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following failure and more external attributions following successful social situations (self-blaming biases hypothesis). They attributed affiliation outcomes to luck, to social context, and to external causes. In contrast, low social anxiety individuals assumed more personal responsibility for favorable social outcomes and externalized the cause of their social failure (self-serving biases hypothesis). A social outcome x internality interaction was found for psychological consequences. Internal perceptions of causality were associated with differential affective reactions.

The stability x social outcome interaction for expectancy for future success indicated that stable attributions were associated with high expectancies following success in low social anxiety subjects but were associated with low expectancies in high social anxiety individuals. Contrary to Weiner’s attributional model, people in social situations perceived social context and social ability as unstable attributions. Effort was the more salient ascription in successful social situations, whereas lack of ability attributions for social failures minimized positive psychological consequences. The discussion of these results focused upon the self-blaming biases hypothesis and implications for treatment of social anxiety.
Sabogal, Fabio, *Psychological Consequences of Causal Attributions of Social Success and Failure: An Analysis in Terms of Social Anxiety*. Doctor of Philosophy (Experimental Psychology), December, 1983, 93 pp., 12 tables, 3 figures, references, 60 titles.

This study attempted to extend the concept of achievement motivation, as proposed by Weiner's attributional model, to social affiliative contexts. It was proposed that low social anxiety individuals behave like high achievement motivation individuals who make more self-attributions for success, but more external attributions for failure, whereas high social anxiety individuals take more personal responsibility for failure social outcomes, but make more external attributions when successful.

Subjects were 243 undergraduate students, 143 females and 100 males. They completed the Leary Social Anxiety Scale, the Lefcourt Affiliation Locus of Control Scale, the Fenigstein Social Anxiety Scale, the Social Attribution Scale, and the Russell Causal Dimension Scale.

The results supported the hypothesis that individuals with different degrees of social anxiety have different levels of self-esteem, self-reward, affective reactions, and expectancies for future success. As anticipated, high social anxiety individuals tended to make more internal attributions
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Attribution theory is concerned with the causes of observed behavior as perceived by the "man in the street." The "naive psychology," as it is called by the father of attribution theory, Fritz Heider, is a process in which the layman, in an attempt to understand himself and his environment, infers the causes of one's own behavior (self-perception), and the causes of another's behaviors (other-perception).

Attribution theory has focused on the antecedents and consequences affecting the perceived causes of observed behaviors. That is, attribution theory is concerned with the systematic rules that people in everyday life use to infer causes of their behavior in social contexts and with the important consequences that those inferences have for future behaviors. Thus, information, beliefs, and motivation are antecedent factors that affect the attributional process and consequently influence subsequent behaviors, feelings, and expectancies. Within this context, attribution theory has attempted to answer three basic questions: (1) What are the antecedents of causal attributions? (2) What are the
contents and the dimensions of the attributions? and (3) What are the consequences of the attributions? (Frieze & Bar-Tal, 1979; Jones, Kanouse, Kelley, Nisbett, Valins & Weiner, 1971).

Weiner's attributional model for success and failure.

Weiner's model of motivation is based upon perceived attributions of causality for success and failure especially in achievement-related contexts. Thus, attributions that a person makes have motivational consequences and affect future performance (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rest, & Rosenbaum, 1971; Weiner, 1979).

Future expectancies of success and failure are based on the perceived causal dimensions of past experiences that differentially affect the degree of motivation and performance. For example, individuals high in resultant achievement motivation assume more personal responsibility (internal cause) for success, produce more self-attributions (perceived causes of success attributed to themselves), persist more in the face of failure outcomes, increase self-reward for success, select tasks of moderate difficulty which yield the greatest self-evaluative feedback, and perform with great intensity (Weiner & Kulka, 1970; Weiner et al., 1971). Thus, achievement motivation is a cognitive disposition that plays an important role in the determination of outcomes and, consequently, influences affective reactions. In brief, the achievement motive is a "capacity for perceiving success as caused by internal factors" (Weiner et al., 1971).
This study attempts to extend the concept of achievement motivation, as proposed by Weiner's model, to social affiliative contexts. It is proposed that low anxiety people in social situations behave like high achievement motivation individuals, assuming more self-attributions for success, making more internal and stable attributions, increasing self-reward and self-esteem, and increasing their expectancies for future success. Thus, although the psychological literature has considered the fields of achievement motivation and social behavior as two different areas, it was expected that this study would provide evidence that attributions in a social context function much as they do in an achievement context, and that their causal ascriptions have important psychological consequences.

In order to describe the proposed similarity between achievement motivation in academic contexts and in social situations, it is necessary to identify the dimensions of causality (taxonomy of causes) underlying the perceived variables associated with success and failure, and their behavioral consequences. In an attempt to create a classification of variables to understand the perceived causal dimensions, Weiner (1979) proposed a group of dimensions of causality that people use to explain success and failure. In a reformulation of his initial theory (Weiner & Kukla, 1970; Weiner et al., 1971), Weiner (1979) identified three major causal dimensions: internality, stability, and controllability.
1. Internality. Heider (1958) identified an internal-external dimension of causality and distinguished between "factors within the person" and "factors within the environment." In the same way, Rotter (1966) distinguished between outcomes that are perceived as dependent on one's responses (internal) and outcomes that are produced by other sources independent of one's responses (external). Rotter's one dimensional classification of causality located causes inside (internal) or outside (external) the individual. Thus, locus of control is defined as a generalized expectancy, that outcomes are dependent on or independent of a person's responses across different situations. Internal control refers to people's perceptions that events are under their personal control and that responses are correlated with outcomes. Within this context, Lefcourt (1966) reported that internal-external control of reinforcement is an expectancy variable which predicts social behaviors, achievement, and learning performance.

Internal-external perception of causality has been consistently reported (Weimer & Kelly, 1982). For example, working with this dimension, Weiner et al. (1971) found that success is more likely to be attributed to internal causes while failure is usually ascribed to external sources. Thus, attributions to effort or ability are reported more frequently than attributions to luck or task characteristics when people evaluate successful outcomes. On the other hand, attributions to the difficulty of a task are more likely when
people evaluate failure outcomes.

Internal-external attributions of causality are more closely associated with affective responses than with the stability factor. Weiner et al. (1971) found that the quantity and quality of affective behaviors are a function of personal responsibility. Internal attributions of successful outcomes produce more affective reactions and self-reward than do external attributions.

The tendency to accept more personal responsibility for success than for failure, or the inclination to attribute success to internal causes and to attribute failure to external causes, has been called "self-serving" biases in the attribution process (Miller, 1978; Miller & Ross, 1975; Bradley, 1978). Labels such as "ego-defensive", "ego-biased", or "ego-protected" attribution have been used to point out that particular attributions may serve to protect or enhance the person's self-esteem.

To date the postulate that the "self-serving" biases in the attributional process operate only in low anxiety people, who are more likely to make self-attributions for positive success than for failure, but do not operate in high anxiety people, who are more likely to make self-attributions for negative outcomes than for good outcomes, has not been tested. Five studies have indirectly examined the links between social anxiety and the internality causal dimension in college students. Girodo, Dotzenroth, and Stein (1981) pointed out that while high social self-esteem students made
internal attributions for past social successes and external ones for past social failures in heterosexual interactions, that pattern was not found in low social self-esteem students. Similarly, people high in public self consciousness, who were aware of themselves as social objects and who exhibited social anxiety, accepted more personal responsibility when they were rejected by a peer group, than did people low in public self consciousness (Fenigstein, 1974). Low self-esteem people, who frequently exhibit social anxiety, attributed loneliness and its depressive affect to internal causes (self-blaming), whereas high self-esteem people attributed loneliness to external (self-exoneration) factors (Peplau, Russell, & Heim, 1980). Similarly, Horowitz, French, and Anderson (1982) found that lonely people, like depressed subjects, ascribed interpersonal failures to their lack of ability (social ineptness), whereas nonlonely people in these conditions made attributions based on temporary conditions such as "strategy" or mood. In brief, as Zimbardo (1980, p. 54) suggested "shy people blame themselves" (e.g., "I am reacting negatively because I am shy, it's something I am, something I carry around wherever I go"); "the non-shy blame the situation" (e.g., "Who likes to make public speeches or go on blind dates? They're a drag").

The previous studies linking social anxiety and the internality causal dimension are consistent with the literature review reported by Archer (1979) in which locus of control was associated with trait anxiety and test anxiety.
The greater the externality, the higher the level of general trait anxiety. Both externality and anxiety were found to be positively related to psychopathology (Archer, 1980). Also, the previous studies are consistent with Lefcourt, Von Baeyer, Ware, and Cox (1979) and Lefcourt et al. (1980) who pointed out that affiliation locus of control (internality) predicts self-disclosure, listening skills in a dyadic interaction, ability to converse and to share ideas with others, and confidence during social interactions. In addition, locus of control was related to recalled early life events (undesirable events during the preschool years are more likely to be associated with externality).

2. Stability-Unstability. Originally, Heider (1958) pointed out the importance of the enduring versus transient factor. Later Weiner et al. (1971) and Weiner (1979) labeled this factor "stability" to refer to the "temporal nature of a cause." Thus, perceived causes can be relatively permanent, invariant, durable, or fixed (e.g., ability, family) or can be relatively transitory, variant, or unstable (e.g., luck, attention, effort, or mood).

Fixed versus variable factors are related to level of expectancies. Weiner et al. (1971) pointed out that if past behavior to a certain outcome was attributed to fixed variables, there should be fewer expectancy changes than if attributions were associated with variable factors. Thus, ascriptions to unstable elements (effort and luck) signify that future outcomes may differ from the prior
outcome...attributions to stable factors (ability and task difficulty) indicate that conditions are not perceived as changeable. Thus, the past and the future are anticipated to be the same (Weiner, 1974, p. 103-104).

In brief, the stability of the perceived cause determines the degree of expectancy for future outcomes and also produces effects upon behaviors and emotions (Kelley & Michella, 1980).

In the same way, expectancy disconfirmation produces higher attributions to effort or luck (unstable) than to ability and task difficulty. Fixed or stable causes are associated with high expectancies of success following good outcomes and with low expectancies following bad outcomes. Variable causes are associated with low expectancies following good outcomes and with high expectancies following bad outcomes (McMahan, 1973). People ask more "why" questions in situations in which there is disconfirmation of previous expectations, failure, and frustration. Unexpected and surprising outcomes, nonattainment of goals, and novel and unknown events instigate this attributional search process (Wong & Weiner, 1980; Weiner, 1979). In the same way, the process of searching for causal understanding is more likely to occur in affiliative contexts related to social rejection (failure) than in those related to social acceptance (success) (Folkes, 1978, as cited in Weiner, 1979).

In this study, it was predicted that high social anxiety
students are more likely to attribute bad outcomes to stable factors (expectancy confirmation) and to attribute good outcomes to unstable factors (expectancy disconfirmation), than low social anxiety students. As a consequence, high social anxiety students would tend to demonstrate expectancy decreases for success after a failure, whereas low social anxiety subjects, who perceive that bad outcomes are caused by transient or unexpected factors (effort or luck), would tend to protect their self-esteem by believing that bad outcomes will not result from the next attempt, thus maintaining a high expectancy for future success.

This hypothesis is in concordance with Girodo et al.'s study (1981) in which subjects who made stable attributions for past success in heterosexual social experiences had higher expectancies for future success in heterosexual interactions than subjects who made unstable attributions. It also agrees with the finding of Peplau et al. (1980) that low expectancy of social success is associated with stable attributions for loneliness and with repeated social failure.

3. Controllability-Uncontrollability. Controllability is defined as "the degree of volitional influence one has over a cause" (Betancourt & Weiner, 1982, p. 363). Because the controllability dimension of causality seems to be a factor nonorthogonal to the locus and stability dimensions (Weiner, 1979), and since controllable causes are perceived as internal and stable (Michella, Peplau, & Weeks, 1982), this study was concerned only with the internality and stability
causal dimension.

In summary, the dimensions of causality can be classified according to the original 2 X 2 Anova model proposed by Weiner (1979). Causes can be classified within one of four possibilities (2 levels of locus of control: internal-external; 2 levels of stability: stable-unstable). Table 1 describes the anova model of causal attributions. Thus, ability is classified as internal and stable, luck as external and unstable, effort as internal and unstable, and task difficulty as external and stable.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable (Fixed)</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable (Variable)</td>
<td>Effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These causal dimensions were not derived empirically but were derived "from intuition" (Weiner, 1973) as part of the "naive psychology of the psychologists" (Weiner, 1974, p. 7). However, more recently, some studies using factor analysis and multidimensional scaling techniques have been conducted to examine the dimensions of causality. Table 2 shows a review of these studies classified by author, method of data
analysis, topic of study, and perceived dimensions of causality.

Table 2

Studies that Identified the Dimensions of Causal Attribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Topic of Study</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosembaum (1972)</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Causes for success and failure</td>
<td>1. Internality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passer (1977)</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Causes for success and failure</td>
<td>1. Internality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scaling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passer, Kelley, Michella (1978)</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Causes for negative interpersonal attitude</td>
<td>1. Positive-negative attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scaling</td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>2. Intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Locus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Controllability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michella, Peplau, &amp; Weeks (1982)</td>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Attributions for loneliness</td>
<td>1. Internality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scaling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimer, &amp; Kelley (1982)</td>
<td>Principal components</td>
<td>Attributions on a broad major set of scales (variety of events)</td>
<td>1. Good-bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>factor analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Simple-complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Locus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there are some differences in the topics of study and in the methods of data analysis, the locus of control and the stability factors are consistent both logically and empirically, and they seem to emerge in many
research studies independent of method and topic of study. Thus, when people make attributions of causality, they tend to distinguish between causes that are relatively fixed versus those that are changeable, and between causes that exist in the person versus those in the environment.

In an attempt to extend Weiner's model to the area of affiliative behavior, Peplau, Russell, and Heim (1979) studied the consequences of causal attributions for loneliness on: (1) Expectancies. Low expectancies of social success were related to stable causes and to repeated social failure. For example, people were seen as more pessimistic when their loneliness was attributed to stable causes. (2) Affects. Loneliness was associated with unpleasant affects such as "depression," "sadness," "emptiness," and "frustration". (Berke & Peplau, 1976). Feelings of depression were positively related to internal attributions. (3) Self-esteem. Loneliness was related to self-esteem only when it is attributed to internal causes. (4) Coping behavior. Active coping (social integration) was related to internal and unstable attributions, while passive coping (social withdrawal) was associated with stable attributions. Thus, "stability should lead to feelings of hopelessness (low expectancy) and a belief that "there is nothing I can do" (low control)" (Peplau, Russell, & Heim, 1979, p. 56).

Social skills and social anxiety.

As proposed by Kelly (1982), social skills are learned behaviors used in interpersonal situations to obtain or
maintain reinforcing consequences from the environment. A wide range of different behaviors are included under social competence: behaviors that facilitate relationship development, behaviors that prevent the loss of reinforcement, and behaviors that bring about nonsocial reinforcement.

Because social skills are abilities to obtain reinforcing consequences from environmental events, Kelly (1982) hypothesized that social skills are prerequisites of adjustment, rather than its consequence. Thus, social competence leads to the attainment of personal goals and consequently produces a favorable self-evaluation. Therefore, self-esteem and self confidence are consequences of social competence.

According to this hypothesis, people under repeated social failure develop negative self-evaluations (e.g., "I am unattractive to women," "my conversation bores women,"). Those cognitions are antecedent events for future social failure and consequently lead to repeated failure in social interactions. As a result of this cycle, an individual may "develop failure oriented cognitions and anticipate anxiety when confronted with situations that he or she feels unprepared to handle effectively, based on past experience" (Kelly, 1982, p. 13). What people say to themselves can increase social anxiety, which associated with impaired social skills, can produce avoidance of social situations and expectancies for failure in future social interactions.
Negative and inhibitory self-statements which reflect "self-depreciation" and "fear of negative evaluation" are exhibited in internal dialogue in people high in social anxiety while thoughts of "positive anticipation" and "coping" (facilitative self-statement) are more likely to occur in people low in social anxiety. Facilitative self-statements correlate positively with social skills and negatively with social anxiety. Thus, cognitions play an important role in facilitating or interfering in social interactions. Consequently, cognitive self-statement modification is an important technique for changing heterosexual behaviors (Glass, Merluzzi, Bieuer, & Larsen, 1976).

Similarly, according to Kelly (1982), cognitive expectancies for success or failure in social interactions are related to the way people label situations based on previous experiences. Hence, the perceived probability of successfully handling social interactions can influence the attainment of goals. For example, if people learn skills to handle interpersonal relations, they develop adequate self-evaluations of themselves and form positive expectancies for future success; therefore, they are likely to exhibit social skills and to handle social interactions effectively. Conversely, negative cognitive expectancies are developed under past circumstances associated with social anxiety. Cognitions of failure are antecedent stimuli that predict
troublesome situations, and consequently lead to uncomfortable anxiety associated with negative outcomes. In the same way, social anxiety is acquired by prior social disapproval, maybe in situations associated with frustration or punishment (Watson & Friend, 1969).

According to Watson and Friend (1969), social evaluative anxiety implies three different characteristics (1) social distress or the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as tension, distress, or anxiety in social situations, (2) social avoidance or the tendency to avoid and escape from social interactions (e.g., avoidance or the desire to avoid being with or talking to), and (3) fear of negative evaluations or the concern, worry or apprehension about other's evaluations.

Leary (1983), in an attempt to define social anxiety, pointed out that the construct should be described in terms of its subjective cognitive affective component rather than in terms of its concomitant behaviors. That is, social anxiety is a subjective affective reaction to social situations labeled in terms such as "anxious", "nervous", "tense", "worried", or "shy". Because a measure of social anxiety should include only items of experienced anxiety independent of specific overt behaviors, Leary's Interaction and Audience Anxiousness Scales were used in this research.

In the same way, Schlenker and Leary (1981), cited in Leary (1983, p. 67), defined social anxiety as a "state of anxiety resulting from the prospect or presence of
interpersonal evaluation in real or imagined social settings." Two terms are important factors in this definition: (1) the evaluation and perception by others, and (2) the "real" or the "imagined" (anticipatory anxiety) social interactions. The first term has been described as the fear of negative evaluations (Watson & Friend, 1961) or as the fear of disapproval or criticism by others (Richardson & Tasto, 1976) or as the fear of revealing inferiority (Dixon, De Monchaux, & Sander, 1958).

In brief, some of the above factors related to the fear of interpersonal social situations have been pointed out by Richardson and Tasto (1976, p. 454):

Fear reactions to social or interpersonal situations may: (1) represent relatively automatic emotional reactions conditioned to social stimuli based upon prior (unpleasant or traumatic) experience; (2) be viewed as negative states of arousal that are actively self-generated by irrational thinking or panicky thoughts and images; or (3) be considered negative emotional byproducts of ineffective behavior, covert and motor, that fails to successfully cope with the demands of the environment and secure rewards from it.

Although social anxiety has been classified in several categories (Dixon et al., 1957; Richardson & Tasto, 1976), this study included two categories of social anxiety as proposed by Leary (1983): First, anxiety experiences in contingent social encounters—interaction anxiety—(an
individual's responses are dependent on the responses of the other interactants; e.g., a conversation). Examples include dating anxiety, shyness, loneliness, heterosexual-social anxiety, fear of interpersonal contact, and interpersonal anxiety. Second, anxiety experience in noncontingent social situations--audience anxiety--(an individual's responses are independent of the responses of other interactants; e.g., a speech, a public presentation). This category includes communication apprehension, stage fright, audience anxiety, or speech anxiety. Thus, the distinction between interaction anxiety and audience anxiety takes into consideration the structure of the situation in which social anxiety occurs. However, Leary (1983) found a moderately high correlation between interaction and audience anxiety. He speculated that these variables are nonorthogonal because both are related to other psychological factors such as low self-esteem, high fear of negative evaluation, and high public self consciousness. In fact, interaction and audience anxiety were related positively to social avoidance and distress, fear of negative evaluation, public self consciousness, and personal report of confidence as a speaker, and were associated negatively with self-esteem and sociability (Leary, 1983).

As predicted by the construct of social anxiety, high scores in social avoidance and distress were related to avoiding social situations, to working alone, to talking less, to being uncomfortable in social situations, and lacking confidence in interactions. People with high scores
on the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale avoided social
disapproval, sought approval, and felt "nervous" in

In the same way, a measure of interpersonal orientation,
the Liking People Scale (Filsinger, 1981), showed that
individuals who had a lower score on this scale were more
socially anxious, tended to spend more time alone, had fewer
close-friends, tended to be introverted, had lower social
self-esteem, tended to be less confident, had lower need to
affiliate, and were less socially adjusted. Thus, socially
anxious individuals showed a more negative interpersonal
attitude on this scale.

Social anxiety has been related to other psychological
constructs. For example, social avoidance and distress was
negatively associated with affiliation and audience
influence, and was positively associated with intense
discomfort, a desire to flee, and general anxiety in social
evaluative and achievement situations. The Fear of Negative
Evaluation Scale was associated negatively with dominance,
desirability, autonomy, and exhibitionism; it was associated
positively with need for social approval, dependence,
achievement anxiety, and fear in social-evaluative situations

Social anxiety is generally related to shyness. Buss
(1980) defined it as the discomfort, tension, inhibition, and
aversion of normal social behaviors that occur in the
presence of others (Cheek & Buss, 1981). According to the
authors, shyness is a personality trait independent of sociability (low sociability is not shyness). Thus, shy persons may be classified as sociable or unsociable. Shy sociable people have a high desire to be with people and also have a high level of emotionality, arousal, or fear. So a person who is "high in both emotionality and sociability tends to be socially anxious. He is strongly motivated to seek the company of others but is inhibited by strong fear" (Buss & Plomin, 1975, p. 188).

In the same way, Check and Buss (1981) found that shyness was positively associated with fearfulness and negatively with self-esteem. Shy people tended to be fearful and also aware of themselves as social objects (public self consciousness). Self-report measures also showed that shy people described a social interaction as more tense and inhibiting than did unshy people. Behavioral indexes indicated that shy sociable people talked less, initiated conversations less, and looked at others less than did the unshy group.

Social anxiety also has been associated with self consciousness. One of its components, public self consciousness, defined by items such as "I am very concerned about the way I present myself," is an antecedent factor of social anxiety. According to Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975), when a person is aware of himself as a public object (public self consciousness) and simultaneously focuses his attention on himself (private self consciousness), he or she
may exhibit behaviors indicative of social anxiety; that is, social anxiety is associated with fear of negative evaluation and with public self consciousness, but it is not related to private self consciousness. For example, a person could be very aware of himself without feeling discomfort in the presence of others. High scores in public self consciousness were also related to sensitivity to rejection while high scores in private self consciousness were not. Internal attributions of accepting responsibility when subjects were rejected by a peer group were made more by people high in public self consciousness than by those in low public self consciousness (Fenigstein, 1974). Thus, it could be hypothesized that people, who are aware of themselves as social objects and who frequently exhibit social anxiety, perceive themselves as responsible for failure in social interactions and make more internal attributions of causality in social rejection situations.

According to Kelly and Michella (1980), the general model of the attributional process, antecedents, attributions, and consequences, implies two different sets of relationships: The first one refers to the relationship between the antecedent factors of attributions and the attributions people make. The antecedents of attributions are the information about behaviors and circumstances the actor uses to infer the causes of behaviors. This term of the model implies all precedent variables that affect the attributional process. In this study, it was postulated that antecedent
factors such as personality trait (social anxiety) and social outcome situations (success-failure) influence the perceived causes of behaviors. Thus, it was hypothesized that high social anxiety students would make more internal and stable attributions in unsuccessful social outcomes, and external and unstable attributions in successful social situations.

The second set of relationships, according to the Kelly and Michella model, postulates an association between attributions that people make to explain their own behavior and their psychological consequences for subsequent behaviors, feelings, and expectancies. Thus, the second term of this model focuses on the consequences of the attributional process. In this study, it is postulated that the internality and the stability dimensions of causal attributions produce behavioral differences. Hence, people who make internal and stable attributions in successful outcome situations will exhibit higher means with regard to self-esteem, expectancy of future success, self-reward, and pleasantness of affects. These same attributions (internal and stable) in failure social outcome situations will produce less positive psychological consequences than in successful social outcome situations.

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

I. Is it possible to extend Weiner's attributional model developed in academic achievement contexts to social situations?

II. Antecedents--->Attributions.
a) Do people with different degrees of social anxiety rate differentially the internality and stability causal dimensions in situations of social success and failure?

b) What is the relationship between social anxiety and affiliation locus of control? Are students high in social anxiety more external in affiliation locus of control?

III. Attributions\(\rightarrow\)Consequences.

a) Depending on the social outcome (success or failure), do people exhibit different psychological consequences (expectancy of future success, self-esteem, self-reward, and affects) as their causal attributions vary with regard to stability and internality?

b) Do external and unstable attributions in failure social situations produce less negative psychological consequences than stable and internal attributions? Do these same attributions (external and unstable) in successful social outcomes produce less positive psychological consequences than stable and internal attributions?

c) Is there an interaction between social anxiety, social outcomes, causal attributions, and psychological consequences. In other words, depending on the social outcome and on its perceived causal attributions, do people with different degrees of social anxiety exhibit opposite psychological consequences?

Following Kelly and Michella’s model of causal attributions, Table 3 illustrates the basic relationships
that are tested in this study.

Table 3

Hypothesized Relationships Between Social Anxiety, Social Outcomes, Causal Attributions, and Psychological Consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
<th>Causal Dimensions</th>
<th>Psychological Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Low Social Anxiety</td>
<td>Internal Stable</td>
<td>High Self-esteem, Self-reward, Expectancy, Affects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Social Anxiety</td>
<td>External Unstable</td>
<td>Intermediate Self-esteem, Self-reward, Expectancy, Affects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Low Social Anxiety</td>
<td>External Unstable</td>
<td>Low Self-esteem, Self-reward, Expectancy, Affects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Social Anxiety</td>
<td>Internal Stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific hypotheses tested were as follows:

I. Antecedents ---> Attributions.

a) In successful social outcome situations (social acceptance) students low in social anxiety take more personal responsibility for success outcomes and make more internal and stable attributions than students high in social anxiety.

b) In failure social outcome situations (social rejection), students high in social anxiety take more personal responsibility for the failure outcome and make more internal and stable attributions than students low in social anxiety.
c) Students high in social anxiety exhibit a lower mean in internality of affiliative locus of control than students low in social anxiety. Thus students high in social anxiety are higher in externality (as measured by the Affiliation Locus of Control Scale).

II. Attributions—Consequences.

a) The psychological consequences (self-esteem, self-reward, affects, expectancy of future success) that people exhibit as a result of making internal and stable attributions in successful social outcomes (social acceptance) are significantly different from and in the opposite direction of the same attributions (internal and stable) made in failure social outcomes (social rejection). Thus, students who make internal and stable attributions in successful social outcome situations (social acceptance) exhibit the highest means in self-esteem, self-reward, expectancy of future success, and pleasant affects. Conversely, students who make these same attributions (internal and stable) in failure social outcome situations (social rejection) exhibit the lowest means in self-esteem, self-reward, expectancy of future success, and unpleasant affects.

b) Independently of the social outcome (success or failure) and the level of social anxiety (high or low), students who make external and unstable attributions exhibit intermediate means in self-esteem, self-reward, expectancy of future success, and neutral affects.
In summary, it was expected that the most favorable psychological consequences would be exhibited by low social anxiety students in successful outcome situations, and that these students would make the most internal and stable attributions. Intermediate psychological consequences were expected to be exhibited by the high social anxiety students in successful social outcome situations and by the low social anxiety students in failure social outcome situations. Also, it was expected that both these groups would make relatively unstable and external attributions. The lowest psychological consequences were expected to be exhibited by high social anxiety students who experience failure social outcomes. It was expected that these students would make relatively internal and stable attributions.

Method

Subjects and Design

Subjects were 243 students, 143 females and 100 males, from 37 different majors enrolled at North Texas State University. The "modal figure" was a single undergraduate woman, 22, senior, studying psychology, computer sciences, business, or an undecided major. The subjects participated voluntarily and received extra credit for their participation.

Participants were assigned to one of two groups—high anxiety or low anxiety—on the basis of a median split in the total social anxiety score. This score was calculated by
adding the Leary social anxiety score, the Fenigstein social anxiety score, and Zimbardo's principal shyness item (coded from 1: No to 5: Yes). A similar method of selecting subjects in social anxiety research has been used by Leary (1983).

Then, students in each group were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions—success social outcome or failure social outcome—. Thus, there were at least 58 subjects in each of the four cells: 1) high social anxiety-success outcome: 58 subjects, 2) high social anxiety-failure outcome: 62 subjects, 3) low social anxiety-success outcome: 65 subjects, and 4) low social anxiety-failure outcome: 58 subjects. Those 243 were the subjects who completed all of the questionnaires.

Finally, the subjects within each social outcome and each social anxiety group were assigned to one of the two groups for each attribution dimension—internal or external, and stable or unstable—on the basis of the median splits based on stability and internality scores from Russell's Causal Dimension Scale (1982). The final group conformation is summarized in Table 4.

Participants were given an informed consent form (See Appendix A) which explained that: 1) participation in the study would be voluntary, 2) subjects could drop out of the study at any time, 3) confidentiality of responses would be maintained, 4) participants were assured of anonymity, and 5) the study investigated "evaluations of social situations".
Table 4

Subjects Classified by Social Anxiety, Social Outcome, and Attributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Social Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internality</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments

Interaction and Audience Anxiousness Scales.

This instrument was designed to assess the degree of social anxiety on the basis of the structure of the situation in which it occurs: 1) interaction anxiety tends to be associated with contingent encounters, and 2) audience anxiety is related to noncontingent social interactions (Leary, 1983). Thus, the scale measures the degree to which college students experience anxiety in both interpersonal encounters and audience situations. This self-report instrument (Appendix B) consists of 27 items (15 in the Interaction Anxiousness Scale and 12 in the Audience Anxiousness Scale). The participants are instructed to indicate the "degree to which the statement is characteristic or true of you on a five-point scale: not at all, slightly, moderately, very, or extremely characteristic." (Leary, 1983,
A total score is obtained by adding the item scores, after changing the direction of reversed items (items 3, 6, 10, 15 on the interaction scale and items 2, 8 on the audience scale). Raw scores range from 0 to 108 (total score), 0 to 60 (interaction scale), and 0 to 48 (audience scale).

Leary (1983) reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .89 (interaction anxiousness) and .91 (audience anxiousness). Item analyses showed a high internal consistency in both scales; in fact, all items correlated higher than .50 with their subscale total score. Eight day test-retest reliability coefficients of .80 for interaction anxiousness and .84 for audience anxiousness were reported. The two scales correlated .44 with one another demonstrating a common underlying social anxiety dimension. Strong evidence of construct and criterion validity also has been reported (Leary, 1983).

The Multidimensional-Multiattributational Causality Scale (MMCS). The affiliation scale of the MMCS has been constructed on the basis of the locus (internal-external) and stability (stable-unstable) dimensions of Weiner's causal attributional model (Lefcourt et al., 1979). This goal specific locus of control scale, especially designed for use with university undergraduate populations, consists of 24 Likert items (0: disagree, 4: agree). Twelve items are related to success and 12 are related to failure experiences. The 24 items (See Appendix C) are also divided into 4
attribution subscales of 6 items each: 1) stable-external attributions (effort, motivation), 2) stable-internal (abilities, skills), 3) unstable-external (fortuitous events), and 4) unstable-internal (contextual characteristics). Since each Likert item is scored from 0 to 4, the externality total score ranges between 0 and 96. The higher the raw score, the higher the individual in externality (low in ability and effort attributions, and high in context and luck attributions).

Psychometric data of the MMCS has been reported by Lefcourt et al. (1979) and Lefcourt (1981). The affiliative locus of control scales have Cronbach alphas ranging from 0.58 to 0.81. Test-retest correlations have ranged from 0.50 to 0.81. The average correlation between affiliation items and the affiliation locus of control scale was 0.31. A series of studies have been conducted to investigate the validity of the MMCS (Lefcourt, 1981).

Fenigstein’s Social Anxiety Scale. This instrument was designed to assess the degree of discomfort in the presence of others. The short version used in this study is composed of 6 items from the Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). Each item is rated on a scale of 0 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 4 (extremely characteristic). This scale has a test-retest reliability of .73. Some studies (Leary, 1983) have shown a strong association between Fenigstein’s Social Anxiety Scale, the Interaction Anxiety Scale (r=.78), and the Social Audience Anxiety Scale (r=.64).
Also Fenigstein (1975) found a significant relationship between the Social Anxiety Scale, the Public Self-Consciousness Scale, and sensitivity to social rejection.

The Social Attribution Scale. This instrument is a modified version of Betancourt and Weiner's (1982) scale used to measure causal attributions for social success and failure, and to evaluate their psychological effects on expectancy, affects, evaluation, and liking. The revision of Weiner's achievement attribution scale used in this research was an attempt to extend the attributional dimensions of internality-externality and stability to social contexts.

The Social Attribution Scale has two versions, one evaluates social success, and the other assesses social failure. Each version has two types of social events, interaction encounters and audience situations (situations similar to those used in the Leary Social Anxiety Scale), and four conditions which represent four causal attributions: ability, effort, context, and luck (attributions similar to those used in the MMCS).

The task of a subject on these scales, given a specific outcome (failure or success) and four different attributions in interaction and audience situations, is to determine the effects of these causal ascriptions on expectations of future success, affect, self-esteem, and self-reward.

Four types of variations can be generated with this instrument: (See Appendix D)

1. **Outcome** (success-failure). A positive social outcome
involves social acceptance and excellent performance. This social situation is described as a "success". A negative outcome involves social rejection and very poor performance. This social situation is described as a "failure".

2) Social situations. The construction of the Social Attribution Scale was consistent with the distinction between two different types of social anxiety, interaction and audience anxiousness, depending upon the structure of the situation (Leary, 1983). However, analyses of the data ignored this distinction since the evidence indicated the interdependence of the scales.

3) Causal attributions. Within each outcome, the causal attribution for a particular social situation represents one cell in a 2 x 2 table involving the internal-external and stable-unstable dimensions. Thus, specific causes represent each of the four possible cells: a) internal-stable attributions (e.g., social ability), b) internal-unstable attributions (e.g., effort), c) external-stable attributions (e.g., task "difficulty"), d) external-unstable attributions (e.g., luck). As proposed by Betancourt and Weiner (1982), each dimension was evaluated to determine the subject's perception of the dimensional proprieties of the causes. Four bipolar 7-point items anchored at the extremes with "reflects an aspect of yourself-reflects an aspect of the situation", "variable over time-stable over time", "something about you-something about others", and "changeable-unchanging" were used (Appendix D). These four items were chosen from the
Causal Dimension Scale (Russell, 1982) on the basis of their high factor loadings (superior to .55) with internality and stability causal dimension. As reported by Russell (1982) a total score for each of the two scales is arrived at by summing the responses to the individual items as follows: 1) Internality: items 1 and 3; 2) Stability: items 2 and 4. High scores on these subscales indicate that the cause is perceived as external and stable. The Causal Dimension Scale is a measure designed to assess "how the attributor perceives the causes he or she has stated for an event. This scale assesses causal perceptions in terms of the locus of causality, stability, and controllability dimensions described by Weiner." (Russell, 1982, p. 1137).

4. Psychological consequences. There were 4 dependent variables: expectancy of success, affects, self-esteem, and self-reward.

a. Expectancy. Perceptions of expectancy of success were measured by asking the subjects to rate the likelihood of future success on a 7-point scale anchored at the extremes with "very low" and "very high".

b. Affect. The affects or emotions that the person experiences in the described situation were rated on a 7-point scale anchored at the extremes with "unpleasant" and "pleasant". Specific affects associated with the situation were evaluated using the open format proposed by Betancourt and Weiner (1982).

c. Self-esteem. The self-esteem scale was
constructed following the definition provided by Coopersmith (1967). According to this author, self-esteem refers to:

The evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness..... (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 4,5).

The Self-esteem Scale was also rated on a 7-point scale with 1 represented by "low" and 7 by "high".

d. Self-reward. The self-reward or self-punishment scale is a modification of a scale used originally by Weiner and Kulka (1970). Initially, they used this scale to evaluate reward-punishment in an external achievement situation. In this study, the self-reward scale was used to evaluate the person's degree of self-gratification as a function of outcome and causal attributions. This scale also used a 7-point format for the items with 1 represented by "high" punishment and 7 by "high reward".

In brief, the Social Attribution Scale involves two outcomes (success-failure), two social situations (interaction and audience situations) within each outcome, two causal attributions (internality and stability), and four psychological consequences (expectancy, self-reward, self-esteem, and affects).
Procedure.

The participants were asked to complete the informed consent form and the Leary and the Fenigstein Social Anxiety Scales. On the basis of the total social anxiety median score, subjects were assigned to one of two subgroups (high social anxiety-low social anxiety). Then, students in each group were randomly assigned to one of two outcome conditions, success social outcome or failure social outcome. There were at least 58 subjects in each of the four groups: 1) high social anxiety-success condition, 2) low social anxiety-success condition, 3) high social anxiety-failure condition, and 4) low social anxiety-failure condition. The participants were asked to complete the Affiliative Locus of Control Scale. Then, using the Social Attribution Scale, each participant evaluated eight ascriptions (ability, effort, context, and luck), four in audience situations and four in interpersonal interactions. Thus, each causal attribution was represented in a cell in a 2 x 2 dimensional categorization, with the two factors internality (internal or external) and stability (stable or unstable) within each social situation (audience situation or interaction encounter). Specific causal attributions were chosen that represent each of these cells. For success, the causes included high ability ("My high social ability to handle the situation"), high effort ("I tried very hard"), task easy ("the speech was so easy"), and luck ("I was just lucky"). A corresponding list of causal attributions for failure was presented.
All subjects were given the following instructions for filling out the Social Attributional Scale (adapted from Betancourt and Weiner, 1982; Seligman, et al., 1979):

On the following pages you are asked to imagine yourself in a series of social situations. Please try to vividly image yourself in each situation as clearly as you can. Take as much time as you need to visualize it clearly. Next we want you to answer some questions about the consequences and causes of each situation. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions asked.

Please answer all questions.

Your task will be to evaluate the situation appearing at the top of every page by answering the questions on a scale from 1 to 7. Please circle the number that best describes your responses.

Specifically, in a social success outcome situation each participant read:

a) Audience situation.

I gave a very important speech to a large audience. My speech was excellent and was well received. My success was due to MY HIGH SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION. (or BAD LUCK, or because I TRIED VERY HARD, or because THE SPEECH WAS SO EASY).

b) Interaction situation.

I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I succeeded. My success was because of MY EXCELLENT SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION.
(or, due to GOOD LUCK, or because I TRIED VERY HARD, or because the OTHER PERSON WAS EASY GOING).

Specifically, in the social failure outcome situation each participant read:

a) Audience situation.

I gave a very important speech to a large audience. My speech was badly done and poorly received. My failure was because of MY POOR SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION. (or, due to BAD LUCK, or I DID NOT TRY VERY HARD, or THE SPEECH WAS SO DIFFICULT).

b) Interaction situation.

I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I failed. My failure was because of MY POOR SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION. (or, because I DID NOT TRY VERY HARD, or due to BAD LUCK, or due to the fact that THE OTHER PERSON WAS SO DIFFICULT TO DEAL WITH).

Thus, "my excellent social ability in this type of situation" is an internal-stable cause while "good luck" is an external-unstable cause. Each of these social stimuli were evaluated with regard to expectancy of success, self-esteem, affects, and self-reward. Finally, each participant was assessed with regard to their perceptions of the dimensional proprieties of the causes using the Causal Dimension Scale.

There were eight random orders of the attributional conditions within each outcome to balance any possible position effect in the presentation of the social stimuli.
Results

The median social anxiety score which was used to split the subjects into low social anxiety (M = 42.39; S.D. = 13.30) and high social anxiety (M = 82.64; S.D. = 15.67) was 62.95. The difference in social anxiety mean scores between these two groups was significant (F (1, 242) = 466.66, p < .001).

Affiliation Locus of Control and Social Anxiety.

High social anxiety individuals reported a significantly greater mean on the MMCS Affiliation Locus of Control Scale (M = 46.76) than did the low social anxiety individuals (M = 43.49). A one way analysis of variance indicated a significant social anxiety effect (F (1, 241) = 12.85, p < .0004). Thus social anxiety was associated with greater externality. The higher the social anxiety, the greater the externality attribution. (See Table 5, Figure 1). In the same way, high social anxiety individuals attributed positive affiliation outcomes to luck (F (1, 241) = 24.50, p < .0001), to social context (F (1, 241) = 17.20, p < .0001), and to more external situations (F (1, 241) = 31.34, p < .0001).

Antecedents and Attributions

To test the hypothesis that the antecedent factors social anxiety and social outcomes are related to attributions that people make, two different two-way 2(Social Anxiety) x 2 (Social Outcome) analyses of variance were performed, one for internal attributions, and the second one for stable attributions.
Table 5

Mean Scores on the Affiliation Locus of Control Scale as a Function of Social Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMCS Scales</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affiliation Locus</td>
<td>43.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externality</td>
<td>20.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores indicate higher endorsement of attribution.

a The higher the score, the greater the externality.

*** p < .0001

As predicted, a Social Anxiety x Social Outcome interaction (F (1, 242) = 6.06; p < .01) was found for internal attributions. Thus, high social anxiety individuals exposed to successful social outcomes made more external attributions and high anxiety individuals exposed to failure social outcomes made more internal attributions than did their low social anxiety counterparts. Conversely, as described by the "self-serving bias" hypothesis, low social anxiety individuals took more personal responsibility for successful social outcomes and attributed more of their social failures to external causes than did high social anxiety individuals. The social anxiety x social outcome interaction was even stronger (F (1, 242) = 8.97, p < .003).
FIGURE 1. THE MMCS AFFILIATION LOCUS OF CONTROL AS A FUNCTION OF SOCIAL ANXIETY.
when subjects judged internal situations (i.e., ability or effort).

The above interaction was not found when the stability dimension was considered. However, there was a significant main effect due to social outcome ($F (1, 242) = 32.56, p < .001$). Thus, social rejection was perceived as relatively more unstable ($M = 3.03$) than social acceptance ($M = 3.67$).

Internal attributions ($M = 2.52$) were rated as more internal ($F (1, 242) = 3570.17, p < .001$) than the causes classified a priori as external ($M = 4.54$). Subjects in social situations, like in those earlier achievement context studies, made attributions based on the internality dimension (Table 6). Thus, social ability and effort attributions were perceived as internal, whereas social context (task difficulty) and luck were judged as external.

The individuals participating in this study perceived social ability ($M = 3.85$) and social context ($M = 3.34$), those causes classified a priori as stable, as relatively more stable than those causes, luck ($M = 2.92$) and effort ($M = 3.30$), classified a priori as unstable ($F (1, 242) = 1614.91, p < .001$). However, all four causes were perceived to be toward the unstable end of the continuum (See Table 6).

**Attributions and Psychological Consequences**

A three way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) 2 (social outcomes) x 2 (levels of attribution) x 2 (levels of social anxiety) was perform for each dimension to test the hypothesis that the psychological consequences that people
Table 6
Externality and Stability Mean Scores as a Function of Social Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Situations</th>
<th>Externality</th>
<th>Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>2.68 (Internal)</td>
<td>3.85 (unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>2.36 (Internal)</td>
<td>3.30 (Unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.54 (External)</td>
<td>3.34 (Unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4.55 (External)</td>
<td>2.92 (Unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2.52 (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.54 (External)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60 (Unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11 (Unstable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The higher the score, the more external or unstable the attributions.

exhibit (self-esteem, self-reward, affects, expectancy for future success), as a result of making internal and stable attributions, significantly differ in success situations (social acceptance) from the psychological consequences for these same attributions in failure situations (social rejection). The results of the first MANOVA, taking the internality dimension, did indicate a significant overall contribution to the psychological consequences due to social anxiety (Wilks's lambda = .87630, F = 8.18, p < .0001), and due to social outcome (Wilks's lambda = .25632, F = 168.27750, p < .01). The internality x social outcome
interaction was significant (Wilks’s lambda = .94081, F = 3.64922, p < .007).

The results of the second MANOVA, taking the stability dimension, showed a significant overall contribution to the psychological consequences due to social anxiety (Wilks’s lambda = .87758, F = 8.09099, p < .0001) and due to social outcome (Wilks’s lambda = .25674, F = 167.91154, p < .01).

Univariate analyses of variance were performed next for the four psychological consequences: expectancy of future success, affective reactions, self-esteem, and self-reward. The means are summarized in Table 7. The results provide support for the predictions concerning social anxiety, social outcome, and internality x social outcome.

Attributions produced different psychological consequences according to social outcomes. For example, the significant social outcome x internality interaction (See Figure 2) indicates that subjects who ascribed to themselves a successful social outcome exhibited the best psychological consequences, whereas those who perceived the social outcome as caused by external sources decreased their expectations (F(1, 242) = 5.61, p < .01), self-reward (F(1, 242) = 2.84, p < .09), and self-esteem (F(1, 242) = 5.65, p < .01). This tendency was reversed in the social rejection group. In that situation, the psychological consequences tended to improve as a function of a shift from internal to external causes ("self-serving bias"). Thus, when failure was perceived as caused by external factors, the effects are less negative.
than when it was perceived as caused by internal factors.

In the same way, in failure social outcomes (social rejection) people who made external attributions exhibited the highest expectancy for future success ($F (1, 119) = 4.811, p < .03$), self-reward ($F (1, 119) = 3.31, p < .07$), self-esteem ($F (1, 119) = 5.64, p < .019$), and pleasant affects ($F (1, 119) = 8.849, p < .004$). Similarly, high social anxiety individuals exhibited more negative psychological consequences especially when they ascribed failure to internal causes, whereas low social anxiety individuals who made external attributions exhibited more positive psychological consequences.

On the other hand, in successful social outcomes, the results of the univariate two-way 2 (social anxiety) x 2 (attributions) analyses of variance yielded a social anxiety main effect for expectancy of success ($F (1, 122)= 5.11, p < .02$), affective reactions ($F (1, 122)= 8.27, p < .005$), self-reward ($F (1, 122)= 4.17, p < .04$), and self-esteem ($F (1, 122)= 4.49, p < .03$), and a significant social anxiety x internality interaction for expectancy of success ($F (1, 122)= 5.01, p < .02$), affective reactions ($F (1, 122)= 6.41, p < .01$), self-reward ($F (1, 122)= 5.22, p < .02$), and self-esteem ($F (1, 122)= 3.41, p < .06$). Thus, low social anxiety individuals who made internal attributions in social acceptance situations exhibited the highest positive psychological consequences. However, those who made external attributions in the same situation, exhibited a lower mean.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Social Anxiety, Social Outcome, and Attributions on Means Psychological Consequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Outcome</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
<th>Expectancy</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Self-reward</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Expectancy</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Self-reward</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 2. INTERNALITY × SOCIAL OUTCOME INTERACTION FOR EXPECTANCY OF FUTURE SUCCESS.
The opposite seems to be true for high socially anxious individuals. In this group, there was a tendency to exhibit greater positive psychological consequences concurrent with external attributions. In brief, while low social anxiety individuals decreased the positive effect of a successful social outcome with increase in external attributions, high social anxiety individuals experienced better psychological consequences as a function of the external attributions in successful outcomes.

For the affective reactions, a three way internality x social anxiety x social outcome interaction was found ($F(1, 242) = 4.413, p < .03$). The above described pattern for the psychological consequences in social acceptance situations was also found for the affective reactions. There was a different degree of positive emotions between high and low social anxiety individuals when the cause of social successful outcomes was ascribed to internal factors (See Figure 3). In that situation, low social anxiety individuals exhibited the highest positive affective reactions. However, in social acceptance situations, external attributions reduced positive feelings in low social anxiety individuals but increased positive emotions to the same level in high social anxiety individuals. In contrast, in failure social outcomes, low social anxiety individuals experience less negative affect with increments of externality, whereas high social anxiety individuals experienced more unpleasant affect.
FIGURE 3. A THREE-WAY INTERNALITY × SOCIAL ANXIETY × SOCIAL OUTCOME INTERACTION FOR EMOTIONS.
The stability dimension also had a slight influence on the psychological consequences. For example, a stability x social outcome interaction ($F\ (1,\ 242) = 4.26, p < .04$) for expectancy of future success indicated that stable attributions were associated with high expectancies following success in low social anxiety subjects but were associated with low expectancies in high social anxiety individuals. Also in this group, stable attributions were associated with low expectancies following failure, whereas in the low social anxiety group, there was no change in the expectancies associated with the shift from unstable to stable attributions. Similarly, in the expected direction but not statistically significant ($F\ (1,\ 242) = 2.90, p < .08$), pleasant emotions were higher when success was attributed to stable rather than to unstable causes.

Attributions to effort ("try") and ability ("can") more than attributions to social context ("task difficulty") and luck, were associated with high expectancies, self-reward, and pleasant affective reactions. These psychological consequences were even higher when subjects made attributions to effort. Thus, effort was the more salient attribution in social contexts especially in social success situations. However, a lack of ability, especially in failure social situations, produced more negative psychological consequences, and focused on unpleasant affective reactions and low self-esteem. In the above described social situation, high social anxiety individuals exhibited the lower mean
scores in the psychological consequences scales following failure and success (See Table 8 and 9).

### Table 8

Effects of Social Anxiety on Psychological Means in Successful Social Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Situation</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S.: Not significant.

Additional Results.

Cronbach's alpha was 0.92 for audience anxiousness and social anxiety, 0.83 for interaction anxiousness, 0.73 for Fenigstein's social anxiety, and 0.47 for affiliation locus of control (See Table 10). As the data suggested, social
anxiety scales were highly reliable.

The Leary Social Anxiety Scale was factor analyzed to
determinate the scale factorial validity as well as the
number of factors (Table 11). The method of factor analysis
involved a rotation to an orthogonal structure producing
three conceptually clear factors accounting for 87% of the
variance. The factors are: (1) Audience anxiousness that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Situation</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. S.: Not significant.
that included eleven items with factorial loading superior to .34 accounting for 63.1% of the variance. (2) Interaction anxiousness that included twelve items with factorial loading superior to .34 accounting for 15.4% of the variance, and (3) Shyness that included six items with factorial loading superior to .32 accounting for 8.5% of the variance.

Table 10

Alpha Coefficients for the Scales Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Locus of Control</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Anxiety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Anxiety</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Social Anxiety</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenigstein’s Social Anxiety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A correlation matrix for the scales' total scores (See Table 12) indicated a strong relationship between the social anxiety scales. Thus, the Leary Social Anxiousness Scale correlated highly ($r$: 0.85, $p < .0001$) with the Fenigstein Social Anxiety Scale and with the most important item in the Zimbardo Shyness Scale ($r$: 0.58, $p < .0001$). The relationship between interaction and audience anxiousness was significant ($r$: 0.58, $p < .0001$). The social anxiety scales correlated significantly with the MMCS and with externality.
Table 11

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix for the Leary Social Anxiety Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leary Social Anxiety Scale</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often feel nervous even in casual get-togethers</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually feel uncomfortable when I am in a group of people I don't know</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get nervous when I must talk to a teacher or boss</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties often make me feel anxious and uncomfortable</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am probably less shy in social interactions than most people</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel tense when talking to people of my own sex if I don't know them very well</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I had more confidence in social situations</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seldom feel anxious in social situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am a shy person</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel nervous when talking to an attractive person of the opposite sex</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel nervous when calling someone I don't know very well on the telephone</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get nervous when I speak to someone in a position of authority</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually feel relaxed around other people, even people who are quite different from me</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually get nervous when I speak in front of a group</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy speaking in public</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to experience &quot;stage fright&quot; when I must appear before a group</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be terrified if I had to appear before a large audience</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get &quot;butterflies&quot; in my stomach when I must speak or perform before others</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel awkward and tense if I knew someone was filming me with a camera</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My thoughts become jumbled when I speak before an audience</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't mind speaking in front of a group if I have rehearsed what I am going to say</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I did not get so nervous when I speak in front of a group</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were a musician, I would probably get &quot;stage fright&quot; before a concert</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I speak in front of others, I worry about making a fool out of myself</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get nervous when I must make a presentation at school or work</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I. Audience Anxiety. II. Interaction Anxiety. III. Shyness.
Table 12

Correlation Matrix Between the Scales Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Audience Anxiety</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
<th>Fenigstein Soc. Anx.</th>
<th>Zimbardo Shyness</th>
<th>Lefcourt Locus</th>
<th>Externality Lefcourt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenigstein Soc. Anx.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbardo Shyness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefcourt Locus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  *** p < .0001

Discussion

The results of the present study supported the hypothesis of different attributional pattern for high vs low social anxiety individuals. In turn, the attributions made affected individuals' expectancies for future success, their self-esteem, self-reward, and affective reactions. As anticipated, high social anxiety individuals tended to make more internal attributions following failure social outcomes and more external attributions following successful social situations. In general they attributed positive affiliation outcomes to luck, to social context, and to more external sources. In contrast, low social anxiety individuals assumed more personal responsibility for favorable outcomes and externalized the cause of their social failure.
The proposed attributional bias for high social anxiety individuals, the "self-blaming" biases hypothesis, could be defined as the tendency to accept more personal responsibility for failure than for success, making internal attributions for failure and external attributions for success. Thus, high social anxiety people are more likely to make self-attributions for negative social outcomes than for good outcomes. In a similar manner, as the "self-serving" hypothesis predicts, low social anxiety individuals assume more personal responsibility for favorable social outcomes than for unsuccessful ones.

As proposed in this study, the "self-blaming" biases hypothesis (the opposite of the "self-serving" biases hypothesis), is indirectly consistent with the causal attribution bias of shy people (Girodo et al., 1981), with the tendency of highly test-anxious students to blame their character (Arkin, Kolditz, & Kolditz, 1983), with the depressive attributional style in which depressed individuals attribute bad outcomes to internal causes (Seligman, Abramson, Semmel, & Von Baeyer, 1979), with the findings that people who attribute their problems to pejorative internal causes may worry more than those who do not (Storms, Denney, McCaul, & Lowery, 1979), with the loneliness self attributions of low self-esteem people (Peplau et al., 1980; Horowitz et al., 1982), with the tendency in high public self consciousness people to accept more personal responsibility in social rejection (Fenigstein, 1974), and with Zimbardo's
statement (1980, p. 50) that "shy people blame themselves" (self-blaming); "the non-shy blame the situation" (self-exoneration).

Similarly, high social anxiety people, who generally with repeated social failure associated with frustration, social disapproval, and punishment (Watson & Friend, 1969) develop negative and inhibitory self-statements ("Self-depreciation"; "fear of negative evaluation"; Glass et al., 1976), who have lower social self-esteem and tend to be less confident in social situations (Filsinger, 1981; Girodo et al., 1981), who are more aware of themselves as public objects and more sensitive to social rejection (Fenigstein, 1974), perceive themselves as responsible for failure in social interactions and make more internal attributions of causality in social rejections (self-blaming biases hypothesis). High social anxiety people tend to overemphasize the negative consequences of social interactions, especially the affective reactions; they also tend to underemphasize the positive psychological consequences of successful social outcomes. For them, success in social interactions is located outside themselves, is something external, is caused by luck, and is out of personal control. The finding that high social anxiety individual are more likely to attribute affiliative outcomes to external events is consistent with the fact that high social anxiety individuals tend to seek approval and are more dependent in social interactions (Watson & Friend, 1969). It also confirms the earlier work of Archer (1979, 1980) who
pointed out a meaningful relationship between greater externality and higher trait anxiety, test anxiety, and psychopathology.

This study attempted to extend the conceptualization of achievement motivation proposed by Weiner's model to social affiliative contexts. Thus, it was proposed that low social anxiety people would behave in social interactions in a manner similar to that of individuals high in resultant achievement motivation. They would assume more personal responsibility for success, thereby increasing their expectancy for future success, their self-reward for success, exhibiting more pleasant affective reactions as a result of success, and increasing their self-esteem.

This study also supports the hypothesis that the psychological consequences that people exhibit are associated with their attributions and their social successes and failures, as well as their level of social anxiety. Within this context, the internality x social outcome interaction indicates that when favorable social events are attributed to internal factors (e.g., ability or effort), the psychological consequences are best, whereas the same attributions (e.g., lack of ability or effort) made in failure social situations, produces the opposite effect, a dramatic decrease in the expectancy for future success, lowered self-esteem, and increases in self-punishment and unpleasant emotions. Those effects were even more severe for those with high social anxiety. On the other hand, external attributions following
failure, produce more favorable psychological consequences. The same attributions following success reduces the positive effects.

These results partly supported the application of Weiner's attributional model for success and failure to social situations. As in the achievement-related contexts, people in social situations made attributions based on the internality dimension, locating social ability and effort attributions toward the internal pole, and social context and luck attributions toward the external pole of the dimension. Also as Weiner’s model postulates for the achievement context, people in social situations made causal attributions that, interacting with social outcomes, produced dramatic effects on their expectancies of future success, their self-esteem, their emotions, and their self-reward.

These results also supported Weiner’s statement that "internal versus external perceptions of causation result in differential affective reactions" (Weiner, 1974, p. 5). Pleasant emotions were maximized when success was attributed to internal causes and minimized when failure was attributed to internal causes. Apparently external attributions prevent individuals from exhibiting strongly positive or negative affective reactions. As proposed by Weiner (1974), locus of causality influences the affective consequences of social situations. Results of this study, however, suggest that the proposed influence varies according to the degree of social anxiety. For example, pleasant affective reactions were
similar for high and low social anxiety individuals when they attributed success to external causes. However, these positive reactions were maximized when low social anxiety individuals attributed social outcomes to internal causes. On the contrary, high social anxiety individuals making internal attributions to success decreased their positive affective reactions. The opposite pattern was true in failure social outcomes.

Results of this study confirmed Weiner's (1974, p. 32) statement that attributions to effort, "which is an internal cause under volitional control, maximize positive and negative affects for success and failure." Causal attributions to effort were the most salient ascriptions in maximizing the positive psychological consequences of social successes. Lack of ability attributions for failure social outcomes minimized the positive psychological consequences, especially the expectancy for future success.

Weiner's (1974) model proposed that the perceived stability of attributions is an important determinant of psychological consequences, especially expectation of future success. According to this model, task difficulty and ability are stable attributions. In this study, however, people perceived these traditionally "stable" categories (task difficulty and ability) as factors that are "variable over time" and "changeable." This conception of task difficulty and ability as unstable factors could explain the relatively slight influence of the stability dimension on psychological
consequences in the present study. Feather (1983) reported that affiliation outcomes are perceived as more unstable, external, and global than achievement outcomes.

The stability x social outcome interaction for expectancy of future success is partly consistent with Weiner's statement that stable perceptions of causality produce expectancy shifts, and with the findings reported by McMahan (1973) and Valle (1976) that attributions to fixed factors were associated with high expectancies following success and with low expectancies following failure, whereas attributions to variable factors were associated with low expectancies following success and high expectancies following failure. However, these results are valid only for attributions to ability and are not for attributions to task difficulty (social context). Thus, while attributions to ability are associated with high expectancies following success and with low expectancies following failure, the opposite is true for attributions to social context. Within this context, attributions to ability and effort seem to behave in a similar manner, whereas attributions to social context and luck seem to behave in opposite directions. Thus, contrary to Weiner's hypothesis in achievement contexts that internality is not associated with expectancy shifts, these results indicate that in social situations there is an internality x social outcome interaction for expectancy of future success. Future research needs to be done to clarify the role of attributions to effort and social context in
social interactions.

Also further work is necessary to determine why task difficulty and social ability in social interactions tend to be perceived as unstable factors and how and what stable social attributions are related to psychological consequences if any are. Also it is necessary to replicate these findings with social situations in vivo (Lefcourt et al., 1979; Lefcourt, 1981) as has been done in achievement situations. Additional research could utilize the same scales used in this study since these scales have good reliability and validity. Because sex differences have been reported in social anxiety (Watson & Friend, 1969) as well as in causal attributions research (Girodo, et al., 1981), because other attributional dimensions are probably important (e.g., globality, controllability, intentionality, etc.) (Wimer & Kelley, 1982; Weiner, 1979), and because there are different kind of social anxiety (Leary, 1983), further work needs to be done taking sex differences, new attributional categories, and different social situations into account.

The present findings have important implications for cognitive-behavior programs to improve social skills. Individuals high in social anxiety often avoid social situations, prefer to work alone, engage in minimal conversation, and lack confidence in interactions with others. Cognitive restructuring therapy (Beck, 1976) and cognitive self-statement modification (Meichenbaum & Cameron, 1973) are techniques which could be applied.
Persons who experience high social anxiety tend to accept more personal responsibility for failure than for success. Individuals who experience repeated social failure develop negative and inhibitory self-statements. Such cognitions produce interference in stressful social situations and consequently lead to poor performance and repeated failure in social interactions. Therefore, cognitive self-statement modification is an important element in improving social skills. In-vitro practice and in-vivo experience in structured social situations could be helpful in alleviating high social anxiety. In brief, the "self-blaming" biases exhibited by socially anxious individuals could be modified toward a "self-serving" biases which, in turn, would result in higher self-esteem, willingness to take credit for successes, expectancy of future successes, and positive feelings.
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INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT

NAME OF SUBJECT:

1. These research forms are being used to further our knowledge in the area of social psychology. There should be no harm whatsoever in completing these forms. 2. I hereby give consent to FABIO SABOGAL to use the forms I am filling out for research purposes only. I understand that this information is confidential and that my name will be removed from these instruments. 3. I have heard a clear explanation and understand the nature and purpose of the procedure. I have received a clear explanation and understand the benefits to be expected. I understand that the procedure to be performed is investigational and that I may withdraw my consent to participate at any time. With my understanding of this, having received this information and satisfactory answers to the questions I have asked, I voluntarily consent to the procedure described in Paragraph 2 above.

SIGNED:
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Leary's Social Anxiousness Scale

Interaction Anxiety
I often feel nervous even in casual get-togethers
I usually feel uncomfortable when I am in a group
of people I don’t know
I am usually at ease when speaking to a member of
the opposite sex
I get nervous when I must talk to a teacher or boss
Parties often make me feel anxious and uncomfortable
I am probably less shy in social interactions than
most people
I sometimes feel tense when talking to people of my
own sex if I don’t know them very well
I would be nervous if I were being interviewed
for a job
I wish I had more confidence in social situations
I seldom feel anxious in social situations
In general, I am a shy person
I often feel nervous when talking to an attractive
person of the opposite sex
I often feel nervous when calling someone I don’t
know very well on the telephone
I get nervous when I speak to someone in a position
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of authority

I usually feel relaxed around other people, even people who are quite different from me

Audience Anxiety

I usually get nervous when I speak in front of a group
I enjoy speaking in public
I tend to experience "stage fright" when I must appear before a group
I would be terrified if I had to appear before a large audience
I get "butterflies" in my stomach when I must speak or perform before others
I would feel awkward and tense if I knew someone was filming me with a movie camera
My thoughts become jumbled when I speak before an audience
I don't mind speaking in front of a group if I have rehearsed what I am going to say
I wish I did not get so nervous when I speak in front of a group
If I were a musician, I would probably get "stage fright" before a concert
When I speak in front of others, I worry about making a fool out of myself
I get nervous when I must make a presentation at school or work
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Multidimensional Multiattributitional Causality Scale.

A. ABILITY.
It seems to me that getting along with people is a skill.
Having good friends is simply a matter of one's social skill.
It is impossible for me to maintain close relations with people without my tact and patience.
It seems to me that failure to have people like me would show my ignorance in interpersonal relationships.
I feel that people who are often lonely are lacking in social competence.
In my experience, there is a direct connection between the absence of friendship and being socially inept.

B. EFFORT.
Maintaining friendships requires real effort to make them work.
In my case, success at making friends depends on how hard I work at it.
If my marriage were to succeed, it would have to be because I worked at it.
If I did not get along with others, it would tell me that I hadn't put much effort into the pursuit of social goals.
When I hear of a divorce, I suspect that the couple probably did not try enough to make their marriage work.
In my experience, loneliness comes from not trying to be friendly.

C. CONTEXT
My enjoyment of a social occasion is almost entirely dependent on the personalities of the other people who are there.
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Some people can make me have a good time even when
I don't feel sociable.

To enjoy myself at a party I have to be surrounded by how
others who know how to have a good time.

No matter what I do, some people just don't like me.

Some people just seem predisposed to dislike me.

It is almost impossible to figure out how I have
displeased some people.

D. LUCK

Making friends is a funny business; sometime I have
to chalk up my success to luck.

In my experience, making friends is largely a matter of
having the right breaks.

If my marriage were a long, happy one, I'd say that I
must just be very lucky.

Often chance events can play a large part in causing rifts
between friends.

I find that the absence of friendships is often a
matter of not being lucky enough to meet the right people.

Difficulties with my friends often start with chance remarks.

Note: All items scored 0 = disagree, 4 agree. First 3 items
of each set of 6 refer to success, last 3 items refer to
failure experiences.
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GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This research is being conducted by a graduate student in psychology under the supervision of a professional psychologist. The ethical standards of the psychology profession will be maintained at all times. You can be assured that the data you provide by participating will remain anonymous.

The purpose of this study is to identify certain characteristics which are associated with social situations. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions asked. PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. If you are not sure of an answer then give the best answer you can. Do not spend too much time on any one answer. Usually the first answer you think of is the best answer.

PERSONAL DATA

Please choose the one category which best describes you. Place a checkmark in the space provided.

Sex: 1.------Female  2.------Male

Age  (_)(_)

Marital status: 1.------Single  2.------Divorced  3.------Separated  4.------Married  5.------Remarried  6.------Widowed  7.------Unmarried, living with someone

Major: ----------------------------------

College: 1.------Freshman  2.------Sophomore  3.------Junior  4.------Senior  5.------Graduate Student
On the following pages you are asked to imagine yourself in a series of social situations. Please try to vividly image yourself in each situation as clearly as you can. Take as much time as you need to visualize it clearly.

Next we want you to answer some questions about the consequences and causes of each situation. There are not right or wrong answers to any of the questions asked. Please answer all questions.

Your task will be to evaluate the situation appearing at the top of every page by answering the questions on a scale from 1 to 7. Please circle the number that best describes your responses.
Appendix E -- Continued

I gave a very important speech to a large audience.
My speech was excellent and was well received.
My success was due to MY HIGH SOCIAL ABILITY IN
THIS TYPE OF SITUATION.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:
(single words if possible)
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I gave a very important speech to a large audience.
My speech was excellent and was well received. My success was because I TRIED VERY HARD.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect
of myself reflects on an aspect
of the situation

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:
(single words if possible)
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I gave a very important speech to a large audience. My speech was excellent and was well received. My success was due to GOOD LUCK.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are: (single words if possible)
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I gave a very important speech to a large audience.

My speech was excellent and well received. My
success was because THE SPEECH WAS SO EASY.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
reflects on an aspect reflects on an aspect
of myself of the situation

The reason for my success is:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:
(single words if possible)
I gave a very important speech to a large audience. My speech was badly done and poorly received. My failure was because of MY POOR SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is: low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself? high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are: unpleasant pleasant

My self-esteem is: low intermediate high

The reason for my failure: reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my failure is: variable over time stable over time

The reason for my failure is due to: something about me something about others

The reason for my failure is: changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are: (single words if possible)
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I gave a very important speech to a large audience.

My speech was badly done and poorly received. My failure was due to BAD LUCK.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my failure:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself
reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my failure is:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my failure is due to:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my failure is:

1 低 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:
(single words if possible)
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I gave a very important speech to a large audience. My speech was badly done and poorly received. My failure was because I DID NOT TRY VERY HARD.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my failure:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my failure is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my failure is due to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my failure is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:

(single words if possible)
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I gave a very important speech to a large audience.

My speech was badly done and poorly received. My failure was because THE SPEECH WAS SO DIFFICULT.

My expectation of succeeding at my next speech is:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant pleasant

My self-esteem is:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my failure:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my failure is:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my failure is due to:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my failure is:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:
(single words if possible)
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I wanted to form a close relationship with another person. I succeeded. My success was because of MY EXCELLENT SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do I punish or reward myself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high punishment</td>
<td>high reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emotions I experience are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My self-esteem is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my success:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reflects on an aspect of myself</td>
<td>reflects on an aspect of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my success is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>variable over time</td>
<td>stable over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my success is due to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>something about me</td>
<td>something about others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my success is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changeable</td>
<td>unchanging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:

(single words if possible)
I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I succeeded. My success was because I TRIED VERY HARD.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:
(single words if possible)
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I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I succeeded. My success was due to GOOD LUCK.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my success is:

variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:

(single words if possible)
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I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I succeeded. My success was because THE OTHER PERSON WAS EASY GOING.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
high punishment high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
unpleasant intermediate pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
low intermediate high

The reason for my success:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
reflects on an aspect of myself reflects on an aspect of the situation

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
variable over time stable over time

The reason for my success is due to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
something about me something about others

The reason for my success is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
changeable unchanging

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my success are:
(single words if possible)
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I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I failed. My failure was because of MY POOR SOCIAL ABILITY IN THIS TYPE OF SITUATION.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do I punish or reward myself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high punishment</td>
<td>high reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emotions I experience are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My self-esteem is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reflects on an aspect of myself</td>
<td>reflects on an aspect of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>variable over time</td>
<td>stable over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure is due to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>something about me</td>
<td>something about others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changeable</td>
<td>unchanging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:
(single words if possible)
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I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I failed. My failure was because I DID NOT TRY VERY HARD.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:
low  2  3  intermediate  4  5  6  high

How much do I punish or reward myself?
high punishment  1  2  3  4  5  6  high reward  7

The emotions I experience are:
unpleasant  1  2  3  4  5  6  pleasant  7

My self-esteem is:
low  1  2  3  intermediate  4  5  6  high  7

The reason for my failure:
reflects on an aspect of myself  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

The reason for my failure is:
variable over time  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

The reason for my failure is due to:
something about me  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

The reason for my failure is:
changeable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:
(single words if possible)
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I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I failed. My failure was because THE OTHER PERSON WAS SO DIFFICULT TO DEAL WITH.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>intermediate</th>
<th>high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do I punish or reward myself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>high punishment</th>
<th>high reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The emotions I experience are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unpleasant</th>
<th>pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My self-esteem is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>intermediate</th>
<th>high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>reflects on an aspect of myself</th>
<th>reflects on an aspect of the situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>variable over time</th>
<th>stable over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure is due to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>something about me</th>
<th>something about others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for my failure is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>changeable</th>
<th>unchanging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:

(single words if possible)
I wanted to form a close personal relationship with another person. I failed. My failure was due to BAD LUCK.

My expectation of succeeding at the next relationship is:

1 low  2 intermediate  3 high

How much do I punish or reward myself?

1 high punishment  2  3  4  5  6  7 high reward

The emotions I experience are:

1 unpleasant  2  3  4  5  6  7 pleasant

My self-esteem is:

1 low  2 intermediate  3 high

The reason for my failure:

1 reflects on an aspect of myself  2  3  4  5 reflects on an aspect of the situation  6  7

The reason for my failure is:

1 variable over time  2  3  4  5 stable over time  6  7

The reason for my failure is due to:

1 something about me  2  3  4 something about others  5  6  7

The reason for my failure is:

1 changeable  2  3  4  5 unchanging  6  7

Two emotions that I am experiencing due to my failure are:
(single words if possible)
Appendix F

Fenigstein’s Social Anxiety Scale.

Please indicate the degree to which the statement is characteristic or true of you on a five-point scale:

1. Not at all characteristic
2. Slightly characteristic
3. Moderately characteristic
4. Very characteristic
5. Extremely characteristic

There are not right or wrong answers to any questions asked. Please answer all questions and circle the number that best describes your responses.

1. It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations
2. I have troubles working when someone is watching me
3. I get embarrassed very easily
4. I don’t find it very hard to talk to strangers
5. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group
6. Large groups make me nervous

Zimbardo’s Principal Shyness Item

1. Do you consider yourself to be a shy person?
   No   Yes
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