.57, and girls receiving an average of 4.53 out of a possible 6. A similar trend occurred with children's references to self-conscious shyness, with neither boys (mean = 1.16) nor girls (mean = 1.27) displaying greater Type 2 conceptual development than the other ($t = -.38$, $df = 220$, $p = .704$). Significant differences were apparent, however, between boys and girls in the development of their descriptions of social-evaluative shyness ($t = -3.17$, $df = 220$, $p = .002$), for which girls received much higher scores than their male counterparts (3.91 and 2.80, respectively).

Intercorrelations Among Shyness Types Across Grade and Gender

In order to determine whether social-evaluative shyness is mentioned in isolation from the other two shyness types (i.e., fearful and self-conscious shyness) and may be a construct that is independent of these other types, Pearson correlation coefficients were performed between pairs of each child's three shyness type scores. As indicated in Table 3, the relationship between children's fearful (Type 1) and self-conscious (Type 2) shyness scores was significant overall and negative in direction ($r = -.23$, $df = 221$, $p = .001$). In addition, although of a non-significant magnitude, the relationship between children's descriptions of these two shyness types was negative at most grade levels. Therefore, children who possess a sophisticated understanding of fearful shyness were not likely to also comprehend the self-conscious shyness concept.

Descriptions of the fearful (Type 1) and social-evaluative (Type 3) shyness types were also negatively correlated among the entire sample of children ($r = -.26$, $df = 221$, $p = .000$). These two concepts were, however, not significantly related to each other at any grade level. Therefore, a child's level of understanding of fearful shyness was not likely to predict that he or she also possessed a grasp of the Type 3 shyness concept.

Children's scores for social-evaluative (Type 3) and self-conscious (Type 2) shyness, on the other hand, were positively and moderately related overall ($r = .25$, $df = 221$, $p = .000$). Interestingly, however, three of the four individual grade correlation analyses assessing the relationship between children's descriptions of these two shyness concepts failed to reach significance. Therefore, while these two concepts are more likely to be mentioned concurrently during a child's interview (showing evidence of their

Table 3Pearson Correlations Among Shyness Type Scores Across Grade and Gender

Group	Shyness Types		
	Types 1 & 2	Types 1 & 3	Types 2 & 3
Entire Sample	-.23***	-.26***	.25***
Grade			
1	.01	.09	.06
3	-.43***	-.17	.04
5	-.18	-.24	.31*
7	-.09	-.20	.12
Gender			
Males	-.24***	-.38***	.22*
Females	-.22*	-.17	.27**

Note: * = $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$. *** = $p < .001$.

understanding) than the other shyness type pairings, the small proportion of variance each accounts for in the other (6.25%) suggests that they are not the same concepts. Indeed, if these shyness types were in fact one and the same conceptually, the variance that is shared between their concepts would likely have been of a much greater magnitude than that found in this study.

A similar pattern of relationships emerged when only the boys in the present sample were used and when grade level was no longer considered. Among boys, the relationship between their scores for fearful and self-conscious shyness was significant and negative in direction ($r = -.24$, $df = 105$, $p = .000$). Also significant was the correlation between boys' fearful and social-evaluative shyness descriptions ($r = -.38$, $df = 105$, $p = .000$). Like the within-grade analyses, this relationship was also negative. Finally, the scores for social-evaluative and self-conscious shyness were moderately and positively related to one another among the boys sampled ($r = .22$, $df = 105$, $p = .023$).

A similar pattern of relationships among the three shyness type descriptions emerged among the girls in this sample. Like the boys, the relationship between their scores for their descriptions of fearful and self-conscious shyness was significant and negative in direction ($r = -.22$, $df = 115$, $p = .017$). This value, however, did not deviate significantly from that obtained by the boys sampled ($F = .662$, $df = 221$, $p = .506$). Furthermore, though not as strong as that obtained for their male counterparts, the relationship between fearful and social-evaluative shyness scores among girls approached statistical significance, was negative in direction ($r = -.17$, $df = 115$, $p = .069$), and was not significantly different from that of the boys ($F = 1.076$, $df = 221$, $p = .284$). Finally, girls'

self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness descriptions were found to be positively related to one another ($r = .27$, $df = 115$, $p = .003$). It must be noted, however, that this value also did not differ significantly from that obtained by the boys ($r = -.332$, $df = 221$, $p = .641$). This cross-gender similarity in the pattern of relationships among the shyness type scores suggests that the conceptual structure of shyness among the girls in this sample does not differ significantly from that of the boys.

Shyness as a Problem - Developmental and Gender-Related Differences

Of the entire sample of 222 children, 59 (27%) responded that yes, they believe that shyness in general is a problem, while 131 children indicated that it is not a problematic trait at their grade level (See Table 4). An additional 25 (12%) youngsters were unable to decide whether shyness is consistently a problem or not. In other words, these 25 children believed that in some situations (e.g., when giving a speech), shyness could be a problem, whereas in other situations (e.g., playing with other shy children), this is not the case. The remaining 7 responses provided were deemed uncodable, in that the children did not answer the question at all, or that they did not appear to understand the question that was put to them. Because they formed such a small portion of the entire sample, these uncodable responses were excluded from further analyses.

The three-way interaction between grade, gender, and children's views on shyness as a problem was initially examined using loglinear analysis. This interaction was found to be non-significant ($\chi^2 = 5.430$, $df = 6$, $p = .654$). The overall effect of grade on problematic perceptions ($\chi^2 = 30.080$, $df = 6$, $p = .000$), however, was significant. The

Table 4Distribution of Shyness as a Problem Responses Across Grade and Gender

<u>Group</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes & No</u>
Entire Sample	27%	61%	12%
<u>Grade</u>			
1	47%	53%	-
3	16%	71%	13%
5	18%	74%	9%
7	33%	43%	24%
χ^2	8.051*	8.389*	4.160
<u>Gender</u>			
Males	29%	64%	7%
Females	26%	58%	16%

Note. * = $p < .05$.

effect of gender on problematic perceptions ($\chi^2 = 4.090$, $df = 2$, $p = .129$), by contrast, was not significant. The effect of gender, therefore, does not need to be considered further. In addition, it can be concluded from this finding that neither boys nor girls are more likely than the other to believe that shyness in general is a problem. Due to this pattern of results, the effect of grade on children's perception of the problematic nature of this characteristic may be discussed in isolation.

The responses provided by children in the first grade were almost equally divided ($\chi^2 = .192$, $df = 1$, $p = .662$) between affirmative and negative opinions concerning whether shyness is a problem. Of the 47 children in grade 1, 22 (47%) believed that shyness is a problem, while 25 (53%) did not. Interestingly, more children in this grade felt that shyness among their peers is a problem than either children in grade 3 ($\chi^2 = 5.452$, $df = 1$, $p = .011$) or in grade 5 ($\chi^2 = 4.500$, $df = 1$, $p = .013$), 16% and 18% of whom also supported this view. First graders were also more likely to suggest that this characteristic is problematic than are children in the seventh grade (33%), although the difference between these grades is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = .400$, $df = 1$, $p = .527$). Indeed, Table 5, which presents the observed and expected frequencies for responses regarding shyness as a problem, suggests that of all grade levels, the children in the first grade were the least expected ($n = 12.9$) to agree that shyness is problematic, yet they were also the most likely to support this view in reality ($n = 22$) (See Table 5). Finally, none of the children at this grade level supported the view that situational circumstances may affect just how much of a problem shyness can be for their peers.

Table 5Observed and Expected Frequencies of Shyness as a Problem Responses

Group	Yes	No	Yes/No
Grade			
1	22 (12.9)	25 (28.6)	0 (5.5)
3	9 (15.4)	40 (34.1)	7 (6.5)
5	10 (15.6)	42 (34.7)	5 (6.6)
7	18 (15.1)	24 (33.5)	13 (6.4)
Gender			
Males	29 (27.7)	65 (61.5)	7 (11.7)
Females	30 (31.3)	66 (69.5)	18 (13.3)

Note. Numbers outside of brackets represent observed values, while the numbers inside of brackets represent expected frequencies.

The opinions of third graders, on the other hand, were dominated ($\chi^2 = 36.679$, $df = 2$, $p = .000$) by those who believed that shyness is not a problem (71%). Indeed, only 9 (16%) of the 56 children in this grade level agreed that shyness is problematic. The number of children who supported this view was somewhat less than expected ($n = 15$). In addition, 7 (12%) thought that whether shyness is problematic depends mainly on the circumstances and the other individuals present within any given situation.

Like the third graders, children in grade 5 were most likely ($\chi^2 = 42.421$, $df = 2$, $p = .000$) to adopt the position that shyness is not a problem. In fact, almost three-quarters of these children (74%) supported this view. Only 10 of the children (18%) believed the opposite to be true - that shyness is problematic for their same-age peers, a number that is somewhat less likely than expected by chance ($n = 15.6$). Once again, only a minority (9%) believed that circumstances affect the difficulties that shy children may experience.

Interestingly, by the seventh grade, children's perceptions of shyness were more varied, with approximately one third believing that this characteristic is a problem (33%), one quarter (24%) believing that it may be a problem in certain situations, while less than one half (43%) saw it as not being problematic. This variability is supported by relative equalization of the proportions of children who supported each of these views at this grade level ($\chi^2 = 3.309$, $df = 2$, $p = .191$). It is also important to note that the seventh graders sampled were more likely to report that shyness is a problem at their grade level than either the third or fifth graders (33% of seventh graders versus 16% and 18%,

respectively), however these differences were not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.000$, $df = 1$, $p = .083$; $\chi^2 = 2.286$, $df = 1$, $p = .131$).

It is also interesting to note that the children's responses which indicated that shyness as a problem is dependent on the situation (i.e., the yes/no responses) underwent a slight, though non-significant, increase across grade level ($\chi^2 = 4.160$, $df = 2$, $p = .125$). No children in grade 1 presented the idea that shyness is a problem under certain circumstances, even though some of them were expected to do so ($n = 5.5$). However, 13% and 9% of third and fifth graders indicated that this was the case, while even more children in grade 7 (24%) did so. Encouragingly, Table 4 suggests that, by this grade level, twice the numbers of children expected ($n = 6.4$) to support this view actually did so ($n = 13$).

As mentioned previously, the effect of gender on the problematic status of shyness was of a non-significant magnitude. The distribution of shyness as a problem responses within each gender group was as follows. Contrary to predictions, a clear majority ($\chi^2 = 50.931$, $df = 2$, $p = .000$) of the 101 boys sampled (64%) indicated to the interviewer that shyness is not a problem, while less than one third (29%) believed that this characteristic is indeed problematic. At the same time, a small number of these boys suggested that the problematic nature of this trait is dependent on the situation (7%). Like their male counterparts, most ($\chi^2 = 32.842$, $df = 2$, $p = .000$) of the girls in this sample supported the view that shyness in their peers is not problematic. Indeed, almost two-thirds of the girls (58%) stated this opinion during the interview. Just over one-quarter

(26%) indicated that their shy peers experience difficulties as a result of their shyness and that this trait is, therefore, indeed a problem, while a minority (16%) felt that in some situations, shyness can be problematic, whereas in others this is not the case.

Relationship Between Shyness in General as a Problem and Shyness Type Scores

Also of interest is the determination as to which of the three shyness types is the most problematic for children. In order to provide some early exploratory research into this area, the purpose of this section is to determine which of the various shyness type scores provided by the children at various grade levels and of either gender is, on average, greatest among those children who believe that shyness in general is a problematic characteristic. Table 6 presents the obtained mean shyness type scores when the entire sample of children was divided into subgroups based on their responses to the question: Is shyness a problem? (See Table 6). In order to test whether any of these means differ from one another significantly, and to determine which single or combination of independent variables is responsible for this variability, a repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed. In this analysis, grade level, gender, shyness as a problem response, and shyness type were entered as independent variables, while the within-subjects three shyness type understanding scores were entered as the dependent variable.

The four-way interaction between sex, grade, problem response, and shyness type was not significant ($F_{(8, 194)} = .47, p = .871$). The interaction between grade, problem response, and shyness type was also non-significant ($F_{(10, 194)} = .52, p = .869$). Finally,

Table 6Mean Shyness Type Understanding Scores Across Shyness as a Problem Response

<u>Response</u>	<u>Shyness Type</u>		
	<u>Fearful</u>	<u>Self-conscious</u>	<u>Social-evaluative</u>
Yes	4.81 (1.93)	1.02 (2.02)	3.58 (2.57)
Yes/No	4.72 (1.74)	1.20 (2.22)	4.80 (2.06)
No	4.44 (2.29)	1.37 (2.13)	3.07 (2.73)

Note: Numbers outside brackets are means, while numbers in brackets are standard deviations.

neither the interaction between sex, problem response, and shyness type ($F_{(4, 194)} = .66$, $p = .614$) nor that between sex, grade, and shyness type was significant ($F_{(6, 194)} = .93$, $p = .473$). Since, none of these three-way interactions were significant, only the two-way interactions between these variables need to be considered further.

The key question to this subsection is to determine whether children's shyness type scores differ across response to questioning regarding the problematic nature of shyness. Encouragingly, the interaction between these responses and shyness type was significant ($F_{(4, 194)} = 1.97$, $p = .101$), suggesting that children's mean shyness scores do in fact differ across shyness as a problem responses. Not surprisingly, children's fearful shyness mean scores were similar to one another ($F_{(2, 212)} = .67$, $p = .510$), despite their view concerning shyness as a problem. In other words, children who viewed shyness in general as a problem did not receive higher fearful shyness scores than children who did not view shyness as problematic or who believed its problematic status was conditional.

Children's self-conscious shyness understanding scores were also not significantly different from one another across shyness as a problem response ($F_{(2, 212)} = .67$, $p = .510$). Therefore, as with fearful shyness, those children who believed that shyness is a problematic characteristic were not more likely than those who view shyness as aproblematic or as conditionally problematic to also possess a greater understanding of the self-conscious shyness concept.

Interestingly, however, children's mean social-evaluative shyness scores differed from one another across their responses to questioning concerning the problematic nature of shyness in general ($F_{(2, 212)} = .67$, $p = .510$). More specifically, those children who

believed that shyness is problematic in certain situations displayed a significantly greater understanding of the Type 3 shyness concept than those children who did not view shyness as a problem ($t = 3.01$, $df = 154$, $p = .003$) and a slightly greater understanding than those who believed that shyness is a problem ($t = 2.11$, $df = 82$, $p = .038$). Since a Bonferroni correction to the alpha level had to be performed due to the post-hoc nature of these tests, the new critical alpha level is $.05/3 = .0167$, and therefore this last comparison only approaches statistical significance. In sum, of the three shyness type scores, it appears that the variability of children's social-evaluative scores is related to their view regarding shyness as a problem. In addition, children's understanding of this form of shyness was higher among those who believed that shyness is always or can be a problem than those who think that it is not problematic ($t = 2.88$, $df = 212$, $p = .004$). It is likely, therefore, that children who lean toward the more problematic status of shyness are also those with a greater understanding of the social-evaluative shyness concept.

It was also of interest to determine whether children's grade level or sex affected their shyness type scores, depending on how they responded to questions concerning the problematic status of shyness. Within the framework of a repeated-measures MANOVA, these effects would be found in the interaction terms denoting the grade by problem response by shyness type interaction and the sex by problem response by shyness type interaction. As mentioned previously, neither the former ($F_{(10, 194)} = .52$, $p = .869$), nor the latter interaction ($F_{(6, 194)} = .93$, $p = .473$) was significant. Therefore, grade level and gender do not have a significant effect on the relationship between the view that shyness is a problem and shyness type understanding. As a result, they will not be explored further.

Discussion

The Development of the Shyness Type Concepts

The purpose of the present study was to examine the development and the relationships among children's conceptions of three forms of shyness, the development of their perception of shyness as a problem, and to determine which concept of shyness is related to the perception that shyness in general is a problematic characteristic. In order for children to possess each of these concepts, it was assumed that they were observing at approximately the same time the occurrence of each type of shyness within their peer group. This assumption is consistent with that of Crozier and Burnham (1990), who have performed the only similar research in this area to date. These researchers were also interested in children's understanding of Buss' shyness types, and assumed that such concepts could occur if, and only if, the children sampled were being exposed to the shyness types in their everyday life. Therefore, when children provide descriptions of the shyness types, it is assumed that the shyness type is likely to be occurring as well. In this way, the validity of the theories of Buss and Asendorpf concerning the development of the three shyness types may be tested.

According to Buss (1986), fearful shyness is prevalent among children younger than eight years of age. After this point in development, he states, this form of shyness is found only among a minority of older children and adults. Asendorpf (1989) and other researchers, such as Crozier and Burnham (1990), however, believe that fears of social novelty do not fade as age increases, and that this type of shyness remains prevalent even

into the adulthood years. If Buss is correct, it can be assumed that a young child's concept of shyness would be predominated by descriptions of fear of strangers and novel social situations. Furthermore, these references would decline across age as the other types of shyness and their concepts become more visible to the peer group. If Asendorpf and other supporting researchers are correct, this form of shyness does not abate and, therefore, older children would be as likely as their younger schoolmates to mention aspects of this form of shyness when questioned about their shy peers.

It is interesting to note that the results of the present study lend support to both of these views. Indeed, a significant decline across grade level was observed in children's mean level of understanding of fearful shyness. More specifically, the average first grader's fearful shyness score was high at 5.34 out of a possible 6, while that among children in the seventh grade was only 3.66. This decrease in the mention of fearful shyness coincides with Buss' (1986) theorized decline in the numbers of children who display fearful shyness as they get older. Though this characteristic becomes more salient to the peer group as children age (Bukowski, 1990), it is not surprising that fearful aspects of the shyness concept are less likely to dominate children's descriptions of their shy peers as the other forms of shyness become equally or more prevalent among the entire group of children (Asendorpf, 1990; Buss, 1986; Cheek et al., 1986).

Despite this significant decline in children's fearful shyness scores, the fact that the seventh and fifth graders still described their shy peers in fearful terms cannot be overlooked. Indeed, the average scores for these two grade levels are surprisingly high if Buss is entirely correct. In his 1986 paper, he states that few children over the age of

eight years should experience this fearful state. Therefore, few older children should include in their descriptions aspects of this fearful trait if it is no longer seen among their peer groups. What, then, can account for these older children who still do so?

Asendorpf (1989) and other researchers have attempted to answer this important question (Cheek et al., 1986; Crozier & Burnham, 1990; Russell et al., 1986). As stated previously, these researchers have found that shyness toward strangers and fears of novel social situations are common among adolescent and adult populations. In fact, Russell and his colleagues (1986) estimate that as many as 25 to 75 percent of these older groups experience these fears. It would appear, therefore, that the tendency of the fifth and seventh graders in the present study to mention this form of shyness is reasonable. For, if past research is correct in its indication that a large number of adults and older children experience fearful shyness, it is understandable that the older children in the present sample also described their shy peers in fearful terms.

How, then, do we reconcile these two opposing, yet equally supported, theoretical positions? On the one hand, the mean fearful shyness scores declined as children reach higher grade levels. On the other hand, the oldest children sampled also described fearful shyness in detail during their interviews. These results suggest that this type of shyness becomes salient to children at a very early age and remains salient to large numbers of older children. Though social-cognitive researchers would suggest that children in the first grade are unable to grasp this concept that infers a rather "unobvious" state in others (Shantz, 1983), the responses provided by the youngest children sampled (aged only 5 to 6 years) were sufficiently graphic to convince two trained coders that they understood this

elusive concept. It is also obvious that this shyness type remained salient to the older children sampled, as suggested by moderate fearful shyness mean scores that they received. The lower mean fearful shyness concept scores among this group as compared to the younger children, however, suggests that this concept adopts a lesser importance in the opinions of older children, among whom fearful shyness is likely to be seen less often as the other forms of shyness appear (Buss, 1986) and draw the attention of the peer group.

One of the two forms of shyness that are believed to appear during the middle years of childhood is self-conscious shyness. According to the literature on social cognition, children are unable to experience feelings of self-consciousness until they can comprehend that others will look at them, and that they are, therefore, viewed as social objects (Piaget, 1932; Shantz, 1983). Both Buss (1984) and Asendorpf (1990) would argue that this heightened awareness occurs at 7 years of age. It is also at this age that the early signs of self-conscious shyness begin to emerge. They report that, prior to this time, young children also do not possess the social-cognitive abilities to feel anxious under public scrutiny. Therefore, the first graders sampled, aged only 6 to 7 years, would neither be likely to exhibit this shyness type (due to a lack of a social self), nor would they possess the cognitive structures that are necessary to infer the presence of self-conscious shyness among their peers (Crozier & Burnham, 1990). As children age, their childhood egocentrism declines (Piaget, 1932), and their social selves begin to develop. From this point and across the later childhood years, feelings of self-consciousness typically intensify, especially among self-conscious shy children.

As maturing children become exposed to their self-conscious shy peers, and develop the cognitive abilities that are required to take the perspective of these peers, so also is their concept for this form of shyness likely to develop. Therefore, self-conscious shyness should be mentioned rarely, if ever, by young children. Furthermore, self-conscious shyness concept scores should increase steadily as grade level increases.

As predicted, children's descriptions of their shy peers become increasingly filled with references to self-conscious shyness and its characteristics as grade level increases. Specifically, the mean scores obtained by the children in the first and third grades were very low, at .56 and .70, respectively. This finding is consistent with the social-cognitive view that few of these children would possess the self-conscious shyness concept, as indicated by their overall inability to describe this type of shy peer.

Not surprisingly, the older children sampled provided significantly more adequate examples of the self-conscious shyness concept, with fifth graders and seventh graders receiving average scores of 1.67 and 1.83, respectively. The greater awareness of this type of shyness among older children is understandable in light of the development of social cognition during this period of life. During middle childhood, egocentrism declines and these older children become aware of themselves as social entities (Piaget, 1932; Shantz, 1983). As a result, they do not enjoy being at the center of attention (Buss, 1984), even if they are not shy. With the development of these cognitive abilities, therefore, they become aware of and can empathize with the discomfort of their very self-conscious, and thus shy, agemates.

Both Buss and Asendorpf have suggested that self-conscious shyness begins to be seen at approximately 6 to 7 years of age. However, the children in this age group were, overall, unable to describe their shy peers in terms of self-conscious feelings, actions, and situations, as indicated by their low obtained average Type 2 shyness score of .56. Indeed, no noteworthy increase was seen in the development of this shyness concept until the third to fifth grades, or at 9 to 10 years of age. This delay in children's ability to discuss this form of shyness is likely due to the combination of several factors. First, self-conscious shyness is not known to appear among children until 6 to 7 years of age (Buss, 1984). Second, at this young age, children are only just beginning to develop the mental abilities that would allow them to empathize with, and thus describe in detail, their peers who experience extreme levels of self-conscious shyness. It is conceivable, therefore, that there is a delay between the onset of these events and a child's full understanding of the Type 2 shyness concept. As the present results suggest, it is also likely that these changes in cognition occur at some time between the third and fifth grades.

These results agree with those obtained by Crozier and Burnham (1990), who performed the only prior study that is in any way similar to the present research. When these authors asked children of various ages if certain situations or stimuli evoke feelings of shyness, they found that almost no children who were younger than seven years of age felt that conspicuousness (a self-conscious shyness precursor) would cause them to feel shy. Children over 8 years of age, however, were much more likely to feel this way. These authors note that this increase in the mention of conspicuousness as shyness-eliciting "...is related to developments in the capacity for self-reflection, in particular the

ability to take another's perspective on the self" (p. 183) that occurs during the middle childhood years (Shantz, 1983). As mentioned previously, this conceptual link has been proposed by both Asendorpf and Buss in several of their articles.

As stated previously, the occurrence of shyness due to fears of negative evaluation (Type 3) has received little attention by developmental psychologists to date. Unfortunately for developmental psychologists, past research in this area has been limited to the use of adolescent and adult samples (Hartman, 1983; Jones & Carpenter, 1986; Jones et al., 1986; Russell et al., 1986). Unfortunately for the shy person, these researchers have found that social-evaluative shyness is linked to a variety of negative outcomes, such as being seen by others as cold and unfeeling and having weaker interpersonal relationships than more outgoing individuals.

The literature concerning this form of shyness during childhood, however, is only theoretical at best. Both Buss (1986) and Asendorpf (1989) have suggested that younger children are not concerned about being evaluated by their peers because they lack the mental abilities to do so. As with self-conscious shyness, these concerns require the development of an awareness of oneself as a social object (Buss, 1984) and the ability to comprehend that others have their own perspectives (and opinions about others). A child must then be able to understand that his or her behavior, appearance, and characteristics are likely to affect others' opinions in a positive or negative manner (Buss, 1980, 1986; Asendorpf, 1989). As suggested previously, this group of cognitive abilities does not appear among children until 6 to 7 years of age (Shantz, 1983). Once their peers begin to display shy social-evaluative concerns and they can themselves understand the nature of

these concerns, it follows that the concept of this form of shyness would also appear. As with self-conscious shyness, it is likely that a delay would occur in the development of the Type 3 shyness concept, as children in the middle years of childhood require sufficient time to understand their own social-evaluative concerns and those of their shy peers. It is assumed, therefore, that an adequate grasp of this concept will appear more frequently as children age and as they are increasingly exposed to these characteristics in the peer group.

This assumption appears to be correct, as the mean scores for this shyness type increased markedly across grade level in this study, with the average score at each grade level climbing sharply from 1.16 among the youngest group to 2.96 and 4.02, and finally to 5.07 among the oldest children sampled. This sharp age-related trend occurs at the same time as children's social-cognitive abilities are developing, and as their shy peers are likely to be displaying increased social-evaluative concerns. This finding suggests that social-evaluative shyness becomes more salient among children and that they become increasingly cognizant of this concept as they get older.

However, the surprisingly high average score among younger children for this form of shyness suggests that the Type 3 shyness concept develops earlier than Asendorpf's and Buss' proposed shyness type or that the shyness type also develops earlier than they believed. If social-evaluative concerns do not develop prior to 6 to 7 years of age as they suggest, it follows that the concept of this form of shyness would also only be starting to develop as well. Therefore, it is unlikely that children who are younger than seven years of age (i.e., the first graders) would be able to produce well-developed

descriptions of this characteristic. Indeed, it makes sense that only children of at least eight years of age would begin to understand their peers in this fashion. However, in the present study, some of the children in the first grade, aged 6 and 7 years, were able to provide convincing descriptions of the Type 3 shyness concept, while some of the third graders were also able to do so. It is likely, therefore, that children's ability to understand social-evaluative concerns begins to develop prior to the onset of Buss' and Asendorpf's proposed shyness type, as children enter into the early elementary school years and are subjected to highly evaluative situations in the classroom. In this context, most children are likely to experience anxiety due to evaluation by their teachers or due to teasing by the peer group even if their feelings are not yet so severe as to be labeled as shyness. They can, therefore, understand and empathize with their older Type 3 shy peers somewhat and are able to describe their experiences, even at this young age.

In sum, the results of this study present several new findings in the area of shyness concept development. First, consistent with the view of Asendorpf (1989) and other researchers, children of all ages were able to describe the fearful shyness experience, suggesting that they are exposed to and understand the plight of fearful shy peers. However, Buss is also correct, as the mean scores reflecting the development of children's descriptions of this form of shyness decline as grade level increases. In contrast, with age, more children in this sample became aware of both self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness. It is also interesting to note that the development of the social-evaluative shyness concept precedes the theorized onset of this form of shyness by approximately one year,

while the concept for self-conscious shyness develops 3 to 4 years later than the related shyness behavior.

Due to the lack of research in this area, it was hoped that the examination of the development of the three shyness type concepts - fearful, self-conscious, and social-evaluative - in relation to gender would produce some enlightening results. Presenting one of the first findings in this area, the boys and girls sampled in this study received similar average scores for their descriptions of fearful shyness. This similarity is hardly surprising in light of the adaptive nature and early appearance of this form of shyness. Indeed, if boys and girls are equally likely to be exposed to fearful shy peers because of the self-protective aspect of this characteristic, it is probable that children of both sexes would be equally able to describe it in detail. Based on this finding, this appears to be the case.

Predictions regarding the effect of gender on self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness concept development could be made from the results of the small body of literature on such related topics as self-consciousness and the imaginary audience (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984; Rosenberg, 1985; Simmons & Rosenberg, 1975). As a group, these authors have found that girls experience higher levels and more frequent episodes of these phenomena than boys throughout development, particularly as they approach early adolescence. Due to the often simultaneous occurrence of these characteristics and the shyness types (Hauck et al., 1986), it is likely that both self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness occur more strongly and are more salient among girls than among boys across the childhood years and that these gender-related differences will increase markedly as children approach adolescence.

In light of this body of research, it was shocking to note that the mean self-conscious shyness score among the girls in the present sample was not significantly greater than that among the boys. What accounts for this divergent finding? While the actual occurrence of this form of shyness is likely to be greater among older girls due to their higher levels of the imaginary audience and self-consciousness, it is possible that this form of shyness is equally salient to the genders because children of both sexes have experienced such fears themselves in social situations, even if they are not so severe to be labeled "shy", such that they would be equally able to understand and empathize with their shy peers, regardless of the actual prevalence of this shyness type among the peer group.

It is also possible that the children sampled sensed the existence of a subtle difference between the self-consciousness and the self-conscious shyness constructs. As stated previously, the past gender differences in this area have been found using self-consciousness (which is less severe and is experienced by everyone occasionally), and not self-conscious shyness (as defined by Buss and Asendorpf), as the outcome variable. In the past, self-consciousness has been defined as feelings of discomfort when in front of others, while self-conscious shyness is defined in this study not only as a set of feelings, but also as a group of behavioral responses (i.e., fumbling and blushing) and situational antecedents (i.e., while public speaking or entering a crowded room). Perhaps the addition of these other non-emotional components to the definition of self-conscious shyness, over and above the primarily emotional definition of self-consciousness employed elsewhere, caused this unexpected finding.

Finally, as expected, the average social-evaluative shyness score found for the girls sampled was greater than that obtained by their male peers. In fact, this difference was considerable, being as large as 1.11 points out of a possible 6. While having no supporting empirical research, this finding was expected in light of the greater prevalence of the imaginary audience and self-consciousness that occur among girls (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984; Rosenberg, 1985). Therefore, since girls are more likely to experience these phenomena and are exposed to greater numbers of peers who display these traits during later childhood, and therefore also to the related shyness type, it is likely that they would be in a better position to describe this form of shyness than their male agemates.

To conclude, boys and girls were equally likely to understand and describe both the fearful and self-conscious shyness concepts. By contrast, the development of the social-evaluative shyness concept did display a strong gender effect, with the girls in this sample describing their shy peers in terms of Type 3 shyness in greater detail than their male counterparts.

The Social-evaluative Shyness Controversy

A second purpose of this study was to resolve the controversy between Buss and Asendorpf regarding the conceptual independence of social-evaluative shyness from the other two shyness types. In an earlier section, it was hypothesized that the relationships between the fearful and social-evaluative concepts and between the self-conscious and social-evaluative concepts would be non-significant overall, and that the latter relationship,

while non-significant, would be stronger than the link between the fearful and social-evaluative concepts.

Buss (1980, 1986) stated that social-evaluative shyness is conceptually similar to shyness due to fears of social novelty. Several areas of research evidence suggest that this position is not valid. Earlier in this paper, the developmental course, core characteristics, and situational precursors of these two forms of shyness were presented in detail. Fearful shyness, for instance, begins in infancy and continues into the adulthood years. It is characterized by fears of novel persons or unfamiliar social situations and is accompanied by closed body posture, flight, or avoidance of the stressful social event (Buss, 1984). Social-evaluative shyness, by contrast, occurs not in the face of social novelty, but when shy individuals feel that their social behavior is being evaluated by others. This awareness, and this form of shyness, only occur among older children (Asendorpf, 1989), as they both require a certain degree of social-cognitive maturity in order to develop. Fearful shyness, however, does not. In addition, while Type 1 shyness occurs as a strong fearful and physical reaction, social-evaluative shyness is characterized predominantly by feelings of anxiety and recurrent thoughts of being viewed negatively by others (Asendorpf, 1989).

In his work, Asendorpf (1989, 1990) also provided evidence for the independence of these two forms of shyness among older children and adults. In novel social situations, both of these groups reacted with displays of fearful shyness, whereas familiar peers and authority figures produced predominantly social-evaluative responses and emotions. In fact, fearful characteristics were seen only rarely in the familiar and evaluative contexts. These findings suggest, at the very least, that these forms of shyness can occur separately

from one another. When a particular form of shyness occurs in the peer group, it is probable that children will also be able to describe the related shyness concept. It is intuitive, therefore, that the separate occurrence and nature of fearful and social-evaluative shyness would be accompanied by the independence of the two shyness type constructs.

As expected, the findings of the present study support this assumption. Examined more closely, the results of this study indicate that there is an overall significant negative relationship between children's descriptions of these constructs. Though these values at each grade level are not significant, the relationship between children's concept scores of these two forms of shyness at each grade level are predominantly negative in direction. These findings suggest that the children in the present sample were able to describe these types of shyness independently and that these types are, therefore, independent concepts. This suggestion is reasonable in light of the rather small proportions of variance that are shared by all of the pairings between these two constructs. Indeed, the largest proportion of variance that these two concepts account for in one another is 11 percent (among the boys sampled). This tiny portion of shared variance argues strongly for the independence of these concepts. Therefore, Asendorpf's (1989, 1990) assumption that fearful and social-evaluative shyness are separate entities may have some merit.

Is Asendorpf also correct, then, in his belief that social-evaluative and self-conscious shyness are one and the same conceptually? In his work, Asendorpf (1990) states that these forms of shyness are simply two sides of the same concept, so much so that these terms may be used interchangeably. Their development over time is quite similar, beginning at approximately eight years of age as children begin to conceive of

themselves as social objects (Shantz, 1983). As this awareness grows, states Asendorpf, both shyness due to fears of negative evaluation and to self-consciousness are likely to follow and co-occur.

It is not reasonable, however, to conclude that these two forms of shyness are one and the same, solely on the basis of the similarities in the timing of their development and in their common social-cognitive precursors. If they are two sides of the same concept, distinguishing between them would be an unenviable task. Contrary to Asendorpf's contention, however, Types 2 and 3 shyness are readily distinguishable, in terms of the situations that elicit them and their core elements. Indeed, self-conscious shyness occurs when a shy individual is being stared at by one or more people or is at the center of attention. This type of shyness also involves feelings of anxiety and desires that the unwanted attention would cease. Social-evaluative shyness, by contrast, is prevalent in social situations that involve either actual or perceived evaluation of the shy individual's behavior, appearance, or manner by others. The core elements of this form of shyness (Type 3) include rumination about the possible impact that one's own characteristics have on the opinions of others and anxious thoughts that one will be seen as lacking in some way as an individual as a result of these characteristics. Viewed from this perspective, it is obvious that each of these shyness types is conceptually independent from the other.

This critical conceptual independence is supported by the results of this study, where most of the children at each grade level who described these types of shyness in detail did so without similarly referring to the other. Though the overall relationship between the Types 2 and 3 shyness concepts and that which occurred at the grade 5 level

are significant, the greatest amount of shared variance between these two concepts is meager at best (9%). Given the overlap between them in terms of their developmental course (Asendorpf, 1990) and their social-cognitive precursors (Cheek et al., 1986; Elkind, 1967; Hauck et al., 1986), the coefficients that describe the relationship between these shyness concepts are surprisingly low. Had their shared variance been of a greater magnitude, perhaps there would have been some evidence to support Asendorpf's position that these two forms of shyness are the same conceptually. In addition, had he been entirely correct, it is also likely that more children would have described Types 2 and 3 shyness as occurring in concert than they did in the present study, where only 55, or 25 percent, of the 222 children sampled received scores of at least 1 for both of these shyness concepts. Ninety-eight other children (44%), by contrast, scored between 1 and 6 for one of these shyness types and also received a score of zero for the other. Since this sizable number of the children sampled provided separate examples for, and characteristics of, each of these two forms of shyness without referring to the other and without being prompted by the interviewer to keep them separate for ease of coding, it can be argued with conviction that these concepts can be discussed independently from one another.

This series of findings agrees with those of long ago provided by Wolpe and Lang (1964), who produced the Fear Survey Schedules, an instrument designed to assess which situations provoke fear and anxiety in their subjects. Factor analyses of their results suggested that fears of negative evaluation and self-consciousness are distinct entities, being separately characterized by items that describe being afraid of criticism and speaking in front of others, respectively. The results of this and the present study provide evidence

that the concepts for these two forms of shyness are sufficiently dissimilar that they should be characterized as different concepts, in contradiction to Asendorpf's view.

To date, no research by Buss, Asendorpf, or any other researcher has addressed whether the three shyness type concepts will be differentially correlated among boys and girls. However, based on the review provided earlier in this paper, predictions can be made concerning the direction and magnitude of these relationships. First, while Buss (1980, 1986) has proposed that fearful and social-evaluative shyness are similar conceptually, Asendorpf (1989, 1990) has argued and found evidence for their independence among both children and adults. In addition, since their core elements and situational precursors are dissimilar, it is proposed that the relationship between the concepts for shyness Types 1 and 3 will be negligible, regardless of the gender studied, and that no differences will exist between these groups in the magnitude of the values obtained. Second, Asendorpf (1990) has also argued that self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness are conceptually similar to one another. In this vein, it can be argued that the development of these two forms of shyness is almost identical across the childhood years and that their social-cognitive precursors are also similar. However, the core elements of self-conscious and social-evaluative shyness differ from one another, as do the situations in which they occur. Therefore, while they do possess some similarities, it is the contention of the present study and that of Wolpe and Lang (1964) that these two shyness concepts are also independent entities. If this is the case, it is likely that they will be non-significantly correlated in spite of the gender sampled.

A predictable pattern emerged from the analysis of the relationships among the three shyness type concepts when they are examined within each gender group. Taken together, these relationships suggest that if any child mentioned fearful shyness during the interview, he or she was less likely to also describe either self-conscious or social-evaluative shyness, regardless of gender. If a child mentioned either Types 2 or 3 shyness, however, it was increasingly likely that the other would also be discussed. It is not surprising, once again, that very little variance was shared between these two concepts within each gender. They cannot, therefore, be viewed as identical concepts. This pattern emerged for both male and female children, among whom the values of these coefficients were not significantly different. Therefore, neither males nor females were more likely to produce or include a particular shyness type in their interview when one of the other shyness types was mentioned in detail. In sum, the conceptual differences among the three shyness types were supported, regardless of the gender studied.

Conclusion: The Type 3 Controversy. Taken together, these results suggest that Asendorpf (1989, 1990) and Buss (1980, 1986) have greatly overestimated the degree of overlap among the various shyness type concepts. For, if the concepts of each type can be described in statistical isolation from the others, it follows that they may in fact be separate concepts. The present findings concerning the conceptual development of the shyness types indicate that the social-evaluative shyness concept is distinct from that of fearful shyness and positively linked to that of self-conscious shyness. The proportion of variance that is shared between children's scores for shyness Types 2 and 3, however, is so small that their independence is all but certain. These findings are also reflected when the above

relationships are examined within each gender group. Not surprisingly, no significant differences in the pattern of these relationships were found between the samples of male and female children.

Shyness as a Problem: Grade and Gender Differences

A large group of studies has addressed whether extreme levels of shyness during childhood is a cause for concern. Some researchers believe that shyness among children is not a developmental risk factor (Asher et al., 1984; Gough & Thorne, 1986), arguing that shy children are simply a quiet, unnoticed group of children who are otherwise developing normally. A body of research, however, suggests that this characteristic has been linked such outcomes as depression and loneliness during childhood to career difficulties during the adulthood years (Cheek et al., 1986; Hirshfeld et al., 1992; Hymel et al., 1990; Khandelwal & Mathus, 1987).

The later childhood years are particularly traumatic for shy children, as normative and sociometric studies have shown. Indeed, the social behavior of very young children is often dominated by solitary play (Hymel et al., 1983; Rubin & Mills, 1988). Shyness and its related isolation during this developmental period, therefore, is not very noticeable among the peer group (Rubin, 1982). Since solitary play is normal for young children and is not highly noticeable when it occurs, it is not likely that children among this age group would consider shyness-related isolation to be a problem. As children age, however, the social withdrawal that is associated with shyness becomes less normal as most children become more sociable toward their peers (Greenwood et al., 1982; Rubin & Mills, 1988).

It is not surprising, therefore, that isolated children would tend to become increasingly noticeable to their more outgoing peers at this time (Rubin, 1982).

At approximately 8 years of age, children begin to understand that there are norms governing their own behavior and that of their peers (Ruble et al., 1980). Sources of violations of these norms tend to become considered as deviant or problematic (Shantz, 1983). Therefore, as more children desire to be with their peer group, the isolation of the shy child becomes viewed as abnormal or deviant. In fact, several researchers have found that, by ten years of age, shy behavior is considered by many children to be inappropriate (Bukowski, 1990; Coie & Pennington, 1976) and is viewed by the peer group as a reason to dislike the shy peer (Hymel et al., 1983; Rubin & Mills, 1988). Taken together, these research findings suggest that self-isolating shy children in general become viewed more negatively by the peer group as they get older and that this characteristic becomes, therefore, more problematic.

This suggestion, however, is not supported by the findings of the present study. Indeed, contrary to expectations, about one half of the youngest children in this sample believed that shyness is a problem at their age level, while less than one third of the older age groups also did so. When the results of the first grade children are not included, a non-significant age-related increase does indeed occur in the data. More specifically, less than one fifth of the third and fifth graders believed that shyness is problematic. Meanwhile, this opinion was supported by one third of the children in the seventh grade. Therefore, when the youngest group is eliminated from the analysis, these data provide weak support for prior research in this area. This minimal increasing trend suggests that

while researchers such as Rubin (1982), Rubin and Mills (1988), and Bukowski (1990) may be correct in their assumption that the perception of shy, solitary behavior as problematic increases with age, it is likely that the age-related increase in this perception is not as large as previously indicated.

This obtained discrepancy in the magnitude of the age-related increase in the perception of shy behavior as a problem is perhaps explained by the nature of the questions that were put to children in various studies. On the one hand, Bukowski (1990), Rubin (1982) and Coie and Pennington (1967) were interested in the relationship between age level and the deviance of shy behavior or social withdrawal. The work of Hymel et al. (1983) and Rubin and Mills (1988), on the other hand, focused on the sociometric status of various groups of children. In the present study, children were asked if shyness in general is a problem. This question is by far of a more global nature than the specific foci of interest in previous research. Indeed, in order to answer the question in the present study, it is likely that the children would have had to incorporate their ideas concerning the deviance and likeability of shy children into their responses. It is also likely, however, that other unknown considerations (e.g., the belief that everyone is shy in certain situations) also contributed to their opinions. In sum, while the present results should agree somewhat with past research in the related areas of sociometrics and normative behavior that an age-related increase occurs in the perception of shyness is a problem, it would be very surprising if they concurred completely.

The large proportion of first graders in this study who believed that shyness is a problem could not be explained by past research. In reality, this finding is counter-

intuitive and, therefore, bewildering. What accounts for this result can only be speculation. It is possible that large numbers of children in the first grade do in fact believe that shyness can be a problem for their shy peers. If this is the case, it is likely that shyness is problematic among children at this age level due to their entry into elementary school, which, by its nature, is a novel and threatening social environment to the very young child.

It is also possible that this finding is caused by a lack of understanding among the youngest children of the question that was put to them. It is possible that many of these children responded with a positive or negative response without actually comprehending the meaning of the query in order to simply please the interviewer. If this is the case, when the adult interviewer (and thus an authority figure in the eyes of children) asked them a question, it is possible that they provided an answer simply because it was expected of them, and not because of genuine understanding of the issue being discussed.

In order to test this possibility, all responses to this question and the reasons for these opinions that were provided by the children were examined separately at each grade level for evidence of understanding. Less than four percent of the responses were uninterpretable or suggested a lack of comprehension on the part of the child. In addition, this four percent of uncodable responses was evenly distributed across grade level. First graders, therefore, were no more likely than children at the higher grade levels to be included in this four percent. In addition, research investigating children's understanding of the traits of others suggests that children as young as 4 years of age are fully capable of understanding these traits (Harris, Olthof, Terwogt, & Hardman, 1987; Zimbardo & Radl,

1982). In this light, it can be concluded that this finding reflects a real proportion, and not a lack of understanding, among the first graders sampled.

It was noted previously that the literature regarding the gender-related differences in the problematic nature of shyness was inconclusive, allowing for no clear predictions to be made. The earliest research in this area suggested that boys are more likely than girls to believe that shyness-related social withdrawal is a problem due to its lower prevalence and its resulting greater conspicuousness among male children (Yarrow & Campbell, 1963). Opposing this view is a much later study by LaGreca (1981), in which teacher-rated shyness was more strongly related to negative peer-rated sociometric status among the girls sampled than among the boys. On their own, these two studies clearly contradict one another. Finally, in the only other research in this area, Younger and Piccinin (1989) discovered that there is a gender-cross effect in the desirability of withdrawn children as friends. In other words, of all withdrawn children, socially isolated girls were viewed the most negatively by both their male and female peers. In sum, due to the small number of studies in this area, and to their obvious disagreement, it was impossible to draw any clear conclusions based on these findings that would suggest whether shyness is a more of a problem among boys or girls.

The results of the present study do little to clarify this issue, and serve only to further cloud any conclusions in confusion. They do not indicate that one gender is more likely to state that shyness is a problem, nor are they of sufficient detail to support a gender-cross effect. Indeed, they suggest the existence of one of the few remaining possible patterns of results in this area, namely the existence of no gender effect at all.

More specifically, the proportions of boys and girls who felt that shyness at their grade level was and was not problematic were highly similar. Therefore, it can be concluded from this study that no such gender differences exist. This conclusion makes sense in light of the apparent confusion and lack of agreement within the past research. Perhaps the findings of each of the three studies that were reviewed in this area were not replicated by the others or by the present study because their results were simply products of random fluctuation and that, in reality, there was nothing (i.e., no differences) to replicate.

Conclusion: Shyness as a Problem. This discussion regarding the nature of shyness as a problem reveals that several noteworthy conclusions should be presented. Indeed, only one quarter of the children sampled believed that shyness in general is a problematic characteristic. Across grade level, the proportions of children who believed that shyness is a problem only increased in a non-significant manner among the three older groups. Interestingly, and contrary to expectations and the findings of past research in this area, the youngest children in this sample were more likely to state that this characteristic is problematic than any of their older schoolmates. As suggested previously, it is possible that these unusual results are due to the global nature of the question in this research or to the novel nature of the school environment. Finally, no more boys than girls thought that shyness is a problem. Due to the large number of studies that address somewhat similar topics, and to the small number of studies that address this issue directly, it is essential that more direct research in this area be conducted. For, it is only by asking children what they think of their shy peers and by interviewing shy children themselves that we can take

advantage of the unique perspective they offer on the difficulties that occur between the shy child and his or her peer group.

Relationship Between Shyness Types and View of Shyness as a Problem

Very little research has addressed the issue of which of the various proposed types of shyness is the most problematic. Therefore, it is not yet possible to determine which shy children should be targeted for intervention that would alleviate some of their difficulties. In the present study, the children sampled provided to the interviewer their descriptions of what they conceive shyness to be. These descriptions were then examined for evidence of the development of each of the three shyness type concepts. In addition, these children were asked to indicate their opinion as to whether shyness is or is not a problem at their grade level. It seemed only logical that these two sources of information be combined in order to produce results which would indicate which shyness type - 1, 2, or 3 - is the most closely linked to the view that shyness is a problem across grade and gender. In this way, researchers may be guided by the opinions of children, who may be aware of the problems experienced by each type of shy peer and of which adults may not yet be aware, in order to determine which shy peers have the greatest need for adult intervention.

Only one study has focused on the effects of fearful shyness during the childhood years. In this study, Asendorpf and van Aken (1994) found that Type 1 shyness and children's levels of self-esteem were unrelated. In addition, both Buss (1984) and Asendorpf (1993) have suggested that, while fearful shy children experience high levels of

anxiety in new social situations or with strangers, this form of shyness is not a problem because social novelty is very rare for young children. Indeed, it is only as they enter adolescence, and become increasingly exposed to these novel stimuli, that their difficulties, such as lower self-esteem or behavioral inhibition, begin to develop (Bruch et al., 1986, Schmidt & Robinson, 1992).

Optimistically, the results of the present study support this small body of research. Since no children sampled were older than 13 years of age, the sole guiding research is that provided by Asendorpf and van Aken (1994), which suggested that fearful shyness is not a problem with respect to self-esteem levels. Overall, and across grade level, children's ability to describe the fearful shyness concept (i.e., their mean scores) did not differ across response regarding the problematic status of shyness. With the noticeable lack of research evidence to the contrary, it is likely that Buss (1986) and Asendorpf (1993) are correct in their view that this form of shyness is not a problem for young children. Even among the older children, the Type 1 shyness concept was not related to problematic status of this characteristic. Therefore, if the research presented by Bruch and his colleagues (1993) is correct in its assumption that fearful shy adults experience social difficulties, it is entirely possible that these difficulties begin to appear only at some point later than the seventh grade. This assumption makes sense in light of the vast number of novel social situations that children experience as they enter into high school, in which they no longer move from class to class with a familiar group of peers. In the face of new peers in each course, it is likely that fearful shy teens would develop such difficulties as behavioral inhibition during this period (Bruch et al., 1986).

According to the literature in this area, the social and intrapersonal difficulties that are associated with self-conscious shyness appear at an age that is much earlier than those that accompany fearful shyness. Indeed, once this form of shyness develops at 7 to 8 years of age, its associated difficulties are also likely to emerge. During late childhood, shyness due to self-consciousness and fears of negative evaluation have been linked to decreased levels of social self-esteem (Asendorpf and van Aken (1994), while such shy adolescents are likely to experience a variety of anxiety-related difficulties, including increased self-consciousness (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Simmons, Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1973), and related stresses that typically accompany their exposure to public scrutiny, be it real or imagined. According to Bruch and his colleagues (1986), however, the late adolescence and adulthood years are characterized by fewer difficulties due to self-conscious shyness than due to fearful shyness, although some of these difficulties remain.

Unexpectedly, the theorized increasingly problematic nature of self-conscious shyness across the childhood years contradicts the findings of the present study. When examined closely, no significant relationship was found between the view that shyness is a problem and children's descriptions of Type 2 shyness. In addition, of the three shyness types, the mean self-conscious shyness score was lower than either mean for the other two shyness types among children who believed that shyness in general is a problem, indicating that mention of Type 2 shyness during an interview was less likely than the other forms of shyness to be associated with the problematic status of shyness as a whole.

These results are quite surprising in light of the theorized increases in self-consciousness and of the development of the imaginary audience phenomenon that are

reported to occur during the later childhood years. It makes more sense to believe that children who are highly sensitive to these phenomena would experience more difficulties than non-shy children as they get older than to believe that no such developmental differences exist. This disagreement may be due to the prior definition of self-conscious shyness within the other literature. As mentioned previously, the literature in this area has confounded this definition by embedding social-evaluative shyness into it. In the present study, these two forms of shyness were deliberately separated from one another. With this difference in mind, it could only be predicted that children's mean Type 2 shyness scores should increase as grade level increases among children who view shyness as a problem, and that the self-conscious shyness understanding of this group would be lower than their social-evaluative shyness comprehension. As these predictions were based on the newly separate definition of self-conscious shyness and are therefore tentative at best, it should be no great surprise that the first of these predictions was not borne out by the results of this study.

The reasoning underlying the second of these assumptions is as follows. As with self-conscious shyness, social-evaluative shyness is not likely to develop until the middle years of childhood (Buss, 1986). As older children approach adolescence and experience adolescent egocentrism and the imaginary audience, their shy peers become exceedingly concerned about the impact they have on the opinions of others (Asendorpf, 1993; Buss, 1986), overemphasize the importance of ambiguous or negative feedback from others, and interpret this feedback as rejection of their own worth as individuals (Buss, 1986). These interpretations can and often do lead to self-esteem deficits and failures to self-disclose

(Hymel et al., 1993; Ichiyama et al., 1993), which in turn cause the shy adolescent to lose vital interpersonal relationships. Due to the severe repercussions associated with the onset of this form of shyness, it was theorized that, of all three shyness types, shyness due to fears of negative evaluation would be the most strongly related to the view that shyness is a problem, as reflected by higher Type 3 shyness scores among children who view shyness as a problem.

Overall, the results of this study support this hypothesis. Indeed, of all three types, only the Type 3 shyness concept was related among the entire sample to the belief that shyness in general is problematic. When examined at each grade level, however, no between-grade differences in children's mean Type 3 shyness scores were found within the group of children who supported the view that shyness is a problem. Therefore, grade level had no effect on the relationship between this view and the social-evaluative shyness concept. However, children who believed that shyness is unconditionally and sometimes problematic received higher average Type 3 shyness scores than those who believed that shyness is not a problem. This finding suggests that social-evaluative shyness may indeed be associated with difficulties during the childhood years. In light of the negative consequences associated with traits that are similar to this form of shyness (e.g. a lack of self-disclosure due to fears of negative evaluation can cause distant and cool interpersonal relationships), the relationship between this concept and the view that shyness is a problem is entirely acceptable. Whether the actual shyness type is associated with negative outcomes, however, is an issue that still requires resolution.

Additional research is also needed in the area of gender differences in the difficulties that occur as a result of the three shyness types. Discouragingly, no research has yet attempted to explore these difficulties among young children. However, both Buss (1986) and Asendorpf (1993) have suggested that fearful shyness is not a problem at all during childhood because elementary school-age children are rarely, if ever, exposed to fear-eliciting social novelty agents. Therefore, since fearful shyness is problematic overall, it can only be assumed that neither gender will report that this form of shyness is related to the view that shyness is problematic in the present study.

On a positive note, the results of the present study lend support to this assumption. Indeed, among both the boys and girls sampled, the Type 1 shyness concept was not associated with the view that shyness is problematic, nor were there any significant gender differences in this area. It would appear, therefore, that children of both genders would agree that Asendorpf and Buss are correct in their statement that this form of shyness is not a risk factor because children remain in relatively familiar social environments and, therefore, are unencumbered by the difficulties that may be encountered otherwise.

As with fearful shyness, no literature to date has examined the differential problematic effects of self-conscious shyness among boys and girls. Furthermore, no such literature exists for adolescent populations. However, based on the differences that have been found between the two genders in the levels of the imaginary audience and of self-consciousness (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984), it was predicted that girls would suffer more in late childhood and early adolescence than boys as a result of this form of shyness. Since no research has been performed to this effect, it is only speculation

that these girls would experience lower levels of self-esteem (Asendorpf & van Aken, 1994), more embarrassment, and more avoidance of social situations which contain an actual or perceived conspicuousness component. Unfortunately for these girls, such situations occur frequently in any older child's life. In such situations, the Type 2 shy child feels that others are watching constantly (due to the imaginary audience). This continual perception of being the focus of everyone's attention is doubtless going to cause these teens and older children considerable amounts of stress.

However, children's scores for self-conscious shyness in this study were unrelated to whether boys or girls viewed shyness as a problem. Indeed, the mean scores for this form of shyness among both boys and girls did not differ significantly across response to questioning regarding the problematic nature of shyness. These findings indicate that while being older and female will increase a child's self-consciousness and feelings of the imaginary audience (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984), older or female children may not experience the hypothesized increased difficulties as a result of the shyness that is related to these phenomena.

Of the three shyness types, the concept of social-evaluative shyness was the most positively linked to the view that shyness is a problem among children of both genders. Somewhat counter-intuitive, however, was the lack of an obtained gender effect on the relationship between children's Type 3 shyness understanding scores and the view that shyness is a problem. Indeed, although there is no prior conclusive research in this area, distinct gender differences in the problematic nature of this form of shyness had been predicted. This prediction was based on related research results which suggested that girls

tend to experience greater level of self-consciousness and are affected more than boys by the imaginary audience (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984). According to Ichiyama and his colleagues (1993), social-evaluative concerns are also likely to cause greater problems among girls because girls of all ages use self-disclosure to maintain interpersonal relationships with their peers (McGuire & McGuire, 1982). When social-evaluative shy girls, however, do not self-disclose (Buss, 1986), their relationships with other girls are likely to cease, thus eliminating the possibility for Type 3 shy girls to develop the self-esteem that is fostered by their interactions with their peer group (Ichiyama et al., 1993).

What, then, accounts for the equality across gender in the strength of the relationship between the Type 3 shyness concept and the view that shyness is a problem? In their article, Ichiyama and his colleagues stated that Gilligan (1982) found that the peer relationships of boys are held together through shared interests and activities. When, and if, a young Type 3 shy boy discloses embarrassing personal information to his peers, he is likely to be teased by them (Buss, 1986). As mentioned previously, it was believed that this teasing would only be temporary and that, since the boy remains with the peer group despite the teasing, his self-esteem would emerge more intact than the girl's if she lost her peer relationships. However, children are in a much better position than adults to perceive the social consequences which may occur as a result of any form of shyness. It is possible, therefore, that the consequences of being teased by other boys (even for non-shy boys) and remaining in the peer group, thus allowing for additional teasing to occur, are viewed equally as traumatic by the boys sampled as the shy girl's loss of peer relationships are to

her agemates, who value such relationships highly. Therefore, though the outcomes of this shyness type may be gender-specific, the finding that the relationship between the Type 3 shyness concept and the view that shyness is problematic does not differ across gender suggests that these different negative outcomes of social-evaluative shyness are equally difficult for shy boys and girls.

To conclude, of all three shyness concepts, only social-evaluative shyness was more likely to be discussed among children who believe that shyness is, or can sometimes be, a problem. In addition, no significant grade or gender differences were found in the relationships between children's understanding of the shyness type concepts and the view that shyness is a problem.

Theoretical Implications

Pilkonis and Zimbardo (1979) once stated that shyness is a "fuzzy concept that defies simple definition (p. 133)." Although many authors have attempted to assign one all-encompassing definition to this characteristic, its multifaceted nature remains elusive. Understanding this nature, both Asendorpf (1989, 1990, 1993) and Buss (1980, 1984, 1986) have presented what they believe is the nature of shyness by going further than its global, fuzzy definition and introducing several shyness subtypes that develop differently across the lifespan. These two theories exemplify the difficulties inherent in defining the concept of shyness, as they define its various subtypes in a similar manner, yet still manage to contradict one another in several key areas. The main purpose of this study, therefore, was to determine which aspects of these two theories are correct and which are not.

Both Buss (1980, 1986) and Asendorpf (1989) have suggested that fearful/temperamental shyness appears during infancy and remains very strong during the early childhood years. However, while Buss states conclusively that fears of social novelty fade during middle childhood, Asendorpf has contradicted himself on this issue. In his 1989 work, Asendorpf found that this early-appearing form of shyness was prevalent among adults. However, in a later paper (Asendorpf, 1993), he overlooks this finding and stated, like Buss, that fearful shyness abates almost entirely as children approach adolescence.

According to the present study, both of these views are supported. Overall, a decline in the mention of this form of shyness was found as grade level increased. In addition, however, the oldest children sampled also described Type 1 shyness as characteristic of their shy peers. Unfortunately, the sample in this study included only children under the age of 14 years. Therefore, it was impossible to determine the extent of the decline of the incidence of fearful shyness (or of its concept) among older samples. It was also not possible to discover when, or if, this decline levels off to a constant rate among adults. Due to the mixed theoretical support provided by these findings, future researchers need to ask adolescents and adults about the incidence of Type 1 shyness among their peers in order to address these issues.

Buss (1984) and Asendorpf (1990) agree that self-conscious, or Type 2, shyness appears among children after they have reached 8 years of age and markedly increases in occurrence among older children. According to the present study, these authors are correct. As shown earlier, however, the concept of this form of shyness is not discussed in detail among many children until between the third and fifth grade levels, or at

approximately 9 to 10 years of age. Since the development of a concept or schema typically occurs during the same developmental period as the shyness type itself, it is surprising that a conceptual delay occurred for this shyness type, which is, according to Buss and Asendorpf, theorized to develop at approximately 6 to 7 years of age. This delay makes sense, however, when it is considered that few children are likely to describe this form of shyness until after their social-cognitive abilities are well developed. As stated previously, significant changes in this development do not occur among many children until after 8 years of age.

Neither of these theorists considered the third form of shyness, namely shyness due to fears of negative evaluation, to be a separate entity from the other two shyness types. Indeed, Buss (1986) has suggested that social-evaluative shyness is conceptually similar to fearful shyness, while Asendorpf (1990) refutes this view, believing that social-evaluative and self-conscious shyness are one and the same. This theoretically important issue was addressed by the present study, which suggested there is sufficient evidence to argue for the independence of this concept from that of Type 1 shyness and an only very limited overlap with that of self-conscious shyness. Therefore, the development of this form of shyness was considered independently.

Despite their disagreement regarding the classification of Type 3 shyness, both Buss and Asendorpf have agreed that this third form develops similarly to self-conscious shyness over the childhood years. Buss (1986) has suggested that young children are unable to experience fears of negative evaluation. Asendorpf (1990) agrees with this view, and has found that the prevalence of this shyness type increases among children as

they approach adolescence. Somewhat encouragingly, the results of this study indicate that there is indeed a very sharp grade-related incline in the mention of the Type 3 shyness concept. Since surprisingly large numbers of the youngest children sampled described fears of critical evaluation as being typical of their shy peers, it is likely that the concept for this form of shyness appears earlier in development than the actual shyness type itself, as proposed by Asendorpf (1989; 1990) and Buss (1986). The combination of this finding and that of similar research concerning the development of children's concepts of others' characteristics (Harris et al., 1987; Zimbardo & Radl, 1982), which indicates that young children are able to describe these characteristics as early as four years of age, suggests that social-cognitive researchers may have underestimated the level of cognitive maturity of very young children. It would be interesting, therefore, to explore this area further by asking more young children to infer the internal states of others in order to lend support to, or refute, this somewhat controversial finding.

Over the course of the years, neither Buss nor Asendorpf addressed whether there are any differences between males and females in the development of the above-mentioned shyness type concepts. In the present study, no gender differences were found in children's mean level of description of either fearful/temperamental or self-conscious shyness provided. The lack of an observed difference between boys and girls in their scores for of self-conscious shyness was unexpected in light of past research that suggests that such related entities as self-consciousness and the imaginary audience are typically more prevalent among girls (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Rosenberg, 1985). Though it was assumed that this discrepancy is due to the definition of self-conscious shyness used in this

study, further research should address whether this observed gender difference is fact or artifact.

The hypothesized difference between the genders in the level of development of their descriptions of social-evaluative shyness was borne out by the present research. Not surprisingly, girls were significantly more likely than boys to mention this shyness type during their interview. This finding was expected, as past research has shown that girls are typically more preoccupied with their impact on others and more likely to experience feelings of self-consciousness than boys (Elkind & Bowen, 1979; Gray & Hudson, 1984). However, as this finding is new and is not supported by any directly-related research, it is hoped that replication studies will be undertaken in order to determine its validity.

An analysis of such depth into the concept of shyness and of its subtypes is warranted in order to identify what the nature of shyness is and whether shy children experience difficulties as a result of this trait. By far the most clinically practical finding of the present study was that those who did believe that shyness is problematic were also more likely to describe social-evaluative fears as typical of their shy peers than they were to describe the other two shyness types. It is critical to note, however, that most of the children sampled did not consider shyness overall to be a problem. As a result, it can be argued that conclusive statements about the negative outcomes associated with this characteristic can be made only when shyness as a global concept is broken down into more specific subtypes. Otherwise, critical information in this area may be lost due to the combination of groups of shy children who are anxious for different reasons. Therefore,

the definition of shyness in terms of subtypes appears to have merit, as does the separation of social-evaluative shyness from its fearful and self-conscious counterparts.

Limitations and Future Directions

This research was first conceived with the hope that a direct replication of the Crozier and Burnham (1990) study could be conducted. Their examination of children's understanding of Buss' fearful and self-conscious shyness subtypes was sorely needed by a field that was, and still is, mired in controversy due to its continued use of the global shyness concept.

As with the present research, the primary assumption of the Crozier and Burnham study was that a child's description of a particular form of shyness suggested that the child is being exposed at approximately the same time to incidents of that shyness type. If the shyness type is not occurring among the child's peers, he or she should, conversely, be unable to describe it for its lack of salience within the peer group. These authors used a combination of techniques to determine which form of shyness a child has produced. They asked the children in their sample what makes people shy, why they think that shy people are shy, and which of several circumstances (i.e., meeting strangers, or being conspicuous) would make the children feel more shy. Based on each child's responses to these questions, several judges determined whether the child had perceived shyness in a fearful or self-conscious way. As stated previously, Crozier and Burnham found that the number of children's references to fearful shyness remained relatively constant across age, while

their references to self-conscious shyness occurred only among children who were over 7 to 8 years of age. To date, this research has not been replicated.

In the present study, the interviews with the children were performed prior to the involvement of this researcher in the Shyness Project. Therefore, the format of these interviews had already been determined and was somewhat limiting, as the children were asked only open-ended questions that allowed them to describe shyness in any way they saw fit. Furthermore, the purpose of these interviews was not to elicit descriptions of the three shyness types, but to explore children's understanding of the shyness concept in general. Therefore, it is possible that a particular shyness type was included in a child's conception of shyness and was not mentioned during the interview due to reluctance on the child's part or was simply not drawn out by the interviewer. As a result, while the competence of the interviewer is not in question, the determination of whether the limits of each child's understanding of the shyness types were reached could not be made conclusively. In the Crozier and Burnham study, however, the open-ended method was combined with several theory-driven fixed-choice questions concerning the various shyness types. This dual approach has the advantage of being more thorough than that employed in the present research. In addition, children's responses to direct theoretical questioning (e.g. 'Does meeting strangers make you shy?') can serve as a very clear and unambiguous source of comparison information of the various shyness types across grade level and gender. This method can also serve to better test the limits of children's understanding of the more narrow focus of interest, namely the shyness subtypes, and not the general concept itself. Therefore, a replication of the present study using the three

proposed shyness types and the methods employed by Crozier and Burnham (1990) would be both useful and informative to researchers who have expressed an interest in the development of, and the relationships among, the various forms of shyness.

In the early planning stages of this project, it was hoped that the development and incidence of the shyness types, and not their concepts, could be determined using the interviews with the children as a source of information. When it was later learned that the one to one correspondence between a concept and the associated behavior is not likely to be perfect, this goal was put aside in favor of the development of the concepts of the various forms of shyness. The determination of whether the three shyness types occur behaviorally among various groups of children, however, cannot be made until information is known concerning the development of children's conception of shyness. In other words, if children are not capable of conceiving of the shyness types, they will in turn be unable to identify their peers who display the behaviors associated with these concepts within their age group. The present study has, hopefully, added some valuable insight into this issue. One of the most striking suggestions to come out of this research, for example, is that very young children appear to be in a good position to understand these concepts, despite the current conviction that this is not the case. Therefore, while many researchers have been reluctant in the past to ask children as young as 5 years of age about their shy peers, it is hoped these encouraging findings will prompt others to do so without questioning the validity of their results.

When the present study was first conceived, it was also deemed interesting to determine whether any of the various shyness types is associated with negative outcomes

and is, therefore, problematic for children. This interest was fostered by the controversy within the shyness research on this issue, particularly due to the large number of synonyms and definitions applied to the global shyness concept that only served to cloud this issue. Because several shyness subtypes were proposed by both Buss and Asendorpf to exist, it was hoped that the relationships between these more specific subtypes and problematic outcomes would be more informative to those whose interests lie in addressing intervention issues that are specific to each of these shy subpopulations. In the present study, information concerning the development of children's concepts of the three shyness subtypes was available. In addition, these same children had been asked if shyness in general was a problem at their age level. It was hoped that, by examining the interactions between these two sources of information, conclusive statements about the problematic status of the shyness types themselves could be made. However, the interviewer for the present study kept these two sections of the interviews separate from one another. She did not, therefore, ask the children about the negative consequences of each subtype directly. In order to address this clinically important issue properly, it would be much more informative to ask children directly whether each shyness type is problematic at their age level and ask them to describe in detail the negative consequences that are associated with each. The most effective methodology to answer this question, however, would be to first identify children who possess characteristics of each of the three shyness types and then to observe these children behaviorally for interpersonal difficulties within the peer group and administer to them a battery of measures of emotional and social functioning. Though these methods are time consuming, it is only by this meticulous approach that we

can determine which shy children, if any, require such intervention as self-esteem building or social skills training.

During this discussion, several important questions were raised, and yet remain unanswered by researchers to date: How do fearful, social-evaluative, and self-conscious shyness develop across the lifespan? If a child is shy in one of these ways, how likely is it that he or she is also experiencing one or both of the other types of shyness? If a shy child is fearful of strangers at an early age, what is the probability that he or she will also develop social-evaluative or self-conscious shyness later during childhood? It is also interesting to ask such related questions as: How do children with these various forms of shyness fare academically, socially, or psychologically? Furthermore, is there one shyness type that is more of a risk factor for negative outcomes than the others not only during childhood, but also later in life? If so, how do we target the fears of these children in order make their path across the course of development an easier one? Until researchers are able to cast aside their view of all shy children as simply a quiet and otherwise normal group, and are then able to address some of these issues, it is likely that the silent, "unobvious" tears of the social-evaluative shy child will remain unseen.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Wittig, B. A. (1969). Attachment and the exploratory behavior of one-year-olds in strange situations. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), Determinants of infant behavior, (Vol. 4). London: Methuen.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Arkin, R. M., Lake, L. A., & Baumgardner, A. H. (1986). Shyness and self-presentation. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 188-204). New York: Plenum Press.
- Asendorpf, J. B. (1986). Shyness in middle and late childhood. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 91-103). New York: Plenum Press.
- Asendorpf, J. B. (1989). Shyness as a final common pathway for two different kinds of inhibition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *57*, 481-492.
- Asendorpf, J. B. (1990). Development of inhibition during childhood: Evidence for situational specificity and a two-factor model. Developmental Psychology, *26*, 721-730.
- Asendorpf, J. B. (1993). Abnormal shyness in children. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, *34*, 1069-1081.
- Asendorpf, J. B., & van Aken, M. A. G. (1994). Traits and relationship status: Temperamental inhibition and test intelligence versus peer group inhibition and peer group competence as early predictors of self-esteem. Child Development, *64*.

- Asher, S. R., Hymel, S., & Renshaw, P. D. (1984). Loneliness in children. Child Development, 55, 1456-1464.
- Asher, S. R., Markel, R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Identifying children at risk in peer relations: A critique of the rate of interaction approach to assessment. Child Development, 52, 1239-1245.
- Boivin, M., Thomassin, L., & Alain, M. (1989). Peer rejection and self-perceptions among early elementary school children: Aggressive rejectees versus withdrawn rejectees. In B. H. Schneider, G. Attili, J. Nadel, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Social competence in developmental perspective (pp. 392-393). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishing.
- Briggs, S. R. (1986). Timid and withdrawn children. In J. D. O'Brien, D. J. Pilowsky, & O. W. Lewis (Eds.), Psychotherapies with children and adolescents (pp. 51-70). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Bruch, M., Giordano, S., & Pearl, L. (1986). Differences between fearful and self-conscious shy subtypes in background and current adjustment. Journal of Research and Personality, 20, 172-186.
- Bukowski, W. (1990). Age differences in children's memory of information about aggressive, socially withdrawn, and prosociable boys and girls. Child Development, 61, 1326-1334.
- Bukowski, W., Bowker, A., Zarpagour, S., & Hoza, B. (1995, April). An analysis of the structure of social isolation. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Buss, A. H. (1980). Self-consciousness and social anxiety. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Buss, A. H. (1984). A conception of shyness. In J. A. Daly and J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence and communication apprehension (pp. 39-49). Beverly Hills, CA: Plenum Press.

Buss, A. H. (1986). A theory of shyness. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 39-46). New York: Plenum Press.

Cantor, N. & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In M. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 12, pp. 3-52). New York: Academic Press.

Chandler, M. (1973). Egocentrism and antisocial behavior: The assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. Developmental Psychology, 9, 326-332.

Cheek, J. M. & Briggs, S. R. (1990). Shyness as a personality trait. In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), Shyness and embarrassment: Perspectives from social psychology (pp. 315-337). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cheek, J. M., Carpentieri, A. M., Smith, T. G., Rierdan, J., & Koff, E. (1986). Adolescent shyness. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 105-116). New York: Plenum Press.

Cheek, J. M. & Melchior, L. A. (1990). Shyness, self-esteem, and self-consciousness. In H. Leitenburg (Ed.), Handbook of social and evaluation anxiety. New York: Plenum Press.

Coie, J. D. & Dodge, K. A. (1988). Multiple sources of data on social behavior and social status in the school: A cross-age comparison. Child Development, 59, 815-829.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Coppotelli, H. A. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. Developmental Psychology, 18, 557-569.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Kupersmidt, J. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S. R. Asher and J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 17-59). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D. & Pennington, B. F. (1976). Children's perceptions of deviance and disorder. Child Development, 47, 400-413.

Cowen, E. L., Pederson, A., Babigian, H., Izzo, L. D., & Trost, M. A. (1973). Long-term follow-up of early detected vulnerable children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 438-446.

Crozier, W. R. (1981). Shyness and self-esteem. British Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 220-222.

Crozier, W. R. & Burnham, M. (1990). Age-related differences in children's understanding of shyness. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 8, 179-185.

Damon, W. (1983). Social and personality development. New York: Norton.

Elkind, D. (1967). Egocentrism in adolescence. Child Development, 38, 1025-1034.

Elkind, D. & Bowen, R. (1979). Imaginary audience behavior in children and adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 15, 38-44.

Ellis, S., Rogoff, B., & Cromer, C. C. (1981). Age segregation in children's social interactions. Developmental Psychology, 17, 399-407.

Evans, M. A. (1987). Discourse characteristics of reticent children. Applied Psycholinguistics, 8, 171-184.

Freedman, J. (1978). Happy people: What happiness is, who has it, and why. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

French, D. C. (1988). Heterogeneity of peer-rejected boys: Aggressive and non-aggressive subtypes. Child Development, 59, 976-985.

Gersten, M. (1989). Behavioral inhibition in the classroom. In S. R. Reznick (Ed.), Perspectives on behavioral inhibition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilmartin, B. G. (1987). Peer group antecedents of severe love-shyness in males. Journal of Personality, 55, 467-489.

Gottman, J. M. (1977). Toward a definition of social isolation in childhood. Child Development, 48, 513-517.

Gough, H. G. & Thorne, A. (1986). Positive, negative, and balanced shyness: Self-definitions and the reactions of others. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 205-226). New York: Plenum Press.

Gray, W. M. & Hudson, L. M. (1984). Formal operations and the imaginary audience. Developmental Psychology, 20, 619-627.

Greenwood, C. R., Todd, N. M., Hops, H., & Walker, H. M. (1982). Behavior change targets in the assessment and treatment of socially withdrawn preschool children. Behavioral Assessment, 4, 273-297.

Hall, J. & Beil-Warner, D. (1978). Assertiveness of male Anglo- and Mexican-American college students. Journal of Social Psychology, 105, 175-178.

Harris, P. L., Olthof, T., Terwogt, M. M., & Hardman, C. E. (1987). Children's knowledge of the situations that provoke emotion. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 10, 319-343.

Hartman, L. M. (1983). A metacognitive model of social anxiety: Implications for treatment. Clinical Psychology Review, 3, 435-456.

Hartup, W. W. (1978). Children and their friends. In H. McGurk (Ed.), Issues in childhood social development (pp. 130-170). London: Methuen.

Hartup, W. W. (1983). Peer relations. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of childhood psychology: Socialization, personality and social development (4th ed., Vol. 4). New York: Wiley.

Hauck, W. E., Martens, M., & Wetzel, M. (1986). Shyness, group dependence and self-concept: Attributes of the imaginary audience. Adolescence, 21, 529-534.

Hay, D. F. (1985). Learning to form relationships in infancy: Parallel attainments with parents and peers. Developmental Review, 5, 122-161.

Hirshfeld, D. R., Rosenbaum, J. F., Beiderman, J., Bolduc, E. A., Faraone, S. V., Snidman, N., Reznick, J. S., & Kagan, J. (1992). Stable behavioral inhibition and its association with anxiety disorder. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 31, 103-111.

Hymel, S. (1983). Social isolation and rejection in children: Considering the child's perspective. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Detroit, Michigan.

Hymel, S., Freigang, R., Franke, S., Booth, L., Bream, L., & Borys, S. (1983, June). Children's attributions for social situations: Variations as a function of social status and self-perception variables. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Hymel, S. & Rubin, K. H. (1985). Children with peer relationship and social skills problems: Conceptual, methodological, and developmental issues. Annals of Child Development, 2, 251-297.

Hymel, S., Rubin, K. H., Rowden, L., & LeMare, L. (1990). Children's peer relationships: Longitudinal predictions of internalizing and externalizing problems from middle to late childhood. Child Development, 61, 2004-2021.

Hymel, S., Woody, E., & Bowker, A. (1993). Social withdrawal in childhood: Considering the child's perspective. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 237-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Ichiyama, M. A., Colbert, D., Laramore, H., Hein, M., Carone, K., & Schmidt, J. (1993). Self-concealment and correlates of adjustment in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 7, 55-68.
- Izard, C. E. (1984). Emotion-cognition relationships and human development. In C. Izard, J. Kagan, & R. Zajonc (Eds.), Emotions, cognition, and behavior (pp. 17-37). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Izard, C. E. & Hyson, M. C. (1986). Shyness as a discrete emotion. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 147-160). New York: Plenum Press.
- Jahnke, H. C., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (1993). A test of two models of adolescent egocentrism. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 22, 313-326.
- Janes, C. L. & Hesselbrock, V. M. (1978). Problem children's adult adjustment predicted from teachers' ratings. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 300-309.
- Janes, C. L., Hesselbrock, V. M., Myers, D. G., & Penniman, J. H. (1979). Problem boys in young adulthood: Teachers' ratings and twelve-year follow-up. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 453-472.
- Jones, W. H., Briggs, S., & Smith, T. (1986). Shyness: Conceptualization and measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 629-639.
- Jones, W. H. & Carpenter, B. N. (1986). Shyness, social behavior, and relationships. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 227-238). New York: Plenum Press.

- Jones, W. H., Cavert, C., & Indart, M. (1983, August). Impressions of shyness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, California.
- Jones, W. H. & Russell, D. (1982). The Social Reticence Scale: An objective instrument to measure shyness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 629-631.
- Kagan, J. (1989). Temperamental contributors to social behavior. American Psychologist, 44, 688-674.
- Kagan, J., Reznick, J. S., Clarke, C., Snidman, N., & Garcial-Coll, C. (1984). Behavioral inhibition to the unfamiliar. Child Development, 55, 2212-2225.
- Kagan, J., Reznick, J. S., & Gibbons, J. (1989). Inhibited and uninhibited types of children. Child Development, 60, 838-845.
- Kagan, J., Reznick, J. S., Snidman, N., Gibbons, J., & Johnson, M. O. (1988). Childhood derivatives of inhibition and lack of inhibition toward the unfamiliar. Child Development, 59, 1580-1589.
- Kagan, J., Snidman, N., & Arcus, D. (1993). On the temperamental categories of inhibited and uninhibited children. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 19-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1980). Deviant behavior in defense of self. New York: Academic Press.

Khandelwal, P. & Mathus, V. (1987). A study of job involvement in relation to some personality factors among orthopaedically handicapped and non-handicapped bank employees. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 24, 53-57.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1990). The role of poor peer relationships in the development of later disorder. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 274-308). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ladd, G. W. (1983). Social networks of popular, average, and rejected children in school settings. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29, 283-308.

LaGreca, A. M. (1981). Peer acceptance: The correspondence between children's sociometric scores and teachers' ratings of peer interactions. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 9, 167-178.

Lamb, M. E., & Roopnarine, J. (1979). Peer influences on sex role development in preschoolers. Child Development, 50, 1219-1222.

Lambert, N. A. (1972). Intellectual and nonintellectual predictors of high school status. Journal of Scholastic Psychology, 6, 247-259.

Leary, M. (1983). The conceptual distinctions are important: Another look at communication apprehension and related constructs. Human Communication Research, 10, 305-312.

Leary, M. R. (1986). Affective and behavioral components of shyness. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 27-38). New York: Plenum Press.

Leary, M. R. & Schlenker, B. R. (1981). The social psychology of shyness: A self-presentational model. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Impression management theory and social psychological research (pp. 335-358). New York: Plenum Press.

Ledingham, J. E. (1981). Developmental patterns of aggressive and withdrawn behavior in childhood: A possible method for identifying pre-schizophrenics. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 9, 1-22.

Masten, A. S., Morrison, P., & Pellegrini, D. S. (1985). A Revised Class Play method of peer assessment. Developmental Psychology, 3, 523-533.

McGuire, W. J., & McGuire, C. V. (1982). Significant others in self-space: Sex differences and developmental trends in the social self. In J. Sirls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1978). Aggression in the schools. Bullies and whipping boys. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (1979). Stability of aggressive reaction patterns in males: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 852-875.

Olweus, D. (1993). Victimization by peers: Antecedents and long-term outcomes. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 315-341). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Overholser, J. C., & Freiheit, S. R. (1994). Assessment of interpersonal dependency using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-II (MCMI-II) and the Depressive Experiences Questionnaire. Personality and Individual Differences, 17(1), 71-78.

Parker, J. G. & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? Psychological Bulletin, 102, 111-126.

Parkhurst, J. T. & Asher, S. R. (1987, April). The social concerns of aggressive rejected children. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore.

Pekarik, E. G., Prinz, R. J., Liebert, D. E., Weintraub, S., & Neale, J. (1976). The Pupil Evaluation Inventory: A sociometric technique for assessing children's social behavior. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 4, 83-97.

Phillips, D. L. (1967). Mental health status, social participation, and happiness. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 8, 285-291.

Piaget, J. (1926/1951/1967). The language and thought of the child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. (1932). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Random House.

Pilkonis, P. A. (1977a). Shyness, public and private, and its relationship to other measures of social behavior. Journal of Personality, 45, 585-595.

Pilkonis, P. A. (1977b). The behavioral consequences of shyness. Journal of Personality, 45, 596-611.

Pilkonis, P. A. & Zimbardo, P. G. (1979). The personal and social dynamics of shyness. In C. E. Izard (Ed.), Emotions in personality and psychopathology. New York: Plenum Press.

Quay, H. C. (1986). Classification. In H. C. Quay & J. S. Werry (Eds.), Psychopathological disorders of childhood (3rd ed., pp. 1-34). New York: Wiley.

Quay, H. C. & LaGreca, A. M. (1975). Disorders of anxiety, withdrawal and dysphoria. In H. C. Quay & J. S. Werry (Eds.), Psychopathological disorders of childhood (3rd ed., pp. 73-110). New York: Wiley.

Roff, M. (1963). Childhood social interactions and young adult psychosis. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 19, 152-157.

Roff, J. D. & Wirt, R. D. (1984). Childhood aggression and social adjustment as antecedents of delinquency. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 12, 111-126.

Rosenberg, M. (1985). Self-concept and psychological well-being in adolescence. In R. L. Leahy (Ed.), The development of the self. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Ross, A. O. (1980). Psychopathological disorders of children (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rubin, K. H. (1982). Non-social play in preschoolers: Necessarily evil? Child Development, 53, 651-657.

Rubin, K. H. (1985). Socially withdrawn children: An "at risk" population? In B. H. Schneider, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood (pp. 125-139). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rubin, K. H. (1993). The Waterloo Longitudinal Project: Correlates and consequences of social withdrawal from childhood to adolescence. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 291-314). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rubin, K. H., & Asendorpf, J. B. (Eds.). (1993). Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rubin, K. H. & Coplan, R. J. (1994). Peer relationships in childhood. In M. Bornstein & M. Lamb (Eds.), Developmental Psychology: An advanced textbook (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rubin, K. H., Fein, G., & Vandenberg, B. (1983). Play. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality and social development. New York: Wiley.

Rubin, K. H., Hymel, S., Mills, R. S. L., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1991). Conceptualizing different developmental pathways to and from social isolation in childhood. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), Rochester Symposium on Developmental Psychopathology (Vol. 2, pp. 91-122). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rubin, K. H., LeMare, L., & Lollis, S. (1990). Social withdrawal in childhood: Developmental pathways to peer rejection. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 217-249). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, K. H., & Mills, R. S. L. (1988). The many faces of social isolation in childhood. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 916-924.

Ruble, D. N., Boggiana, A. K., Feldman, N. S., & Loeb, J. H. (1980). Developmental analysis of the role of social comparison in self-evaluation. Developmental Psychology, 16, 105-115.

Russell, D., Cutrona, C., & Jones, W. H. (1986). A trait-situational analysis of shyness. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 239-249). New York: Plenum Press.

Schalling, D. S. (1975). Types of anxiety and types of stressors as related to personality. In C. D. Spielberger & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), Stress and anxiety (Vol. 1, pp. 279-283). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Schmidt, L. A. & Robinson, T. N. (1992). Low self-esteem in differentiating fearful and self-conscious forms of shyness. Psychological Reports, 70, 255-257.

Shantz, C. U. (1983). Social cognition. In J. H. Flavell & E. M. Markman (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology. Cognitive development (Vol. 3, pp. 495-555). New York: Wiley.

Simmons, R. & Rosenberg, F. (1975). Sex, sex roles, and self-image. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 229-258.

Simmons, R., Rosenberg, R., & Rosenberg, M. (1973). Disturbance in the self-image at adolescence. American Sociological Review, 38, 553-568.

Sroufe, L. A. (1977). Wariness of strangers and the study of infant development. Child Development, 48, 731-746.

Staub, E. (1975). To rear a prosocial child: Reasoning, learning by doing, and learning by teaching others. In D. DePalma & J. Foley (Eds.), Moral development: Current theory and research (pp. 113-136). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Turner, S. M., Beidel, D. C., & Townsley, R. M. (1992). Social phobia: A comparison of specific and generalized subtypes and avoidant personality disorder. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101, 326-331.

Vandermolen, H. T. (1990). A definition of shyness and its implications for clinical practice. In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), Shyness and embarrassment: Perspectives from social psychology (pp. 255-285). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vosk, B., Forehand, R., Parker, J. B., & Rickard, K. (1982). A multimethod comparison of popular and unpopular children. Developmental Psychology, 18, 571-575.

Williams, G. A. & Asher, S. R. (1987, April). Peer- and self-perceptions of peer rejected children: Issues in classification and grouping. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore.

Wolpe, J. & Lang, P. J. (1964). A fear survey schedule for use in behavior therapy. Behavior Research and Therapy, 2, 27-30.

Yarrow, M. R. & Campbell, J. D. (1963). Person perception in children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 9, 57-92.

Younger, A. J. & Boyko, K. A. (1987). Aggression and withdrawal as social schemas underlying children's peer perceptions. Child Development, 58, 1094-1100.

Younger, A. J., Gentile, C., & Burgess, K. (1993). Children's perceptions of social withdrawal: Changes across age. In K. H. Rubin & J. B. Asendorpf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 215-236). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Younger, A. J. & Piccinin, A. M. (1989). Children's recall of aggressive and withdrawn behaviors: Recognition memory and likeability judgments. Child Development, 60, 580-590.

Younger, A. J., & Schneider, B. H. (1995). The Behavior-Based Scale of Children's Social Withdrawal. Unpublished report prepared at the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada.

Younger, A. J., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham J. E. (1985). Age-related differences in children's perceptions of aggression and withdrawal in their peers. Developmental Psychology, *21*, 70-75.

Younger, A. J., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1986). Age-related differences in children's perceptions of social deviance: Changes in behavior or perspective? Developmental Psychology, *22*, 531-542.

Youniss, J. (1980). Parents and peers in social development: A Sullivan-Piaget perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1977a). Shyness. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1977b). Shyness. What it is, what to do about it. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Zimbardo, P. G., & Radl, S. L. (1982). The shy child. New York: Doubleday.

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ÉCOLE DE PSYCHOLOGIE
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Phase 1: Item generation study

Dear Parents:

We are conducting research examining children's relationships with their friends. We are particularly interested in children's understanding of shyness. We would like to request permission for you child to participate in this research.

If you agree to participate, the procedure will entail an individual interview, lasting about 10 to 15 minutes and conducted at school, in which children will be asked to describe how someone who is shy or oversensitive typically behaves -- in other words, how the know the person is shy or oversensitive. This information will be later used to assist us in , Improving ways of assessing shyness in children.

Participation is completely voluntary and your child is free to withdraw from the study at any time. All interviews will be kept confidential, with only overall group averages reported. This research is in no way connected to any services provided by your child's school, although it has been approved by the school board and by the principal of your child's school. If you wish, a summary of the overall findings will be available to participants after the study is completed. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call us at 564-9262 (Dr. Younger) or 564-9259 (Dr. Schneider). Please return the attached consent form and keep this sheet for your information.

Thanks for your cooperation.

I have read the description of the study conducted by Dr. Younger and Dr. Schneider concerning children's understanding of shyness. I have discussed this with my child, and

_____ We agree to participate in this study

_____ We do not agree to participate in this study

Date: _____ Parents' signatures _____

Appendix 2

Shyness Types and Descriptions
(Adapted from the theories of Buss and Asendorpf)Type 1: Fearful/Temperamental Shyness

Behaviors/Physical Signs: escape or retreat from strangers/novel situations, seek proximity to familiar, sad facial expression, crying, shrinking back and closed body posture, gaze aversion, head down

Emotions/Thoughts: fear of strangers, worry about physical harm to self or disappearance of attachment figure

Situations: meeting strangers, novel social situations, separation from familiar person

Example (Boy, Grade 1):

Interviewer: "How can you tell that a person's shy?"

Child: "They look shy."

Interviewer: "They look shy? I need some help with this one. How does a person look shy? What do they look like? Oh, I see. Their head is down. They're kind of looking but their hands are covering up their mouths. . . How do you think they feel?" (coded as shrinking back and closed body posture: 1 example of Fearful Shyness: Behaviors).

Child: "They're scared."

Interviewer: "What are they scared of?"

Child: "They're scared 'cause they're going to take them and their mom and dad and go away somewhere else." (coded as fear: 1 example of Fearful Shyness: Emotions/Thoughts).

Interviewer: "Who's going to take them?"

Child: "Someone you don't know."

Interviewer: "Oh, so when does the shy person get that look on his face?"

Child: "When their mom and dad leave and you don't know who the people are." (coded as situational context of meeting a stranger: 1 example of Fearful Shyness: Situations).

Interviewer: OK, what are some other ways that you can tell that a person's shy?"

Type 2: Self-conscious Shyness

Behaviors/Physical Signs: blushing, fumbling, behavioral disorganization in front of others; stuttering

Emotions/Thoughts: awareness of self as social object; feel awkward; feel foolish; feel vulnerable; embarrassment; feel exposed to the scrutiny of others; wonder what they are doing to make others stare; concern that they will do something dumb or awkward in front of others as a result of the scrutiny

Situations: being at the center of attention or in public scrutiny; formal situations; being different from others; speeches (if scrutiny is the cause for the anxiety)

Example (Girl, Grade 5):

Interviewer: "How can you tell that a person's shy?"

Child: "Well, my best friend is shy."

Interviewer: "What does she do to let you know she's shy?"

Child: "Sometimes, when we have to do speeches, she talks in a really quiet voice that's so quiet that you can't hear her. And she plays with her feet while she's talking so you have to really try and then you can hear her talk. When she's done and she sits down, she's all red." (coded as 1 example of Self-conscious Shyness: Situations: while doing speeches, and 3 examples of Self-conscious Shyness: Behaviors: speaking quietly, playing with her feet (self-manipulation), and red in the face (blushing) - this child would therefore receive a score of 2 for this subcomponent).

Interviewer: "What do you mean, all red?"

Child: "Well, you know, all red in the face."

Interviewer: "Oh, I see. Now, how do you think she's feeling inside when she's giving a speech?"

Child: "Probably nervous." (coded as 1 example of Self-conscious Shyness: Emotions/Thoughts).

Interviewer: "Why do you think she's feeling that way?"

Child: "Because she thinks that she'll mess up her words in front of everybody and fail her speech. Then the teacher will get mad at her and make her do it again. (coded as 1 example of Self-conscious Shyness: Emotions/Thoughts - concern that she will make a mistake due to public scrutiny).

Interviewer: OK, how else can you tell that your friend is shy?

Type 3: Social-evaluative Shyness

Behaviors/Physical Signs: physiological arousal, as indicated by sweating, butterflies in the stomach

Emotions/Thoughts: concern that one's behavior will be evaluated negatively due to physical unattractiveness, due to lack of friendliness or of social skills; awareness of social rules and fear to break them; think will fail social test; concern about social situations; concern about future social situations and errors; nervousness; anxiety; want to play with others, but won't for fear of making social error and/or offending someone, of being teased

Situations: actual or anticipated social evaluation, speeches (if fears of negative evaluation are mentioned), first dates, breaking social rules, intrusiveness into one's psychological space, too much disclosure wanted or given during an interaction; when private act/thought is made public; talking to authority figures

Example (Boy, Grade 7):

Interviewer: "How can you tell that a person is shy?"

Child: "Because a shy person wouldn't put up their hands in class as much as other people, so they wouldn't get as much of a good mark." (coded as 1 example of Social-evaluative Shyness: Behavior - not putting up their hand - in light of the segment that follows).

Interviewer: "Do you have any ideas why the shy person wouldn't put up their hand?"

Child: "He'd probably feel shy, actually."

Interviewer: "What does feeling shy mean in that situation?"

Child: "He probably feels like: "What will people say if I get the wrong answer?" Like they would laugh or something." (coded as an interpretation of the shy child's concern about being evaluated negatively/teased by others: 1 example of Social-evaluative Shyness: Emotions/Thoughts).

Interviewer: "And when does he feel that way?"

Child: "When the teacher asks him a question in class and he doesn't want to answer because they'll laugh at him." (coded as a situational antecedent - the teacher asking a question in the classroom: 1 example of Social-evaluative Shyness: Situations) (It is important to note that the behavior and motivation in this statement have already been coded and are just being restated. Therefore, they are not coded again).

Appendix 3

Coding Form - Shyness Types

Subject Number: _____

CODING CATEGORY	0	1	2
Type 1:			
Fearful/Temperamental			
Behaviors			
Emotions/Thoughts			
Situations			
Total Type 1:			
Type 2: Self-conscious			
Behaviors			
Emotions/Thoughts			
Situations			
Total Type 2:			
Type 3: Social-evaluative			
Behaviors			
Emotions/Thoughts			
Situations			
Total Type 3:			

Appendix 4

Coding Dictionary - Shyness as a Problem

Code only one of the following categories:

- YES - The child indicates that shyness is a problem in grade X and gives reasons to support this opinion.
- The child indicates that shyness is a problem, but is unable to give concrete reasons for this opinion (e.g. "I know, but I can't say.").
 - The child says that no, shyness is not a problem, yet the reasons given clearly indicate that the child believes that it is a problem. It appears that some of the children misinterpreted the original question and just gave an answer because they were expected to do so, yet they often understand the meaning of the question when probed for reasons.
- NO - The child indicates that shyness is not a problem in grade X, and gives reasons to support this opinion.
- The child indicates that shyness is not a problem, yet is unable to provide concrete reasons for this opinion (e.g. "I know that it's not a problem, yet I can't tell you why. It just isn't.").
 - The child says that shyness is a problem, yet the reasons given clearly indicate that the child believes that it is not a problem.

All answers must be considered for placement in the Yes or No categories and must be clearly unclassifiable in these categories before they are to be considered for placement in one of the three categories below.

- YES & NO - The child mentions that shyness is and is not a problem in their answer. The answer could be qualified in terms of certain situations supporting both opinions, and may include such words as maybe or depends. It has to be apparent, however, that the child understands that both situations are possible at once, and that he/she is not simply "waffling" between the two sides of the issue. If the child seems undecided (i.e. can't make up his/her mind), the response should be included in the "Don't Know" category.

All answers must be considered for placement in the Yes and No category before being considered in one of the two categories below.

DON'T - The child says "I don't know/I'm not sure."

KNOW - The child's response is sufficiently erratic/incoherent as to exclude its classification in a more specific category.

Again, all answers must be considered for placement in either the Yes and No or Don't Know categories and must be unclassifiable in any of the four above categories before being considered for the Uncodable category. Any response that is deemed to be uncodable will be placed in the Uncodable folder for discussion with at least one additional rater. If, at this point, two raters are unable to reach a decision, the response will be considered by all four raters for its appropriate classification.

UNCODABLE

- As a rater, you are convinced that the child's response makes no sense. You are baffled as to where to place it based on its lack of clarity. It does not fit clearly into any of the above categories.
- Before this category is used, note again that a second rater will be consulted in order to provide a second opinion in the hope of being able to place it somewhere more applicable.
- If this category is applicable, state the reason for its use on the back of the coding form.

CODING RULES:

- * If a child's opinion wavers, and it is clear that they changed their mind, the final codable category (i.e. the category that their reasons support) is applicable, as though it is the child's final opinion. If the child seems unclear about the issue, the response is to be coded in the "Don't Know" category.
- * Any ambiguous responses - these interviews are to be placed in a separate folder before being coded so that at least one other rater can look at them too. These interviews will then be reviewed again by another rater. The interviews that are to be placed in this folder are those that are difficult to classify as well as those that support one opinion (e.g. yes), yet give reasons supporting the other side (e.g., no) in the same interview.

- * In some interviews, children state that shyness is not a problem now, but that it will be at a later age. Others may say that it is a problem now, but that it was not when they were younger. These situations are to be coded for the response indicating that shyness is/is not a problem now. It does not matter for this part of the coding whether it was or will become a problem.

Appendix 5

Coding Form - Is Shyness a Problem?

Subject Number: _____

Is shyness a problem? Yes _____ No _____ Yes and No _____

Don't Know _____ Uncodable _____