

Shyness and Personal Space between Working and Home Making Women in Context of Sex-role Orientation

Dr. Pragya Kumari

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted on 60 working and 60 home making women equal in respect of androgyny & sex-typed, respectively. The purpose was to examine the impact of working status and sex role orientation on shyness and personal space amongst working and non-working women. Further, it was intended to examine the relationship among shyness, sex role orientation and personal space. Shyness and sex role orientations, were measured using Akhtar's Shyness Scale and Sinha's Masculinity Femininity Check List respectively. The personal space was measured experimentally. The obtained data were analysed using chi-square and r-test respectively. The results reveal that working women, and androgynous women were found more shy than their counterparts. Further, groups of working women as well as androgynous women maintained smaller personal space. Shyness, androgyny and personal space were found significantly correlated. Thus, it was concluded that shyness and personal space both are function of working status and sex-role orientation.

Introduction:

The study under reference embodies several component namely shyness, androgyny and mental health which need elaboration. Shyness is a universal phenomenon that spreads across the length and breadth of human nature. Zimbardo (1977) in his 'Stanford Shyness Survey' has rightly observed that over 80 per cent of all the people are shy at some point of their life. Shyness generates a number of negative emotional correlates and makes it difficult for one to be assertive in expressing opinions and convictions. It is manifested through various behavioural patterns. Silence, blushing, embarrassment, self-consciousness etc. are some of the important manifestations of shyness. Androgyny refers to traits having high on both masculinity and femininity and the difference between the two is minimum.

One vital component of the present study is personal space which needs elaboration. Personal

Space is concerned with the subjective manner of stimulating and maintaining comfortable physical distance to relevant other people in personal and social life. It is the area in which individual human actively maintains ground himself, into which others cannot intrude without arousing discomfort. According to Myers (1983) it is the buffer zone we like to maintain around our bodies.

Several studies indicate that shyness compels most people to face difficulties in different walks of life. Zimbardo (1977) found 80% of people are shy. Pilkonis and Zimbardo (1979) found that 52% females and 46% males are shy in India. Anonymous (2000) found that 13% of total population were found walk drawing themselves from daily life experience due to shyness. Carducci and Zimbardo (1995) found 40–50% of American college students as shy. Further, many study reveal that shy people do not participate in verbal

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Psychology, H.D. Jain College, V.K.S.U., Ara

interaction regularly and exhibit poor communication. Zimbardo et al. (1974) reported that Indian females are more shy than males. Akhtar (1986) found female more shy than males. Akhtar and Krishna (2000) found a significant negative correlation of age with Shyness. Moreover, there are also same studies relating to shyness (D'Sauza et al., 2003, Evam's 1993, Pilkonis and Zimbardo 1979, Rupam, 2000, Schroeder, 1995, Sreasha et al., 2007.

Thus we see that there are a dearth studies relating to shyness and other variables. It is further clear that there is no study relating to the variation namely androgynity, emotional adjustment and personal space with shyness. It is likely that there is a definite link of these variables with shyness. It is expected that androgynous people would less shy than sex-typed people. Further, shy respondents is likely to maintain smaller personal space. So, the present study is an attempt to examine the association of shyness with androgynity and personal space. Hence, the conduction of study seems justified and warranted.

Objectives:

- (i) to compare working and non-working women in terms of shyness.
- (ii) to compare androgynous and sex typed women in terms of shyness.
- (iii) to compare working and non-working women in terms of personal space.
- (iv) to compare androgynous and sex typed women in terms of personal space.
- (v) to examine the relationship among shyness, androgynity and personal space.

Method of Study:

Sample: The sample comprised of 120 working and home making women equal in respect of working home making status, androgynity-sex-

typed respectively. In respect, other than the required condition, they were matched so far as practicable.

Tools Used:

- (i) A PDS was used to seek the necessary information about the respondents.
- (ii) Sinha's Masculinity Femininity Check-List was used to measure sex role orientation among working non-working women. Androgynous and sex-typed women were identified using this checklist.
- (iii) Akhtar's shyness scale was used to measure mental health of the respondents.

Procedures

Masculinity femininity Check-List, along with PDS were employed on 100 working and 100 non-working women of Patna. Working women were selected from among different organisations of Patna. Non-working women were house wives. The scoring was made as per manual. 60 working and 60 non-working women were selected in such a way that they were belonging equally to androgynous and sex-typed group. After that the selected respondents were administered Shyness Scale. The obtained score were analysed using chi square test and r-test respectively.

Experimental Measure of Personal Space :

The respondents were called in one by one in room meant for experimental measurement of personal space. The respondents were asked to take a comfortable space. The experimenter interacted with him for 10 to 15 minutes. Thereafter, the subjects were allowed to go outside. The experimenter measure the distance of the subject from him which is the experimental measure of PS. In this way PS of each subject was measured.

Results and Interpretations

Table-1

Chi-square showing the significance of the difference between working and home making women in terms of shyness.

Variables	Groups	N	Shyness (%)		c ²	df	P
			High	Low			
Working-status	Working	60	71%	29%	29.17	1	<.01
	Home making	60	33%	67%			

The results displayed by table 01 clearly reveal the impact of working non-working status on women's shyness. 71% of working and only 33% home making women belong to high shyness groups. On the other hand only 29% of working and more them 67% home making status of women belong to low shyness group. The chi-square showing the significance of differences among the percentages were found significant (c² = 29.17; df = 1; P<.01). The findings might be interpreted on the ground that working women have to play multiple roles as compared to non-working women counterparts leading to have more anxiety, stress, depression leading to more shyness. (De Rots, 1996; De Souza and Urs 2001, Schimatt and Nathoo, 1995).

Table-2

Chi-square showing the significance of the difference among the percentages of androgynous, sex-typed women in terms of shyness.

Variables	Groups	N	Shyness (%)		c ²	df	P
			High	Low			
Sex-role Orientation	Androgynous	60	73%	27%	33.95	1	<.01
	Sex Typed	60	32%	68%			

The results displayed by table-02 clearly reveal that 73% of androgynous female group and only 32% of sex typed group of women manifested higher degree of shyness. On the other hand only 27% of androgynous women and more than 68% of sex-typed women manifested low shyness. The chi-square was found significant (c²=33.95; df=1; P<.01). The finding might be interpreted on the ground that androgynous people have high ambition. Their need structure dimension are very high as compared to their sex-types women counterpart. High desire for achievement leads higher degree of anxiety, stress, frustration and thereby higher degree of shyness.

Table-3

Chi-square showing the significance of the difference among the percentages of working and home making women in respect of personal space.

Variables	Groups	N	Personal Space (%)		c ²	df	P
			Larger	Smaller			
Working Status	Working	60	30%	70%	30.73	1	<.01
	Home maing	60	69%	31%			

The result revealed by table-03 clearly showed the significant impact of working status women on maintenance of their personal space. More than 70% of working women and only 31% of home making women were found maintaining smaller personal space. On the other hand more than 69% of home making and only 29% of working women maintained larger personal space. The chi-square was found significant ($\chi^2=30.73$; $df=1$; $P<.01$). This finding might be interpreted on the ground that working status of women is characterized by higher degree of confidence, ego-strength leading to have better and frequent interaction action with surrounding people to have maintenance of smaller personal space contrary to it non-working status is often characterised by lack of self confidence as a result the group of people belonging to this group are completed to maintain larger personal space. The findings are supported by the findings Kumar (2008).

Table-4

Chi-square showing the significance of the difference among the percentages of androgynous, sex-typed women in terms of personal space.

Variables	Groups	N	Personal Space		χ^2	df	P
			Smaller	Larger			
Sex-role Orientation	Androgynous	60	71%	29%	29.17	1	<.01
	Sex Typed	60	33%	67%			

The results displayed by table-0.04 clearly revealed that androgyny is a function of maintaining smaller personal space. It is obvious from the results table that more than 71% of androgynous women group and only 33% of sex-types women group maintain smaller personal space. On the other hand more than 67% of sex-typed group and only 29% of androgynous group maintain larger personal space. The chi-square was found significant ($\chi^2= 29.17$; $df=1$; $P<.01$). Thus hypothesis no.(1) is retained the findings might be interpreted on the ground that androgyny leads higher degree of self-concept, self-disclosure, more confidence leading to have quick and rapid interaction thereby to have maintenance of smaller personal space. The findings, again, get support from Kumar's finding (2003).

Table - 5

Correlational Matrixes Showing Correlation among shyness, sex-role orientation and personal space.

Variables	N	r	df	P
Shyness Vs Androgyny	120	0.492	118	<.01
Shyness Vs Personal Space	120	0.488	118	<.01
Androgyny Vs Personal Space	120	-0.483	118	<.01

The results displayed by table-05 clearly revealed the significant correlation between shyness vs androgyny ($r = 0.492$; $df = 118$; $P<.01$), between shyness Vs Personal Space ($r = 0.488$; $df = 118$; $P<.01$) and between androgyny vs personal space ($r = -0.483$; $df = 118$; $P<.01$). These findings are consistent with the findings of tables 01, 02, 03 and 04 respectively.

Conclusion:

- (1) working status as well as androgyny both are conducive to shyness as well as personal space.
- (2) Working status, shyness and personal space are significantly correlated.

References:

1. Anonymous (2000). Shy no more : New treatment for social phobia. *Health and Nutrition*, 12, (4), 92-95.
2. Akhtar, T. (1986). Shyness : A socio-psychological analysis. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Bodh-Gaya, Magadh University.
3. Akhtar, T. & Krishna, K.P. (2000). Some background variables of shyness among college youth *Behaviourometric*, 17, 1, 34-39.
4. Carducci, B.J. (2009). *The Psychology of Personalit: Viewpoints, research and application* (2nd ed.) Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell
5. Carducci, B.J. & Zimbardo. P.G. (1995). Are you shy? *Psychology Today*. 34-41, 64.
6. Chaplin, J.P. (1975)-*Dictionary of Psychology*, New York.
7. De-Roiste, A. (1996). Sources of worry and happiness in Ireland. *Irish Journal of Psychology*. 17, 193-212.
8. D'Souza, L., Urs. G.B. (2001). Effect of Shyness on the adjustment of high school students *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 16. 3-4, 85-94.
9. D'Souza, L., URs. G.B. & Ramaswamy C. 2003. Relationship of self-esttem with shyness. *personality and academic achievement of Social Sciences*, 1, 228-234.
10. Evans, M.A. (1993). *Communicatives competence as a dimension* (Eds.), *Social withdrawl, inhibition and syness in childhood* (pp. 189-213). Hillside, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum.
11. Pilkonis, P.P. & 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.
12. Peter, S. and Nicky, H. (1991) : *A student's Dictionary of Psychology*, University Book Stall, New Delhi.
13. Reber, A.S. Allen R. and Reber, E. (2009) : *The Dictionary of Psychology*. Published by the Penguin Group, 27 Wright Lane, London.
14. Rupam, (2000). Some personal and familial antecedents of shyness. *Behaviorometric*. vol. 17, No. 1. 46-51.
15. Schroeder. J.E. (1995). Self-concept, social anxiety, and interpersonal perception skills. *Personality and Individual-Differences*. 19, 955-958.

