

## Social Phobia among Jordanians University Students

*Fayez A. Simadi, Abdalah M. Gazan \**

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the social phobia aspects among students in some Jordanian universities and to examine the impact of socio-demographic factors on phenomenon with regard to the environment in their universities. The sample consisted of 704 subjects from several universities. Comparative means were used to examine the importance of social phobia aspects and ANOVA as well as MANOVA were used to examine the role of the socio-demographic factors in explaining the students' social phobia aspects, which included: fear of crowds, public speech, other gender and administrators, while the socio-demographic variables included were: university location, specialization, gender, GPA, father education and place of living. The findings revealed that fear of Administrators were the greatest, followed by, other gender, public speech and crowds in order. The results of the ANOVA revealed that all socio-demographic factors impacted significantly on the social phobia of university students, except location of university and the father education. On the other hand, the MANOV findings reported that the fear of administrators, crowds, public speech and other gender was less in students with higher achievement, females, and who came from the city.

**Keywords:** Jordan, Middle East, Social phobia, Socio-demographics.

### 1. Introduction

The concept of social phobia was used by Janet (1903) to characterize the patient who was scared for being watched while speaking, talking to the other gender and so on, has symptoms of shame, anxiety and isolation. The individual with social phobia feels humiliated or criticized negatively by others in social activities. In scary situations phobic person feels embarrassed and experience physical symptoms of anxiety. The person with social phobia is also generally feels from the beginning of the anxiety reaction that it is associated with social or performance fear, and he rarely feels afraid of dying during episodes unlike person with panic attack (Justin et al., 2016).

Social phobia is the third most common psychiatric disorder after depression and alcohol addiction (Sareen et al., 2000). Its expansion ranges from 7-13% (Furmark, 2002). Only few people with this disorder have received any kind of treatment, despite the fact that the treatment options of this disorder are available (Crippa, 2009; Lydiard, 2001; Wittchen et al., 2003). Social phobia is an anxiety disorder recognized by remarkable and continuous scare from one or more social or performance status, the individual fears that he or she may act in a shameful way; the scary social or performance situations are avoided or else tolerated with stressful anxiety (DSM-IV-TR, 2000). Also social phobia defined as an anxiety disorder in which the individual has an extravagant and preposterous scare of social situations. Anxiety arises from a fear of being closely watched, controlled, and criticized by other people (Maeda et al., 2015).

An individual with social phobia disorder is scared that he or she may make faults, look bad, or be confused in the presence of others. The fear may get worse by deficiency of social skills or experience in social life. The phobia can progress and become a panic attack. As a result of the fear, the individual tolerate certain social situations in extreme or ideal way or may avoid them altogether (Hamm et al., 2014). Moreover, persons with social phobia usually are suffering from "anticipatory" anxiety, i.e. the fear of a situation before it even happens, for days or weeks before the event. In many cases, the individual is aware that his scare is preposterous, yet is unable to beat it. It is kind of unreasonable scare

---

\* College of Arts, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan. Received on 20/6/2017 and Accepted for Publication on 24/12/2017.

which has some symptoms of social phobia, so many people with social phobia disorder feel that there is something wrong but they don't consider it as a sign of illness. Symptoms of social phobia disorder may include: first, anxiety in social situations such as: avoiding public speaking; and it is the most common situation that university students have to tolerate. This situation is avoided by most persons with social phobia, which has been related with low levels of educational attainment (Coluccia, 2016). However, epidemiological data on social phobia in university students are uncommon. The second symptom is avoidance of social situations, and finally, some Physical symptoms of phobia such as: bewilderment, pounding heart, venation, shaking, blushing an so on (Swain et al., 2015).

Charter, et al, 2001, in their study on students of University of Parakou (UP), about the effect of social phobia disorder as well as some socio-demographic factors (gender and place of living) on their academic performance, have used a descriptive cross-sectional study with prospective data collection among 363 students selected randomly. The instrument of their study included Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI), the social anxiety intensity evaluation scale and the ASSIST to measure the compliance. They found that the prevalence of social phobia for in campus students was 11.6%, and its intensity was mild in 66.7%, moderate in 23.4%, severe in 7.1% and very severe in 2.8% only for female students. The gender and place of living (rural or urban) have affected negatively on students' academic performance in 57.1%. The remaining 42.9% were not affected.

Ferdalzgıç et al. (2004), in Turkey, have studied the relationship between prevalence of social phobia and body image and self-esteem. The subjects were 1003 selected from Cumhuriyet University randomly. Subjects were introduced to the Diagnostic Interview Schedule-III-Revised (DIS-III-R) Social Phobia Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Multidimensional Body–Self Relations Questionnaire (MBSRQ). Results reported that prevalence of social phobia in university students was 9.6% and past-year prevalence was 7.9%. Self-esteem decreased as social phobia increased. The body image was more distorted with higher levels of social phobia.

In Sweden Tillfors & Furmark, (2007) study they tested the prevalence of avoiding public speaking in a university student populations. They also tested some demographic factors and avoidant behavior in educational settings. They used the Social Phobia Screening Questionnaire (SPSQ)—a validated and DSM-IV compatible instrument. There sample was 753 students randomly selected. Appropriate questionnaires were collected from 523 students. The point prevalence of social phobia between the Swedish university students was 16.1%, while the prevalence of general population was 15.6%. Social phobia was correlated to the use of dysfunctional avoidance strategies in educational situations and in expectations of public speaking. The disorder was less among students who are involved in educational programs. Moreover, the results revealed that females and rural students were more avoidant in public speaking than males and urbans, as well as the scientific students were more avoidant than humanities students

In Brazil Baptista et al (2012), have studied the relationship between social phobia prevalence and academic achievement among large sample of college students in Brazil. The Social Phobia Inventory (SPIN) and the MINI-SPIN were used as the measurement of social phobia in the screening phase. The sample was 2319 students randomly selected from two universities. The results revealed that about 11.6% were suffering from social phobia. Students with social phobia had less academic achievement than the others. Women's with social phobia achievement was more affected negatively than men with this disorder. Also science colleges' students have more social phobia symptoms than other colleges' students.

Tillfor et al (2008) have studied social phobia among seventeen colleges in five Sweden districts. The instrument was the social phobia screening questionnaire-for children (SPSQ-C). The population was 2128 students and the results reported that the rate of prevalence was 4.4%. Boys' prevalence was less (1.8%) than girls' (6.6%), age had no effect on prevalence of social phobia.

In Egypt Afifi (2012) in her study studied the prevalence, severity, demographic variables of social anxiety disorder in a convenience sample of Egyptian university students, and its impact on their academic achievement. 300 undergraduate University students were assessed to detect social anxiety and quantify its severity using the standardized measure of Present State Examination, Symptom checklist prepared from DSM-IVTR diagnostic criteria for anxiety

disorders, Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale (LSAS) and Raulin & Wee Social Fear Scale (R&W). Results reported that 9.3% of students were diagnosed as having social anxiety disorder; most of them were females and students who came from rural areas. The most commonly feared/avoided situations in students with social anxiety disorder were 'Trying to make a romantic relationship' (82%) with other gender, followed by 'Giving a talk in front of an audience' (71%).

### **Problem of the study**

The importance of the present study comes from the desperate need to explore the impact of some Socio-demographic factors on Social Phobia among Jordanians University students. Moreover, the Jordan library and in general Arab library there is no studies in this area of re-search. The guiding assumption of this study is that problems and their treatment may have some ambiguity because there is no serious interest in these socio-psycho diseases. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

- 1- What is the order of social phobia aspects (Fear of crowds, Fear of public speaking, Fear of governors, Fear of other gender) among students in some universities' students?
- 2- What effects do university and personal variables (university, specialization, father education, mother education, income, gender, place of living and GPA) have on social phobia among students?
- 3- Can differences in type of social phobia be attributed to university students' demographic variables Such as (university, specialization, father education, mother education, income, gender, place of living and GPA)?

### **Method**

#### **The Population**

The population of this study consisted of all students from several universities in Jordan. The characteristics of the general population as follows: university, specialization, father education, mother education, income, gender, place of living and GPA.

#### **The Sample**

The study's sample consisted of 704 subjects; there were 288 males and 416 females students, and they came from the following universities: Tafeleh (193 students), Hashemite (220 students) and Yarmouk university (291 students). The sampling frame was randomly chosen. However, it is worth mentioning that the study targeted subjects from different back-grounds in terms of colleges, GPAs, income and where they come from.

#### **The Instruments**

To assess the social phobia, the researchers developed the instrument which was based upon prior instruments used in survey research by the authors and the literature review. The instrument was a Likert-type scale (1 = *at all*, 2 = *rarely*, 3 = *often*, and 4 = *most of times*). This instrument consisted of 21 items representing 4 domains of social phobia (Fear of crowds, Fear of public speaking, Fear of governors, Fear of other gender domains). The questionnaire scores range from 21 to 84. Validity of the instrument was confirmed using a panel of ten specialists in the fields of sociology and psychology. Based on the results of factor analysis as an indicator of construct validity for the test, four dimensions were covered in the instrument. These dimensions were as follows (see table 1):

- (a) Six items on the fear of crowds (e.g. fearing of participation in demonstrations).
- (b) Four items on the fear of administrators (e.g. fearing of to be one in delegation).
- (c) Five items on the fear of other gender (e.g. fearing of participation in mixed parties).
- (d) Six items on the fear of public speaking (e.g. fearing of public recitation).

**Table 1. Results of factor analysis**

Factor	Eigne value	PCT of variance	CUM PCT
Fear of crowds	6.23	30.138	30.138
Fear of administrators	1.29	6.158	36.297
Fear of other gender	1.175	5.596	41.893
Fear of public speaking	1.123	5.350	47.242
N=	704		

Reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha for the total score which was (.86), and the Cronbach's Alpha were calculated for each dimension in the scale as seen in table2.

**Table2.The coefficient of Cronbach's alpha**

Value domain	Coefficient alpha
Fear of crowds	.85
Fear of administrators	.75
Fear of other gender	.80
Fear of public speaking	.86
Total	.86

These results of validity and reliability considered are very satisfied for this study based on the scientific norms and criteria (Robinson et al., 1991).

### Study's variables

The independent variables were: university (1 for Hashemite, 2 for Yarmouk and 3 for Tafelah), specialization (1 for science, engineering and agriculture and 2 for humanities), GPA (1 for D, 2 for C, 3 for B and 4 for A), Father education (1 for illiterate, 2 for elementary, 3 for middle school, 4 for high school, 5 for university and 6 for higher education), gender (1 for males and 2 for females), and place of living (1 for city, 2 for village and 3 for nomadic).

The dependent variable was the social phobia disorder, as measured by the test as mentioned above.

### The Instructions

After the researchers had prepared the names and locations of the subjects, they met the subjects as groups in class rooms and they explained the purpose of the study and asked for their participation in filling out the questionnaires for the study. Instructions for answering the questionnaire items were delivered and subjects were instructed not to write their names on the questionnaires to ensure that their responses are confidential. Questionnaires were completed during a twenty minute period and collected by the researchers. Afterwards, the subjects were debriefed.

### Results

In order to answer the first question in this study, about the status of social phobia types based on the perception of students, means and S.D, were reported in table 3.

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the test dimensions (phobia types)**

Dimension	Mean	S.d
Crowds	13.78	3.59
Administrators	8.69	2.88
other gender	10.29	3.56
public speech	12.52	4.01
N= 704		

Findings indicated that phobia of administrators dimension (M=8.69) was the highest, while phobia of other gender (M=10.29) and public speech (M=12.52) dimensions were lower and the phobia of crowds dimension (M=13.78) was the lowest.

To test the effect of independent variables in the study (university, speciality, GPA, gender, father education and place of living) on the social phobia as a dependent variable (study questions 2), one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used (Table 4) to test the significant differences between the students' means based on each independent variable and the students' performance on the social phobia test (study questionnaire).

**Table 4. Summary of ANOVA to effects of each Independent variable on Satisfaction**

Source of variance	Sum of squares	DF	F	Sig. of F
University	699.371	<b>22.368</b>		<b>NS</b>
Specialization	574.467	<b>2</b>	30.592	<b>.001</b>
GPA	1793.481	<b>4</b>	101.322	<b>.000</b>
Gender	2199.13	<b>1</b>	15.202	<b>.04</b>
Father education	793.481	<b>4</b>	1.3	<b>NS</b>
Living place	3245.592	<b>3</b>	7.78	<b>.01</b>
N=	<b>704</b>			

The findings of ANOVA's in Table 4 showed that the variable specialization (F, (df, 2,677) = 30.592,  $P < 0.001$ ) and GPA (F, (df, 2,691) = 101.322  $p < .000$ ) were highly relevant to social phobia. Gender (F, (df, 1,701) = 15.02  $p < .04$ ) and place of living (F, (df, 2,661) = 7.78  $p < .01$ ) also had a significant effect on social phobia, while university (F, (df, 1,702) =  $p < NS$ ) and the father education (F, (df, 2,695) = 1.30  $p < NS$ ) did not have any significant effect on their satisfaction.

Statistical post comparison tests (*e.g. scheffe and Turkey HSD tests*) were performed to clarify the value of differences between means of each significant independent variable. The results indicated that there are significant differences between those students studying humanities as compared to those undertaking a basic science specialization. The humanities students were less socially phobic (M=45.54) than the basic science students (M=35.26).

In comparing students in terms of their achievement (GPA), the results showed that the lower GPA students had greater social phobia (M=43.33). There were significant differences between males (M=40.8671) and females in their Social phobia (M=46.9327). The results showed that the urban students were less socially phobic (M=46.95) than other students, while there were no differences between villagers (M=41.43), nomadic students (M=40.33) and camps students (M=39.89). The results of comparisons reported that there were no differences between students in terms of their university, however those from Yarmouk University had the lowest level of phobia (M=46.48) followed by those from Hashemite university (M=45.67) and the students from Tafeleh university had the highest level of phobia (M=44.17). Finally, the results reported that there were no differences between students social phobia in terms of their father educational attainment.

To investigate the third question of study about the effect of university life variables (independent variables) on each

Social phobia dimensions (fear of crowds, fear of administrators, fear of other gender and fear of public speaking), the multi analysis of variance statistical test (MANOVA) was used to test the effect of independent variables on a group of dependent variables together (Popham & Sirtonik 1992), because these dependent variables are relatively highly correlated (correlation coefficient ranged from .58 to .69). The findings using MANOVA (Hotelling model) indicated there are significant effects of some of these independent variables on some satisfaction dimensions (see table 5).

**Table 5. MANOVA (Hoteling) summary of effects of university life variables on each Satisfaction dimension**

Source of variance	Dependent Variable fear of:	F	Significance of F
Specialization	Crowds	1.59	NS
	Administrators	7.59	.001
	other gender	4.30	.040
	public speaking	3.32	.04
GPA	Crowds	.37	NS
	Administrators	1.52	NS
	other gender	7.61	.001
	public speaking	5.32	.04
Gender	Crowds	.93	NS
	Administrator	4.52	.04
	other gender	3.44	.04
	public speaking	.22	NS
Place of living	Crowds	3.61	.04
	Administrators	5.72	.04
	other gender	3.22	.04
	public speaking	1.76	NS

The results indicate that specialization has no significant effect on fear of crowds,  $F, (df, 1, 677) = 1.59 P < ns$ , while it has a significant effect on the fear of administrators,  $F, (df, 1, 677) = 7.59 P < .0001$ , on the fear of other gender,  $F, (df, 1, 677) = 4.30 P < .004$  and on the fear of public speech,  $F, (1, 677) = 3.32 P < .004$ . Also, the GPA variable has a significant effect on the fear of administrators  $F, (df, 4, 691) = 4.524 P < .029$ , and on the fear of other gender  $F, (df, 4, 691) = 3.44 P < .05$ , while there was no significant influence on the fear of crowds  $F, (df, 4, 691) = 1.1 P < ns$ , and on public speech  $F, (df, 4, 691) = .92 P < ns$ . The gender variable significantly affects fear of other gender and fear of administrators dimensions  $F, (df, 1, 701) = 3.44 P < .05$  and  $F, (df, 1, 701) = 4.52 P < .05$ , while it is not significant on the dimensions of fear of crowd and public speech,  $F, (df, 1, 701) = .93 P < ns$  and  $F, (df, 1, 701) = .93 P < ns$ . Finally, place of living variable had a significant effect on fear of other gender and fear of administrators dimensions  $F, (df, 3, 661) = 3.22 P < .05$  and  $F, (df, 3, 661) = 5.72, P < .05$ , and it was not significant for other variables: fear of crowds, and public speech,  $F, (df, 3, 661) = 1.44 P < ns$  and  $F, (df, 1, 661) = 1.76 P < ns$ .

A Turkey HSD post-hoc comparison tests were used to address the effects of specialization, GPA, gender and place of living as independent variables on the social phobia dimensions as dependent variables.

The Turkey HSD revealed that Arts students exhibited less fear of crowds ( $M=17.0$ ) than Scientific students ( $M=13.72$ ) and Business students ( $M=3.57$ ). Also, tests revealed that Arts students had acquired a less sense of fear of administrators ( $M=9.8$ ) than Science students ( $M=8.67$ ), while science students were lesser in fear of other gender

(M=10.23) than arts students (M=8.88). finally, there is no difference between arts and science students (M=12.63) (M=12.42) in public speech.

For GPA, the Turkey HSD revealed that excellent students possessed less fear of crowds (M=15.08), fear of administrators (M=9.67), fear of other gender (M=10.46) and fear of public speech (M=12.84) than accepted level students who had fear of crowds (M=12.14), administrators (M=9.8), fear of other gender (M=8.67) and fear of public speech (M= 8.23), while there are no any significant differences between other levels of achievement. For gender variable, the Turkey HSD test revealed that female students had less fear all kinds (crowds, M=14.17, administrators, M=8.92, other gender, M=10.7 and fear of public speech, M=13.6) than male students (fear of crowds, M=13.26, administrators, M=8.2, other gender, M=9.8 and fear of public speech, M=11.73). Finally, in place of living variable students from city had less fear of all kinds of fear (fear of crowds, M=13.35, administrators, M=8.41, other gender, M=9.8 and fear of public speech, M=12.26) followed by students come from camps, (fear of crowds, M=13.76, administrators, M=8.97, other gender, M=9.8 and fear of public speech, M=12.12.53) followed by villagers, (fear of crowds, M=14.26, administrators, M=8.0, other gender, M=10.43 and fear of public speech, M=12.53, while the students who came from nomadic areas had the most fear in all kinds (fear of crowds, M=16.3, administrators, M=14.2, other gender, M=14.0 and fear of public speech, M=16.5).

## Discussion

In addressing the first question of the study, the findings (table 3) show that fear of Administrators among students is the highest, followed by other gender and public speech, while the fear of crowds is the lowest. In addition, comparison tests showed that significant means differences exist between fear of Administrators and all other aspects of social phobia. There are also differences between fear of public speech and the following aspects: Other gender and administrators.

The above results about range of social phobia among university students reflect an important indicator about students' adjustment and stability in their university life. The results indicated that fear of administrators aspect ranked first with a significant difference from all other aspects, which implies that student's do suffer from anxiety, feeling shy and losing initiation (Baptista et al. (2012)). Moreover, this result indicated that students do have some problems in their relationships with their colleagues especially the other gender, public social situations and environment in their universities as Baptista et al. (2012) indicated in their study on Brazil universities. This result is very reasonable in the Arab social context. The traditions of Arab society are trying to formulate the youths in general as a second class people, for example, the youths have to respect the elders and governors, which reflect on students' behavior and personality, to be some weak and followers in the public life aspects as Afifi (2012) indicated in her study in Egypt.

The fear of other gender aspect produced the second greatest level of social phobia, that was expected because of the difficulties that the Jordanian person experience such as the very rigid determinations in concern of relationship between male and female on basis of religion, as known, Islam prohibits any sexual or friendship relationships between man and woman out of marriage. This result agreed with most of studies on universities in the Islamic world. For example, Ibn Baz reported in all his studies that any kind of relationship or direct interaction between man and woman is *haram* (prohibited).

Fear of public speech came as the third highest level of social phobia. Those who were interviewed reported some positive aspects, such as willing to make class presentation which grant some chances to his personality to grow up. At the same time they indicated some serious problems which effect their participation in public events. This result is expected and was confirmed several studies, such as Tillfors & Furmark study (2007), who found similar problems for their students (sample) in Sweden. The vast majority of sample students who have a specific personal barrier such as tachycardia in public conferences participation are avoiding any kind of talks or setting in the front seats.

The fear of crowds is the last and came very close to fear of public speech. As well known, most of Phobic people regarding crowds are suffering from several symptoms and problems, such as: feeling of not being able to breathe or being shocked. This result is consistent with Maria Tillfors et al. (2008) as indicated in their study, that kind of fear is

spread between students because they came from specific social background such as minorities.

In regard to the second question of this study, the findings (table 4) reported that GPA has a strong effect on the social phobia range. As expected, GBA was significant in its effect on students' social phobia. This result is similar to Tillfors, & Furmark, (2007) study. They reported that most of students who have problems of some phobia types are suffering from academic performance problems. Also, many students with social phobia experience a lack of focus in class due to that those students with Social phobia were associated with use of dysfunctional avoidant strategies in most of the educational situations. This result may be due to that they have lower level of motivation and more carelessness in regard to their achievement than higher achieving students.

Concerning the effect of specialization on social phobia among the subjects, the results clearly showed that the humanities' students had a less level of social phobia than the science. That was expected, because the students in this field have more chances in their Curriculums to be well socialized compared to the pure sciences. The nature of their study does contain collective element, which is problematic for other students, who have rigid Curriculums, in other words, they do not have the chance to develop their social senses like humanities students.

The results illustrated significant differences between males and females in their social phobia. Males have more social phobia than females. This result was consistent with Baptista et al. (2012), who found that females can get more chance in the university to participate in several activities than males, which helps them to strengthen their personality. A different result was reported in Afifi, 2012 study which is reported that females have more social phobia than males, because the Egyptian society is giving males more freedom than females.

For the place of living, the results reported that urban students have the lowest level of social phobia and nomadic students were the highest. This result is expected by the researchers and is consisted with Charter's study (2001). The students who came from cities have the best opportunities such as social media and more liberal context, to build their personality than students who came from rural or nomadic areas, which are deprived and conservative.

The speciality has a significance in some aspects of social phobia (fear of Administrators and other gender), the pure sciences' students have more fear of those kinds of fear than other students. This result can be interpreted on the basis of orientation, scientific students have not been prepared through their study to be more socialized and socially interactive since their childhood stages and culturally they are not ready to interface the leaders or other gender.

It was also revealed that the GPA of students (As and Bs levels) had less social phobia than others. This result can be attributed to that high achievers could develop their personality to be more able to deal with the several social situations such as: fear of other gender and public speech, which is considered very complicated in Arabic culture as Afifi (2012), indicated.

Moreover, the gender was a strong variable in its effect on the fear of administrators and other gender. The result revealed that male students had more social phobia (fear of Administrator and other gender) than female students, this result may be due to that male students have more suffering than females in terms of access to get chances in activities participation because girls get more support from men and men administrators (Baptista et al., 2012).

Finally, the place of living has affected most of social phobia types (fear of crowds, administrators and other gender). This result is expected and consisted with the literature, and the area has significant impact on personality structure, and it is a crucial factor in social development to be more strong and asserted. Therefore, this result is very reasonable in traditional Arab environment specially the nomadic area which is closed and deprived from many social chances, while the other areas such as urban, are more opened and has more access to supported instruments facilities, to help the individual to grow up socially and psychologically (Afifi, 2012).

### **Research limitations/implications**

The present findings can be considered as limited and hard to generalize on all Jordan's universities, because the gap between them in their social activities services is very large. Some of universities have very good chances in social activities, while the activities of other universities are very limited or not existed.



## Recommendations

This study may help to establish a significant contribution in offering a background to other studies in this field on Arab societies. Moreover, these results can clarify the modern trends of universities orientations such as social, educational and service changes. The findings suggest that more attention has to be given to the social service especially in the offering chances to students' participation in academic and social events. Moreover, like this study has to be done on other universities to evaluate their services and events.

## REFERENCES

- Baptista C., A. et al. (2008) Social phobia in Brazilian university students: Prevalence, under-recognition and academic impairment in women, *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 136 (3), 857-861.
- Borden, W.B. et al. (1999). Social phobia: Axis I and II correlates. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 100 (3), 877-88.
- Chartier, M.J. Walker, J. R. and Stein, M.B. (2001). Social phobia and potential childhood risk factors in a community sample, *Psychological Medicine*, 31 (2), 307-315.
- Coluccia, A., Fagiolini, F., Costoloni, A.G. and Goracci, S.B. (2016). Adult obsessive-compulsive disorder and quality of life outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis, *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 22, 41.
- Crippa, J.A. et al. (2009). Cannabis and anxiety: a critical review of the evidence, *Human Psychopharmacology*, vol. 24 (7), 515-523.
- Dina Youssri Afifi. (2012). Faculty of Medicine-Cairo University Under S Under Supervision of upervision of Dr. Emad HamdiGhoz Professor of Psychiatry Faculty of Medicine- Cairo University Dr. Amany Ahmed Abdou Professor of Psychiatry Faculty of Medicine-Cairo University Faculty of Medicine Cairo University.
- Furmark, T. (2002). Social phobia: overview of community surveys. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 105 (2), 84-93.
- Hamm, L. (2014). Aberrant amygdala functional connectivity at rest in pediatric anxiety disorders, *Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders*, 4, 1.
- Justin., W; Akanksha S, A, Ashley N., A., Howell, A., Menatti, R. (2016). Speaking More than Words”: Classifying Men with Social Anxiety Disorder via Vocal Acoustic Analyses of Diagnostic Interviews, *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 38 (1), 30.
- Janet (1903). The relationship of social phobia subtypes and avoidant personality disorder P Janet; *Les Obsessions et la Psychasthenie* (ed 3) Alcan, Paris, France.
- IbnBaz, A., A., Islamic Fatawas (advisory opinion), *FatawaIslam.com*. <https://www.binbaz.org.sa/article/127>.
- Izqi, F., Akyüz, F., Doğan Nesim, O. (2004). Social Phobia among University Students and its Relation to Self-Esteem and Body Image. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 49 (9), 630-534.
- Lydiard, R. (2001). Social anxiety disorder: Comorbidity and its implications. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 62 (11), 17-24.
- Kessler RC, Stein MB, Berglund P. (2005). Social phobia subtypes in the National Comorbidity Survey. *Am J Psychiatry* 155:613–619PubMedGoogle Scholar
- Maeda, K.; Sekiguchi, M.; Horiuchi, S.; Justin W. Weeks, Sakano, Y. (2015). Reliability and Validity of a Japanese Version of the Fear of Positive Evaluation Scale, *Anxiety Disorder Research*, 6 (2), 113.
- Rapee RM and Spence, S, H, 2004, The etiology of social phobia: empirical evidence and an initial model. *Clin Psychol Rev* ; 2477, 37-67.
- Sareen, J. and Stein, M. (2000). A review of the epidemiology and approaches to the treatment of social anxiety disorder. *Drugs* 59:497-509 PubMed
- Stein MB, Torgrud LJ, Walker JR. (2000). Social phobia symptoms, subtypes, and severity: findings from a community survey. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 57:1046-1052PubMedCro
- Swain, J.; Hancock, K.; Dixon, A.; Bowman, J., 2015, Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for children: A systematic review of intervention studies, *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 4, 2, 73.
- Tillfors, M.; Furmark, T.; Lewenhaupt, S.; M.; Eriksson, M.; Bengt E. Westling, B., Andersson, G. (2008), Treating university students with social phobia and public speaking fears: internet delivered self-help with or without live group exposure sessions, *Depression and anxiety, the official journal of ADDA* Vol. 25, 8, 2, 708-717.
- Tillfors, M. & Furmark, T., *SocPsychiat Epidemiol*. (2007). doi:10.1007/s00127-006-0143-2. 42: 79.
- Timothy and Atezaz. (1999). Assessment of social anxiety and its correlates among undergraduates in southwestern Nigeria BO Mokuolu - *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*, 21 (1), 324-335
- Wittchen, H., U., Kessler, C.R., Katja, B., Petra, K., Mivhael, H. and Jurgen H. (2002). Generalized anxiety and depression in primary care: prevalence. Recognition and Management. *J. Clin Psychiatry*, 63 (8), 24-34.

## الرهاب الاجتماعي لدى طلبة الجامعات في الأردن

*Fayez A. Simadi, Abdalah M. Gazan \**

### ملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل ظاهرة الرهاب الاجتماعي بين طلاب الجامعات في الأردن والتعرف إلى تأثير المحيط الاجتماعي المتعلق بالبيئة الجامعية. تكونت عينة الدراسة من 704 طلاب من جامعات مختلفة. وقد تم استخدام تحليل التباين الأحادي ANOVA وتحليل التباين المتعدد MANOVA لاختبار دور المؤثرات الاجتماعية الديمغرافية في إيجاد أعراض الرهاب والتي تشمل الخوف من: الازدحامات، التحدث أمام جمهور، الإداريين، والتجمهر في الطابور. بينما تشمل المتغيرات الاجتماعية الديمغرافية: موقع الجامعة، التخصص، الجنس، المعدل التراكمي، تعليم الوالد ومكان السكن. وأظهرت النتائج أن الخوف من الإدارة كان أكثر العوامل تأثيراً يتبعها الجنس ثم التحدث أمام جمهور. بينما أظهرت نتائج ANOVA أن جميع المتغيرات كان لها دلالة إحصائية مهمة باستثناء متغيري موقع الجامعة وعمل الوالد. بينما تبين من خلال MANOVA تأثير الجنس (لصالح الإناث) ومكان الإقامة (لصالح المدينة) والمعدل (لصالح المعدل المرتفع) على الخوف من: الإداريين، الجنس الآخر، التجمهر والتحدث أمام الجمهور. **الكلمات الدالة:** الأردن، الشرق الأوسط، الرهاب الاجتماعي، التركيبة السكانية الاجتماعية.

\* كلية الآداب، قسم علم الاجتماع والعمل الاجتماعي، جامعة اليرموك، الأردن. تاريخ استلام البحث 2017/6/20، وتاريخ قبوله 2017/12/24.