

Guilt and Shame Proneness in Young Adults: Exploring Relation with Personality and Well-Being

Jagrika Bajaj* & Mansimran Kaur**

*Student, MSc. Clinical Psychology, Christ University, Bengaluru

** Student, Masters in Business Administration, Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad

*Shame and guilt are common emotional experiences in an individual's life. Even though a substantial part of our life is spent in either experiencing or avoiding shame and guilt, we disengage from such deliberations. The present study focuses on bringing forth the relationship between personality traits and the emotions of guilt and shame and its subsequent impact on the well-being of the individual. The study aims to understand if personality mediates the management of guilt and shame in everyday life experiences. For the purpose of the study, 80 participants (40 males, 40 females) in age range of 15 to 30 years, using convenient and purposive sampling, were selected. For the purpose of data collection, Big Five Inventory (McCrae and John, 1992) was administered to determine personality traits of an individual while Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale (Cohen, Wolf, Panter and Insko, 2011) was administered to understand an individual's propensity to experience guilt. Additionally, Flourishing Scale (Diener et al, 2010) was used to assess the subjective well-being of an individual. Subsequently, *t* scores and correlation coefficients were calculated to study the interplay of personality, guilt and shame and wellbeing in young adults. Results indicate that gender differences exist on negative self-evaluation aspect of shame and significant correlations have been observed between facets of guilt and shame and personality traits of conscientiousness and agreeableness. Further it has been observed that participants high on guilt repair have higher subjective well-being.*

Keywords: guilt, shame, well-being, personality traits

Introduction

Theology, philosophy and psychology particularly psychoanalysis along with literature are among the few disciplines which have studied the constructs of guilt and shame. These two emotions are experienced by a lot of people on a daily basis but they fail to understand them. These emotions colour the way we feel, act and respond to situations in ways that sometimes we don't even realize. The subtle yet significant difference that exists between these two emotions is often overlooked by many. The common understanding of these emotions is a bit similar to the words from where they are derived from. 'Shame' that is derived from the root *kam/kem* translates to 'hiding' or 'to cover' and 'Guilt' from the old English word 'gild' which loosely refers to money. Shame and guilt are often thought of as being similar. A lot of discussions has been done on the differences and similarities between these two emotions and the possibility of it being interrelated. Guilt is understood often as subset of moral shame. As the individual is seen as the causal agent, guilt and shame are considered to be similar. (Karlsson & Sjöberg, 2009).

At the same time, shame and guilt can also be seen as differing phenomenologically. Individuals can feel exposed to public disapproval when ashamed. Guilt is more attuned to personal worries of having done wrong. Moreover, a failure that can be controlled also culminates in guilt which often results in individuals trying to make amends. However, it is the sense of failure stemming from inadequacy that leads to shame and is also characterized by negative self-evaluation (Einstein & Lanning, 1998). Lindsay-Hartz (1984) through a qualitative study elucidated on the structural differences in experiencing guilt and shame. They found out that shame is associated with feelings of 'getting out' of the situation while guilt is involved with an effort to make things right again. Moreover, they found out that when an individual experience shame, they 'feel small' and the experience transforms their identity while when they experience guilt, it only shakes their identity. The act of reparation and an interpersonal transaction was found to be more associated with experiencing guilt. Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton (1994) found guilt arises in interpersonal transgressions and this emotion was most common in interpersonal relationships.

Distinguishing between guilt and shame also depends to the degree to which individuals are applying these emotional labels to identify their own actions or the actions of others. Schmader & Lickel (2006) found out that people find it much easier to label experiences of others correctly while found it difficult to distinguish shame and guilt in self-caused acts.

The overlapping definitions and experience of states of shame and guilt makes it difficult to discriminate one from other, nonetheless, important differences exist between the two (Cohen, Wolf, Panter, & Insko, 2011).

The nature of these differences, however, are hotly contested. As of now, the difference between shame and guilt is majorly understood on two criterion- the self- behaviour distinction and the public-private distinction. Following the self-behaviour distinction, guilt emerges when an individual makes unstable internal attributions that are specific to individual's actions and lead to the negative feeling in regard to the behaviour that they have committed. On the other hand, shame arises when one makes stable internal attribution, not specific to an action but global about one's self, leading to negative feelings about the global self.

Differentiating guilt and shame through the public-private distinction proposes that misdeeds that remain private are more likely to produce feelings of guilt while the failures that have been publicly disclosed are more likely to needle feelings of shame. Following this idea of distinction, guilt arises when an individual believes that s/he has done something that doesn't comply with their conscience and is linked with a personal feeling of doing something wrong. Shame, alternatively, arises when the failures and misdeeds of an individual get the public eye. Thus, guilt and shame are in this way different. (Cohen, Wolf, Panter, & Insko, 2011). This brings into the equation of how people who experience both of these emotions are different thus bringing the concept of individual differences into play.

The Present Study

Guilt and shame are often interchangeably used and are considered as synonymous words in the English language. But are these two distinct emotions? What do I feel when I am berated? Is it the same if I do something wrong and feel anxious? Why is it that a similar situation has a different effect on two people with all aspects same but different temperaments? Does my personality make me more

prone to feeling shades of guilt and shame? Does this influence my happiness? Further does the experience of guilt and shame influence a person's well-being.

The present study makes an attempt at exploring the relationship between the experience of guilt and shame and people's personalities and their well-being. We do not experience guilt and shame in isolation. Who we are, the people we interact with and how we cope with different life experiences also impact our feelings of guilt and shame. Our actions can result from our need to eliminate that guilt or hide from the shame. The role of culture is also very important in this. A culture is made up of different individuals who share the same beliefs, customs, encompassing language and rituals to a large extent. To understand the cultural bases in experiencing Shame and Guilt, Wallbott and Scherer (1995) hypothesized that whereas 'shame cultures' regulate the behaviour of their members via external sanctions, 'guilt cultures' have internalized sanctions. In other words, shame cultures regulate conduct via compliance and external pressure on the individual and guilt cultures do the same via internalization. Hence according to this India would be a 'shame culture.' For example, in India, lust is accepted at an individual level but rejected at a social level. There is little guilt at lust, but rather, shame if that lust is exposed to society.

Even in the same culture, no two people are truly similar. No two people can ever have the same experience of life, the same perspective, go through similar trials and tribulations, have the same mind or even react to the different life situations in the same ways. Thus, what makes everyone unique is the personality of an individual. According to Allport (1937), "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his characteristics behaviour and thought". While Freud believed that an individual's personality was determined largely by one's unconscious thoughts and desires. These are among the various conceptualisations of the construct of personality. The trait approach to personality focuses on studying human personality by identifying and measuring the degree to which certain personality traits are existing in individuals. Traits are defined as recurring patterns of behaviours and thought, such as openness to new things, anxiousness, shyness; exist from individual to individual. Traits are an individual's patterns of understanding and dealing with the world around them. In the present study, Big Five approach to personality (McCrae & John, 1992)

has been used that makes use of factor analysis trait approach. Often called by acronym OCEAN, this model includes the dimensions: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Personality plays an important role in determining how prone we as individuals would be to the emotions of guilt and shame. In the same situation, one person might be weighed down by the feeling of guilt while someone else might just walk away unaffected by it. Similarly, someone might be ashamed in a situation while others might not be. Understanding how personality affects these emotions is important as it controls how we react to the situation in daily lives. Einstein & Lanning (1998) believed that by following Singer & Bonanno (1990) argument, the trait of extraversion can be associated with shame and guilt could be related with the traits of agreeableness and conscientiousness. Einstein & Lanning (1998) found out that significant correlations were present between the five traits but they were related to guilt and shame in different ways. While shame was positively correlated with neuroticism and agreeableness, it was negatively correlated with extraversion. In regard to guilt, there were positive correlations between empathetic guilt and agreeableness and between anxious guilt and neuroticism.

As a member of this dynamic world, we have to deal with these and numerous other emotions in our daily lives. It is important to understand how these emotions, especially guilt and shame affect us. This study also looks into the Subjective well-being (SWB) of individuals calculated using the Flourishing Scale. Subjective well-being basically refers to how people experience the quality of their lives and includes a combination of both emotional reactions as well as cognitive judgments of individuals. It is stable over time and has relations with the personality traits of an individual. SWB includes under it positive and negative affect, life satisfaction and happiness.

Thus, the purpose of the present study was to offer an understanding into the relationship between personality traits and their dynamic interplay with shame and guilt and its subsequent effect on the subjective well-being. Shame and guilt are emotions that almost all experience, but upon which, only few wish to dwell even when a great part of one's life is spent in either experiencing or avoiding shame and guilt. The study aimed to understand if a correlation prevails between an individual having a certain disposition and his/her ordeal with guilt and shame as constructs in their everyday experiences. Previous

researches had focused only on the trait approach and its correlation with guilt and shame. Moreover, the effect on subjective well-being in correlation with guilt and shame has hardly been explored. This research aimed to understand whether certain traits are more prone to experiencing emotions of anxiety and guilt. The aim was not only to understand this correlation but also if it had an effect on their self-perception of well-being and happiness.

Method

Participants

Target population for the present research was individuals belonging to the age group of 15-30 years (Mean age = 22.5 years). Purposive and convenience sampling were used to select the participants for the survey. Initially, a pilot study was conducted on 10 students. The data was then collected from 83 participants but due to incomplete responses by some respondents, the final study consisted of 80 participants.

Measures

GASP (Guilt proneness and Shame Proneness Scale). Developed by Cohen, Wolf, Panter and Insko (2011). The GASP assesses guilt proneness and shame proneness of individuals and not the feelings of these emotions in the moment. It consists of 16 questions that are based on scenarios. Respondents read about these situations likely to occur in their everyday lives and give their reactions to these. This scale has internal reliability and construct validity > 0.60 .

The GASP comprises two guilt-proneness subscales: Guilt Repair and Guilt negative behaviour evaluation; and two shame-proneness subscales: Shame withdraw and Shame negative self-evaluation. Guilt Negative Behaviour Evaluation items describe negative feelings one experiences about the actions one has committed (e.g., "you would feel that the way you acted was pathetic"). Guilt-repair items are more focused on the actual behaviour or intention of the individual to recompense for the transgression (e.g., "you would try to act more considerately toward your friends"). Shame-withdraw items describe actions focused on hiding or withdrawing from the public (e.g., "you would avoid the guests until they leave"). Shame Negative Self Evaluation items describe the negative feeling one experiences about oneself (e.g., "you would feel like a bad person").

Big Five Inventory. Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999) is a 44-item inventory that

assesses a person on five dimensions of personality namely Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to experience. The scale has a reliability of 0.89 and validity of 0.92.

Flourishing scale. Developed by Diener et al. (2010), it is an 8-item scale used to assess the subjective well-being of individuals. This scale focuses on important aspects of human functioning that include positive relationships, feelings of competence, to having meaning and purpose in life (Diener, et al., 2009). The validity and reliability of the scale was given to be >0.60.

Procedure

The planning of the study included the formation of the questionnaire as well as the selection of the target population. The pilot study was conducted on 10 participants. The data obtained was studied carefully and analysed. Following this, the questionnaire was revised and edited. The final study

was done on individuals from the age range of 15 to 30 years. Convenience and purposive sampling were followed to get the total sample size of 80. A Google Form was constructed to be circulated to participants belonging to various regions. The questionnaire was available in only one language i.e., English, so only those who could understand English were included in the sample. The consent of those willing to participate was taken in the beginning of the questionnaire and were asked to fill their required demographic information. The participants were requested to give honest responses and they were assured that the information they shared would be used for academic purposes only. The final questionnaire had 4 sections – a general introduction and consent form, Guilt and shame proneness scale, OCEAN's Big Five Inventory and Flourishing scale. After the data was collected, the analysis was carried out using SPSS. The analysis included an independent t-test to look for gender differences and correlations between and shame and guilt subscales and personality traits.

Results

Table 1: Table showing Means, SD and t on variables on gender.

	MEANS		SD		t (df=78)
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Shame Withdraw	3.0000	3.1625	0.92161	1.00408	-0.754
Shame Negative Self-Evaluation (Nse)	4.9250	5.4688	0.97763	1.05792	-2.387*
Guilt Repair	5.5938	5.5438	0.83721	0.90562	0.256
Guilt Negative Behaviour Evaluation (Nbe)	5.1750	5.1438	1.14662	1.24921	0.117

*p<.05

Table 2: Correlation between Shame and Guilt subscales and Personality Traits

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Shame Withdraw (1)	.223*	0.094	-0.150	-0.046	-0.021	0.003	0.097	-0.285*	-0.060
Shame Negative Self-Evaluation (2)	1	.410**	.243*	0.137	.368**	.239*	0.124	-0.041	0.211
Guilt Repair (3)		1	0.134	0.110	.270*	.277*	-0.092	0.058	.251*
Guilt Negative Behaviour Evaluation (4)			1	0.194	.407**	.431**	-0.057	0.178	.324**
Extraversion (5)				1	.262*	.372**	-.262*	.358**	.380**
Agreeableness (6)					1	.395**	-0.173	.302**	.298**
Conscientiousness (7)						1	-.260*	.417**	.718**
Neuroticism (8)							1	-.330**	-.332**
Openness to Experience (9)								1	.414**
Flourishing Score (10)									1

*p<.05; **p<0.01

Discussion

Guilt and shame are common emotional episodes in everyone's lives where they unbeknown to us, they drive and influence our behaviour. Many times they are considered to be the same while at others there are stark differences between them. The differences in individual proneness to guilt and shame in various situation and its respective impact on well-being intrigued us. Also, our curiosity was heightened by the fact that almost no researches were done on a topic of this nature solely in the Indian context.

In the present study, it was found that both males and females score higher on the guilt subscales namely Guilt Repair and Guilt NBE than on the shame subscales namely Shame withdrawal and Shame NSE.

Out of these, Shame withdrawal was the least. However, in a study by Anolli & Pascucci (2005) which examined the experience of these emotions as well as their proneness in Indian and Italian young adults, it was found that Indian participants responded more strongly to experiences of shame than to guilt as compared to Italians who showed a reverse trend. In terms of proneness towards these emotions, Indians were found to be sensitive to both guilt and shame.

In our study, gender differences were found on shame NSE. Women are more likely than men to experience shame NSE ($t = -2.387$, $p = 0.019$). In the Indian context, due to Gender Stereotyping women tend to adhere to cultural norms which subjects them to be obedient and submissive of their actions and experience societal pressure leading to feelings of

shame if deter from societal norms while men enjoy greater autonomy.

Relationship between Guilt and Shame

From Table 2, it can be seen that there is a positive correlation between Guilt Negative Behaviour Evaluation and Shame Negative Self-evaluation ($r = .243, p < 0.01$). Experience of a situation or a self-afflicted action/behaviour is never isolated to be interpreted either from an individual perspective or a social standpoint. It is a dynamic interplay of both. Hence the emotions attached to both social and personal experience come into play prompting a tangle of interrelated emotions distinct in their own right yet. Cohen, Wolf, Panter, and Insko, (2011) believed that since guilt and shame, particularly guilt-NBE and shame-NSE, are self-conscious emotions and often occur together so an individual feels bad not only about their behaviour but themselves too when they commit transgressions. The correlation between Shame NSE and guilt repair showed a strong positive correlation ($r = .410, p < 0.05$). This indicates that the people who feel bad after committing a private transgression to try and alleviate this feeling by partaking in repairing acts. A positive correlation between shame withdrawal and shame NSE ($r = .223, p < 0.01$) is also found. Shame-withdrawal items describe action tendencies focused on hiding or withdrawing from the public while shame negative self-evaluation (NSE) items describe feeling bad about oneself. Both are negative self-conscious emotions often occurring in league with each other in social situations. Thus, following a transgression, an individual feels bad about both their behaviour and themselves.

Personality Correlates of Guilt and Shame

From Table 2, a significant negative correlation between shame withdrawal and openness to experience ($r = -.285, p < 0.01$) can be seen. Openness to Experience focuses on all aspects of an individual's mental and experiential life. If a person who is low on openness's exposed to a public transgression, then he/ she would experience shame withdrawal and try to hide/ escape the situation in order to reduce the possibility of experiencing shame. Similar results were observed in a study by Einstein & Lanning (1998) where a reversed relation was seen between openness to experience and shame.

Shame Negative Self Evaluation items define the negative feeling one experiences about oneself (e.g., "you would feel like a bad person"). In turn, this subscale garners some information about the moral

trait in an individual while the shame withdraw scale does not. In this study, we found a significant positive correlation between Shame-NSE and agreeableness ($r = .368, p < 0.05$). Agreeableness includes traits such as altruism, tender-mindedness, trust, and modesty and refers to a prosocial and communal orientation towards others. High scorers on Agreeableness show empathy and are altruistic, while low scorers depict selfish behaviour and a lack of empathy. Moreover, in regard to decision making, the individuals with high shame-NSE scores would have a low probability of unethical decision making as compared to individuals with high shame-withdraw scores who would be more likely to make unethical decisions. Thus, people who are high on shame NSE are also high on agreeableness. Such individuals because of their empathy, trust, kind and sympathetic nature are much prone to find faults with oneself rather than other so experience more instances of shame negative self-evaluation. In our study, we found a negative, though not significant, the correlation between agreeableness and shame withdrawal. While previous research by Cohen, Wolf, Panter, & Insko (2011), these correlations have been found to be significant.

Also, there is a significant positive correlation between shame negative self-evaluation and conscientiousness ($r = 0.239, p < 0.01$). Conscientiousness is characterized by actions such as thinking before acting, self-discipline, purposeful action, following rules, organizing and planning but too much priority to such acts can become psychologically overbearing (Erden & Akbag, 2015). Thus, it can be said that conscientious individuals may not be able to free themselves or let go of previous transgressions or failures which leads to shame NSE.

Guilt-repair items are more focused on the actual behaviour or intention of the individual to recompense for the transgression (e.g., "you would try to act more considerately toward your friends"). In the present study, we have a significant positive correlation between guilt repair and agreeableness ($r = .270, p < 0.01$) and guilt repair and conscientiousness ($r = .277, p < 0.01$). The individuals who are high on agreeableness are thus, predisposed to prosocial behaviour and are perceived as warm, caring and kind; such individuals would have a greater tendency of correcting their transgression/failure to reduce the guilt that their actions have brought. Similarly, individuals high on conscientiousness; who follow rules and norms would be more inclined toward correcting their wrongs to compensate for the amount of guilt they feel. This was also found in a research by

Lanning and Einstein (1998). Guilt Negative Behaviour Evaluation items describe negative feelings one experiences about the actions one has committed (e.g., “you would feel that the way you acted was pathetic”). It has a significant positive correlation with agreeableness ($r = .407, p < 0.05$) and conscientiousness ($r = .431, p < 0.05$). This is corroborated by previous studies done by Einstein and Lanning (1998) and by Abe (2004). Einstein and Lanning (1998) found that both Neuroticism (N) and Agreeableness (A) were related to aspects of shame and guilt but in a different way. Since agreeable personality types always are cooperative and take care of those around them, they are more in tune with others feelings and any action on their part that can disrupt communal harmony induces the feeling of guilt in them for having failed to maintain peace. While on the other hand conscientious individuals being task oriented and think before acting. When their own actions lead to a private failure they find loopholes in their planning and actions thus, tend to feel guilt at not having acted in an orderly fashion. Other significant negative correlations Einstein and Lanning (1998) were able to achieve was between Extraversion and Anxious Guilt, and Openness and Shame. In the present study, there was no significant correlation between extraversion and guilt/shame but a significant negative correlation between openness and shame was present.

Relationship between Guilt and Shame, Personality and Well Being

Furthermore, we found the Subjective well-being (SWB) using the Flourishing Scale. The scale provides a single psychological well-being score which is indicative of how people experience the quality of their lives and include both emotional reactions and cognitive judgments. Results indicate that flourishing had a significant positive correlation with guilt repair ($r = .251, p < 0.01$) and guilt negative behaviour evaluation (NBE) ($r = .324, p < 0.05$). Guilt is a negative emotion that decreases the comprehensive evaluation of a person's own personal satisfaction and happiness. So, they would have a greater tendency of correcting their transgression/failure to reduce the guilt that their actions have brought to restore their self-perception of being happy and satisfied.

In the present study, SWB was found to have a strong correlation with the personality traits too. It is positively and significantly correlated with extraversion ($r = .380, p < 0.05$), agreeableness ($r = .298, p < 0.05$), conscientiousness ($r = .718, p < 0.05$) and openness to experience ($r = .414, p < 0.05$). It is

negatively but significantly correlated with neuroticism ($r = -.332, p < 0.05$). Neuroticism tends to predict low scores in subjective well-being whilst extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience tend to predict higher SWB. It can be reasoned that an individual who scores high on neuroticism would suffer from more depressed states and would view life from a negative lens, which negatively impacts their well-being. Albuquerque, Lima, Matos, & Figueiredo (2013) found that neuroticism, extraversion and conscientiousness facets were significantly able to explain the variance in subjective well-being components (positive affect, negative affect and life satisfaction) thereby, suggesting personality traits played a role in the subjective evaluation of one's well-being. In a meta-analysis by Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz (2008), all aspects of SWB were found to be significantly related to neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Though neuroticism was the strongest predictor of overall SWB, quality of life was strongly predicted by neuroticism, extraversion and conscientiousness and modestly by openness to experience and agreeableness.

With the help of this study, we were able to bring to light the fact that in the present times in the given cultural context how the dynamic interplay of facets of five personality traits bring into play an ascendancy on guilt and shame as experiences and, consequently influence self-perception of well-being. As expected, a correlation between shame/ guilt and the five traits were found. Shame withdrawal was negatively correlated with openness to new experiences. Shame NSE, guilt repair and guilt NBE were positively correlated with both agreeableness and conscientiousness. There was also a negative correlation between neuroticism and guilt subscales but these were not significant. Under Big Five Facets only agreeableness and conscientiousness were seen to be positively correlated not only with guilt but also shame as was seen by Einstein and Lanning in 1998 using TOSCA scale. Both of these traits along with extraversion and openness were seen to be positively correlated with subjective well-being much like Steel, Schmidt and Shultz observed in their study in 2008, focusing on individual measures of personality (e.g., the Neuroticism-Extroversion-Openness Personality Inventory; Costa & McCrae, 1992) and categories of SWB (e.g., life satisfaction).

Implications, limitations and directions for future research

In the present study, it has been found that in

Indian sub-context guilt is a much more defining factor that colour their walk-through tribulations of life than shame. Conscientiousness and Agreeableness are the most common traits under Big five that influence the societal and personal effect of guilt and shame in everyday life. Moreover, the subjective well-being of individuals who are more prone to experience guilt was better as these tend to work to remove those transgressions and tend to perceive their own lives as satisfied and happy.

All these findings can help assess and predict

the potential of the development of psychopathology in individuals. Through this, we have a better understanding of why some people with certain personality characteristics are more affected by the instances of shame. Their reaction to such events and coping is related to mental health conditions that they develop due to bad coping and internalization of behaviour and feelings. Also, with an understanding of guilt and shame and how it relates to personality, we can have a better idea of the moral judgement of people and their tendency.

References

- Abe, J. A. (2004, April). Shame, guilt, and personality judgment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38(2), 85-104.
- Albuquerque, I., de Lima, M. P., Figueiredo, C., & Matos, M. (2012). Subjective Well-Being Structure: Confirmatory Factor Analysis in a Teachers' Portuguese Sample. *Social Indicators Research*, 105(3), 569-580.
- Albuquerque, I., Lima, M., Matos, M., & Figueiredo, C. (2013, January). Personality and Subjective Well-Being: What Hides Behind Global Analyses? *Social Indicators Research*, 105(3), 447-460.
- Allport, G. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: H. Holt and Company.
- Anolli, L., & Pascucci, P. (2005). Guilt and guilt-proneness, shame and shame-proneness in Indian and Italian young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(4), 763-773.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994, March). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 243-267.
- Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2011, May). Introducing the GASP scale: A new measure of guilt and shame proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(5), 946-966.
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New Well-being Measures: Short Scales to Assess Flourishing and Positive and Negative Feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143-156.
- Einstein, D., & Lanning, K. (1998, August). Shame, Guilt, Ego Development, and the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 66(4), 555-582.
- Erden, S., & Akbag, M. (2015). How Do Personality Traits effect Shame and Guilt?: An Evaluation of the Turkish Culture. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 58, 113-132.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives. In L. Pervin, & O. John, *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Karlsson, G., & Sjöberg, L. G. (2009). The Experiences of Guilt and Shame: A Phenomenological–Psychological Study. *Human Studies*, 32(3), 335-355.
- Lindsay-Hartz, J. (1984). Contrasting experiences of shame and guilt. *The American Behavioural Scientist*, 27(6), 689.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of personality*, 60(2), 175-215.
- Rothmann, S., & Coetzer, E. P. (2003). The big five personality dimensions and job performance. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(1), 68-74.

- Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2006, July). The Approach and Avoidance Function of Guilt and Shame Emotions: Comparing Reactions to Self-Caused and Other-Caused Wrongdoing. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30(1), 42-55.
- Singer, J. L., & Bonanno, G. A. (1990, January). Personality and private experience: Individual variations in consciousness and in attention to subjective phenomena. In *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 419-444). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the Relationship Between Personality and Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(1), 138-161.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the Self into Self-Conscious Emotions: A Theoretical Model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(2), 103-125.
- Wallbott, H. G., & Scherer, K. (1995). *Cultural determinants in experiencing shame and guilt*. Guilford Press.