CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction:

The contents of this chapter illustrate the methods used to conduct this study. Introduction and purpose of the study, aim, Operational definitions of shyness, interpersonal relationship, and social conformity were offered to clarify the link between these constructs., objectives, hypotheses and variables. Inclusion and exclusion criteria along with the sample size, assessment tools and their scoring patterns, procedure used, statistics adopted and ethical considerations have been included.

3.1 Need for the study

The purpose of this study was to find out the effect of shyness on interpersonal relationships and social conformity among college students. Shyness as feelings of apprehension or lack of confidence that appear early in life can restrict an individual’s ability to develop their full potential. Although some individuals may grow out of feelings of shyness, in many individuals shyness persists into adult life and interferes in various aspects of one’s day-to-day interactions. When shy individuals become less spontaneous and show low participation in interpersonal relationships, they may have fewer friends and lower quality of life. Further continued feelings of shyness could lead to feelings of anxiety or depression. Therefore examining the nature of shyness in young college students and the role it plays in their interpersonal relationships can be useful in many ways. (career building)

Conformity is connected with adolescence and youth culture. Most of the time we are influenced by people around us and lack of such influence would exclude one from social group. Fitting into a group means adjusting to other people and to conform to atleast some of the social norms of the group. But the vital question is how and to what extent we are influenced by others. Does being in urban versus rural learning environments expect different behaviours in individuals? Does gender and medium of instruction influence on shyness, interpersonal relationships and social conformity?
This line of research can throw light on how to develop strategies and coping patterns for shy young adults who after graduating from college take on greater responsibilities and challenging roles in their life. Any coping patterns or strategies that help shy individuals to reach their full potential will only maximize their participation in interpersonal relationships that further help conform to societal norms.

3.2 Aim

To find out the effect of shyness on interpersonal relationship and social conformity among college students.

3.3 Operational definition:

**Shyness:** Shyness has been defined “as a feeling of discomfort or inhibition, awkwardness in social or interpersonal situations” (Buss, 1985). It is characterized by excessive self-focus, negative self-evaluation particularly in situations with unknown people that keeps one from reaching their goals, either in their academic or personal life (Durmuş, 2007; Pilkonis, 1977; Schölmerich, Broberg & Lamb, 2000).

**Interpersonal Relations**

Interpersonal relationship is an association between two or more people, a strong bond that may range from fleeting to enduring relationship between two or more people.

**Social Conformity**

A type of social influence involving a change in belief of behaviour to fit in with a group is conformity. Conformity involves characteristic willingness of an individual to change their behavior or a tendency to follow other’s ideas, values, behavior, and to avoid conflicts (Mehrabian, & Steffi, 1995; Santor et al, 2000; Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004).

3.4 Objectives

- To study the effect of shyness on interpersonal relations among college students
- To study the effect of shyness on social conformity among college students
To study the influence of gender and shyness on interpersonal relations and social conformity

To study the influence of area/domicile (urban and rural) and shyness on interpersonal relations and social conformity

To study the influence of medium of instruction and shyness on interpersonal relationship and social conformity.

3.5 HYPOTHESES

- Shyness negatively affects social conformity.
- Shyness negatively affects interpersonal relations.
- Male and female college students with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their interpersonal relations.
- Male and female college students with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their social conformity.
- Urban and rural college students with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their interpersonal relations and social conformity.
- Students studying in Kannada and English medium with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their interpersonal relations and social conformity.

3.6 Variables

Independent variable
- Shyness (Low, medium, high)
- Gender (male and female)
- Area (urban and rural)
- Medium of Instruction (Kannada and English)

Dependent variables
- Interpersonal relations
- Social conformity.
3.7 Sample

Participants

The participants were selected based on stratified random sampling method. The participants were 240 male and 240 female college students. Age of students ranged between 18 to 24 years. Sample size consisted of 60 males and females belonging to urban and rural areas from English and kannada medium. They were selected from 9 different colleges in Mysore, Karnataka, India. Students from the following colleges were selected for the study. They are as follows:

1. Maharani’s Science college. JLB Road, Mysore.
3. JSS College for Women. Saraswathipuram, Mysore.
4. Sri Lakshmi Hayagreeva Institute of Science, Commerce and Management, Mysore.
6. SDM College for Women. Krishnamurthypuram, Mysore.
9. Maharani’s Arts College, Mysore.

Table 3.1 showing distribution of the sample by Area and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusion criteria:

- Male and female college students aged between 18 to 24 years
- College students from both rural and urban backgrounds
- College students from English and Kannada medium of instruction.

Exclusion criteria:

- Individuals with any major physical and psychological problem
- Individuals who have been exposed to similar research
- Differently challenged Individuals.

3.8 Assessment tools

Socio-demographic Data Sheet

This semi-structured questionnaire consists of personal details like name of student, age, gender, place of birth, birth order, class, name of college, and academic achievement. It also includes parents’ qualification and their occupation, caste and religion.

Shyness Assessment Test (D’Souza, 2006).

The shyness assessment scale was developed by D’Souza (2006) of Maharaja’s College, University of Mysore. The scale consists of 54 items and asks a participant to respond by selecting Yes, or No, or cannot say. The items on the scale includes three domains of shyness- cognitive/affective, physiological and action oriented. Item analysis of the scale using SPSS program resulted in Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.735 for south Indian adolescents. Further, the scale had sufficiently high validity.

The reactions for shyness can occur at cognitive, affective, physiological and behavioural ways and it may be triggered by a variety of arousal cues (Henderson & Zimbardo, 1998).

The physiological domain: Physiological expressions of shyness include excessive perspiration, blushing, increased heart and pulse rate, dry mouth, trembling and uneasy feeling in the stomach.
The cognitive domain: At the cognitive domain, manifestations of shyness may include, fear of negative evaluation and rejection, self-consciousness, worry and rumination and self-blaming attributions.

The affective domain: Affective symptoms of shyness may include feelings of self-consciousness, embarrassment, insecurity and feelings of inferiority.

Behavioural component: It may include reticence, speech dysfluencies, passivity, reduced eye contact, maintaining physical distance, lack of appropriate responses and avoidance of situations.

Scoring: Responses were scored as 2 for ‘Yes’, 1 for ‘don’t know’, and ‘0’ for No. Depending on the scores the subjects were classified into three levels of shyness—High, Medium, Low. The scores for all the statements were cumulated and if the subject scored 80 and above he/she was considered as having high levels of shyness.

Shyness Assessment Test (SAT) was developed and tested exclusively on Indian adolescents by D’Souza (2006) by considering on the above points. The reliability index ascertained by split half (odd-even) method and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the scale as a whole were found to be 0.735 and 0.812 respectively. The reliability indices of the 3 domains were also calculated by split half method, which are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cognitive/Affective Domain</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physiological Domain</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Action-oriented domain</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 showing reliability index and internal consistency for shyness scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Cognitive/Affective</th>
<th>Physiological</th>
<th>Action-oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive/Affective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action-oriented</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the obtained interrelations were found to be significant at the one percent level (0.1).
The Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation Scale- Behaviour. (FIRO-B)

FIRO-B is a questionnaire designed by Will Schutz, formerly of Stanford University, distributed by consulting psychologists Press of Palo Alto, California. He designed the FIRO-B scale in 1958 which was revised with many significant changes and expansions periodically (Schutz, 1992, 1994, Thompson and Schutz, 2000).

A person’s self perception of how they characteristically relate to other people is one of the measures in FIRO-B.

The FIRO-B scale created by William Schutz has three categories: inclusion, control, and affection. There are two manifestations of each of these need areas: expressed and wanted. The scale also measures overall needs (e.g., total expressed and total wanted scores). Respondents received a numerical score as well as a category and provides an overall interpersonal score (Low, Medium, or high) for each measure.

**Inclusion needs**

Schutz defines inclusion as the “need to maintain a satisfactory relationship with respect to interaction and association”. The inclusion dimension on the scale assesses the degree to which a person likes to be part of a group versus the degree to which a person wants to be left alone. Expressed inclusion is how much a person wants to join a group or how much a person wants to include others. While wanted inclusion is how much a person wants others to ask her/him to be included.

**Control needs**

The interpersonal need for control is defined by Schutz (1958) “as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to influence and power”. The control dimension measures the degree to which a person wants to exert power and influence in relationships versus the degree to which a person wants independence. Expressed control is how much a person wants to take charge and exert control and provide direction and structure to other people. Whereas, wanted control is how much a person wants others to provide that direction and structure for him.
**Affection needs**

The interpersonal need for affection is defined by Schutz “as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to love and affection". The affection dimension assesses the degree to which a person wants to form close relationships versus the degree to which a person feels overcommitted or smothered. Expressed affection is how much a person wants to initiate a closeness or bond with others. While Wanted affection taps into how much a person wants others to show affection toward him.

In summary, inclusion in the Firo model is concerned primarily with the formation of the relation, while control and affection are concerned with relations already formed.

This is a 54 item questionnaire. 24 questions are completed on a 6 point scale (from 1- most people to 6- nobody) where respondents compare their behavioural preferences and patterns with other people. The remaining questions are completed on a 6 point scale (from 1- Usually to 6-Never) which describes usual or typical patterns of behaviour.

This measure leads to six scores, expressed inclusion behavior (eI), wanted inclusion behavior (wI), expressed control behavior (eC), wanted control behavior (wC), expressed affection behavior (eA), and wanted affection behavior (wA). (Schutz, 1966).

For each of the six subscales a respondent is assigned a scale score equal to the number of items accepted. This score can range from 0 to 9. Each participantís total FIRO-B result is 27 given as a set of six numbers, ranging from 0 to 9, presented in the order eI, wI, eC, wC, eA, and wA (Schutz, 1966).

**Scoring**

The subject gets score of 1 when his/her answer corresponds to the alternatives given against each item serial number in the scoring key. The highest possible score obtainable on any scale is 9. Each variable has 2 scores, symbolized by the letters ‘e’ score represents the person’s ‘expressed’ or manifest behavior in the areas of Inclusion, Control, and Affection.
In addition, there are total scores for each of the three dimensions; total inclusion (It), total control (Ct) and total affection (At). There is also a total expressed behavior score (Te), a total wanted behavior score (Tw), and an overall total-total score combining both wanted and expressed scores (Tt).

The ‘w’ scores represent the person’s ‘Wanted’ behavior. These scores refer to what the person wants from other people in the areas of Inclusion, Control, and Affection. Wanted behavior is less directly observable and is valuable in understanding and predicting the person’s behavior.

Total expressed behavior (eI+eC+eA) indicates how often you take the initiative in approaching others to fulfill the three basic interpersonal needs. In general, it shows how comfortable you are being proactive.

Total wanted behaviour (wI+ wC+ wA) indicates how much you rely on others to get what you need. In general, it shows how comfortable you are being reactive or responsive.

Total need results reflect the overall strength of each need, or how much you seek to satisfy each of these needs in interpersonal situations.

Table 3.3 The following table is a common arrangement for FIRO-B scores and illustrates abbreviations used with the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRO-B</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed</td>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Ae</td>
<td>Te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted</td>
<td>Iw</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>Aw</td>
<td>Tw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>It</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>Tt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The current norm sample for the Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation scale- Behaviour instrument includes a U.S. national sample of 3,091 individuals who took the assessment in 1997 (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). In
examining the internal consistency reliability of each measure for the national sample, results indicate that reliability coefficients for all measures are satisfactory, ranging from .85 to .96. Test-retest reliability coefficients also demonstrate good reliability ranging from .71 to .85 for three different samples reported in the FIRO-B® Technical Guide (Hammer & Schnell, 2000).

Social conformity

Social conformity scale (Mehrabian & Steffi, 1995)

The social conformity scale was developed by Mehrabian and Steffi, (1995). The scale consists of seven positively worded items and four negatively worded items. Participants are to indicate on a 9 point scale to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement (-4 = strongly disagree, +4 strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha for the total scale is .77.

Scoring

Total conformity scores is calculated by subtracting the sum of negatively worded items from the positively worded items, and calculating average by dividing total score from number of items that is 11. Higher scores indicate a greater tendency to conform.

3.9. Procedure

College students aged between 18 to 24 years willing to participate in the research were administered scales of shyness, social conformity and interpersonal relations. Inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria was also considered. In the beginning rapport was established with the participants. They were given socio demographic sheets to be filled in by them. All participants received the same descriptions of the study and were told that all responses provided would be both confidential and anonymous.

This study was conducted in two sessions:
Session 1

In the first session Shyness scale was given to subjects after establishing rapport with them. Participants were requested to read each item carefully and choose one of the three possible responses (yes, no and cannot say) to show how much each statement is true about how they feel or do in the described situations. Participants were given assurance that all their information will be kept confidential.

Social conformity scale was given to participants and instructed them to indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the statement on a 9 point scale. Participants were asked to describe oneself the way they actually in most situations and not the way one would hope be. The nine point scale was categorised as +4= Very strong agreement, +3= strong agreement,+2= moderate agreement.+1=Slight agreement.0= neither agreement nor agreement.-1= Slight disagreement.-2= moderate disagreement..-3= strong disagreement.-4= very strong agreement.

Session 2

Participants were given FIRO-B questionnaire. Instructions were given to participants to indicate their answers by underlining one of the six alternatives. There is similarity between items. However, each item is different, so they were asked to answer each one without regard to the others or without trying to be consistent. They were told not to leave any questions unanswered.

3.10 Data Analysis

The data was obtained by adopting the scoring system recommended by the respective authors and Analysis of the data was done by using following statistical methods.

1. Descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, mean and S.D were employed to understand the adolescent's level of Shyness, Interpersonal relationships and Social conformity in general.

2. **Contingency Coefficient** analysis was used to find out the association between levels of shyness and Social conformity.
3. **ANOVA**: One way ANOVA was applied to verify the significance of difference between respondents in different shyness levels and interpersonal relationships.

4. Two way ANOVA was employed to find out the interaction effect between shyness levels and one of the demographic variables (area, gender and medium of instruction) with the selected dependent variables-social conformity and interpersonal relationships.

**Table 3.4 showing statistical method used to test each hypothesis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis /Sl.No</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Statistical Test applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shyness negatively affects social conformity</td>
<td>Contingency Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shyness negatively affects interpersonal relations</td>
<td>One way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male and female college students with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their interpersonal relations.</td>
<td>Two –way ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male and female college students with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their social conformity.</td>
<td>Contingency Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban and rural college students with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their interpersonal relations and social conformity.</td>
<td>Two –way ANOVA and Contingency Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students studying in Kannada and English medium with different levels of shyness differ significantly in their interpersonal relations and social conformity.</td>
<td>Two –way ANOVA and Contingency Coefficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 Ethical considerations

Individuals identified with high level of shyness, showing low social conformity and difficulty in interpersonal relations will be guided to seek help from professionals.

3.12 Summary

The methodology that has been adopted includes purpose of study, operational definitions, objectives and hypotheses. The sample size and procedure that was used to administer the test, scoring pattern for each test, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the statistical measures that have been used to assess the data were also included. Even ethical consideration were taken into account.