

## Assessing Self-Conscious Emotions

### *A Review of Self-Report and Nonverbal Measures*

RICHARD W. ROBINS  
ERIK E. NOFTLE  
JESSICA L. TRACY

In this chapter, we provide an overview of measures of self-conscious emotions (embarrassment, guilt, pride, and shame). The goal of the chapter is to help researchers identify and select measures of self-conscious emotions that meet their diverse needs. Self-conscious emotions are typically assessed through either self-report scales or coding of nonverbal behavior. We first summarize the extant self-report measures and then describe nonverbal coding schemes for each self-conscious emotion previously found to have a recognizable nonverbal expression (i.e., embarrassment, pride, and shame).

#### **SELF-REPORT MEASURES OF SHAME, GUILT, EMBARRASSMENT, AND PRIDE**

In this section, we summarize the self-report measures available for shame (and humiliation), guilt, embarrassment, and pride. For each emotion, we organize the available measures into three sections: (1) trait or dispositional scales, (2) state or online feeling scales, and (3) state and trait scales of related constructs. Within each of the three sections, the scales are ordered chronologically, by date of publication. Reflecting the field's tendency to focus on clinically relevant emotions, considerably more effort has been devoted to developing self-report measures of shame and guilt than pride or embarrassment. As a result, the vast majority of scales included here assess shame and guilt.

For each specific scale, we provide (1) relevant references; (2) a brief description of the scale and the way it was developed; (3) an indication of whether the scale is "frequently used," "occasionally used," or "rarely used," based on a citation analysis of the scale name and relevant publications ("frequently used" = cited at least 50 times; "rarely

used” = cited fewer than 10 times); and (4) psychometric information about the length, reliability, and format of the scale. The scale format is classified into one of the following four categories (adapted from Tangney & Dearing, 2002):

1. *Situation-based* scales: Participants read a set of situations, preselected because they presumably elicit specific emotions, and then rate the extent to which they would feel a particular emotion (or set of emotions) in each situation. For example, participants might be asked to rate their level of embarrassment during the following situation: “Suppose you tripped and fell while entering a bus full of people” (Modigliani, 1968).

2. *Scenario-based* scales: Participants read hypothetical scenarios and then choose which of a set of responses they would be most likely to perform, or rate the likelihood that they would choose each response. These scales differ from situation-based measures in that they usually include multiple response options, and the response options typically refer to behaviors and thoughts in addition to feelings. For example, a participant might read: “You make a mistake at work and find out a coworker is blamed for the error,” and be asked to choose whether he or she would be more likely to respond with: “(a) You would think the company did not like the coworker; (b) You would think ‘Life is not fair’; (c) You would keep quiet and avoid the coworker; (d) You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation” (Tangney, Dearing, Wagner, & Gramzow, 2000).

3. *Statement-based* scales: Participants rate the degree to which they experience different feelings, cognitions, and/or related behaviors specified in sentences or phrases. For example, a participant might be asked to rate the extent to which he or she agrees or disagrees with the statement, “I want to sink into the floor and disappear” (Marschall, Sanftner, & Tangney, 1994).

4. *Adjective-based* scales: Participants rate the extent to which they experience different feelings, such as happy, sad, ashamed, etc. Many adjective-based scales were designed to assess either traits or states, depending on the instructions (e.g., “Indicate to what extent you feel this way in general, that is, on the average” or “Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment”); Watson & Clark, 1994).

## Shame

### A. Trait Measures of Shame

#### A1. SHAME AND EMBARRASSMENT SCALES OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EMOTIONS SCALE (DES-II)

Mosher, D. L., & White, B. B. (1981). On differentiating shame and shyness. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5, 61–74. [includes full scales]

A revision of Izard, Dougherty, Bloxom, and Kotsch’s (1974) DES-II scale (which has been revised a number of times subsequently and now includes statements; see A6, below). This revision includes sets of emotion adjectives to measure distinct emotions. Using the rational method (i.e., devising items rationally, based on face validity, to represent hypothesized constructs), the previous shame/shyness scale was separated into two scales representing shame and shyness and additional adjectives were added. In addition, a new scale for embarrassment was added. Mosher and White’s shame, shyness, and embarrassment scales have not been used frequently by researchers, although the DES itself is frequently used. Izard’s most recent version of the DES (the DES-IV; see A6, below)

now includes separate scales to assess shame and shyness, but not embarrassment. In general, the DES can be used as either a trait or a state measure, although most researchers have tended to use it to measure emotional dispositions. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* shame-humiliation (three items: ashamed, humiliated, disgraced); embarrassment (three items: embarrassed, self-conscious, blushing).

*Response format:* Adjective measure with a 5-point rating scale (1 = “very slightly or not at all”; 5 = “very strongly”).

#### A2. MEASURE OF SUSCEPTIBILITY TO GUILT AND SHAME

Cheek, J. M., & Hogan, R. (1983). Self-concepts, self-presentations, and moral judgments. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 249–273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. [includes full scale]

A set of items were derived from past scales and from participants’ responses to an open-ended questionnaire. The items were selected to reflect a differentiation between inner moral affects (guilt) and outer moral affects (shame). [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* guilt (five items;  $\alpha = .63$ ); shame (five items;  $\alpha = .73$ ).

*Sample item:* “Breaking or losing something I have borrowed from a friend.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “not at all”; 2 = “a little”; 3 = “a fair amount”; 4 = “much”; 5 = “very much”).

#### A3. ADAPTED SHAME/GUILT SCALE (ASGS)

Hoblitzelle, W. (1987). Differentiating and measuring shame and guilt: The relation between shame and depression. In H. B. Lewis (Ed.), *The role of shame in symptom formation* (pp. 207–235). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. [includes full scale]

A set of items were added to Gioiella’s (1979) Shame/Guilt Survey (and some items tapping into anxiety were removed), using the rational method. This scale was designed as a trait measure of shame and guilt, but it could be easily used as a state measure. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (30 items;  $\alpha = .90$ ), shame (10 items: bashful, mortified, shy, humiliated, abashed, embarrassed, depressed, chided, reproached, ashamed;  $\alpha = .86$ ), guilt (12 items: condemned, unethical, immoral, delinquent, unconscionable, inappropriate, wicked, criminal, liable, indecent, unscrupulous, imprudent;  $\alpha = .88$ ).

*Response format:* Adjective-based measure with a 7-point scale.

#### A4. DIMENSIONS OF CONSCIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (DCQ)

Johnson, R. C., Danko, J. P., Huang, Y. H., Park, J. Y., Johnson, S. B., & Nagoshi, C. T. (1987). Guilt, shame and adjustment in three cultures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 8, 357–364. [includes full scale]

Johnson, R. C., Kim, R. J., & Danko, G. P. (1989). Guilt, shame and adjustment. A family study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10, 71–74. [adds five additional items, which are included]

Gore, E. J., & Harvey, O. J. (1995). A factor analysis of a scale of shame and guilt: Dimensions of Conscience Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 769–771.

Items were written to distinguish guilt-inducing situations from those that induced shame; additional items come from related measures and from guilt stories collected from

undergraduates. The current version of the scale uses a psychometrically sound subset of the original 121 items. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics* (Johnson et al., 1987): shame (13 items;  $\alpha = .84$ ), guilt (15 items;  $\alpha = .81$ ).

*Scale characteristics* (Gore & Harvey, 1995): Shame 1: Social impropriety (10 items;  $\alpha = .77$ ), Shame 2: Exposed inadequacy (five items;  $\alpha = .70$ ), Guilt 1: Impersonal transgression (six items;  $\alpha = .88$ ), Guilt 2: Harm to another person (six items;  $\alpha = .88$ ), Guilt 3: Trust/oath violation (three items;  $\alpha = .73$ ).

*Sample item*: “Strongly defending an idea or point of view in a discussion only to learn later that it was incorrect.”

*Response format*: Situation-based measure with a 7-point scale (1 = “not at all bad”; 7 = “as bad as I possibly could feel”).

#### A5. HARDER PERSONAL FEELINGS QUESTIONNAIRE-2 (PFQ2)

Harder, D. W., & Zalma, A. (1990). Two promising shame and guilt scales: A construct validity comparison. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 729–745. [includes full scale]

Harder, D. W., & Lewis, S. J. (1987). The assessment of shame and guilt. In J. N. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 6, pp. 89–114). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Harder, D. W. (1995). Shame and guilt assessment and relationships of shame and guilt proneness to psychopathology. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 368–392). New York: Guilford Press.

A set of items were added to the earlier PFQ (Harder & Lewis, 1987), using the rational method, and several original items were expanded. The original PFQ was devised using the rational method to assess affective tendencies in clinical settings, and was later found to differentiate between clinical shame and guilt. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics*: shame (10 items: embarrassed; feeling ridiculous; self-consciousness; feeling humiliated; feeling “stupid”; feeling “childish”; feeling helpless, paralyzed; feelings of blushing; feeling laughable; feeling disgusting to others;  $\alpha = .78$ ); guilt (six items: mild guilt; worry about hurting or injuring someone; intense guilt; regret; feeling you deserve criticism for what you did; remorse;  $\alpha = .72$ ).

*Response format*: Adjective/statement measure with a 5-point scale (0 = “never experience the feeling”; 4 = “experience the feeling continuously or almost continuously”).

#### A6. SHAME, GUILT, AND HOSTILITY INWARD SUBSCALES OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EMOTIONS SCALE-IV (DES-IV)

Izard, C. E., Libero, D. Z., Putnam, P., & Haynes, O. M. (1993). Stability of emotion experiences and their relations to traits of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 847–860. [includes full scale]

A set of items were generated from cross-cultural labels for emotion expressions, which were later expanded into short statements for ease of use with varied groups. This scale is based on Izard’s differential emotions theory (Izard, 1991). The guilt scale measures self-blame, regret, and wrongdoing. The shame scale seems conceptually closer to current conceptions of embarrassment than shame, whereas the hostility-inward scale seems closer to clinical conceptions of shame. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* shame (three items: feel embarrassed when anybody sees you make a mistake; feel like people laugh at you; feel like people always look at you when anything goes wrong;  $\alpha = .60$ ); guilt (three items: feel regret, sorry about something you did; feel like you did something wrong; feel like you ought to be blamed for something;  $\alpha = .72$ ); hostility–inward (three items: feel you can't stand yourself; feel mad at yourself; feel sick about yourself;  $\alpha = .75$ ).

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “rarely or never”; 2 = “hardly ever”; 3 = “sometimes”; 4 = “often”; 5 = “very often”)

#### A7. INTERNALIZED SHAME SCALE (ISS)

Cook, D. R. (1994). *Internalized Shame Scale: Professional manual*. Menomonie, WI: Channel Press. [includes full scale]

Cook, D. R. (1996). Empirical studies of shame and guilt: The Internalized Shame Scale. In D. L. Nathanson (Ed.), *Knowing feeling: Affect, script, and psychotherapy* (pp. 132–165). New York: Norton. [includes full scale]

[*German version*] Wolfradt, U., & Scharrer, F. (1996). The Internalized Shame Scale (ISS): Conceptual aspects and psychometric properties of a German adaptation/Die “Internalisierte Scham-Skala“(ISS): Konzeptuelle Aspekte und psychometrische Eigenschaften einer deutschsprachigen Adaptation. *Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie*, 17, 201–207.

A set of statements were written to describe the phenomenology of the shame experience. One subscale taps into internalized shame, whereas the other measures negative global evaluations of the self (this subscale consists primarily of items from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale). This scale is used primarily in the clinical literature. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* internalized shame (24 items;  $\alpha = .96$ ); (negative) self-esteem (six items;  $\alpha = .95$ ).

*Sample item:* “I would like to shrink away when I make a mistake.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (0 = “never”; 1 = “seldom”; 2 = “sometimes”; 3 = “often”; 4 = “almost always”).

#### A8. OTHER AS SHAMER SCALE (OAS)

Goss, K., Gilbert, P., & Allan, S. (1994). An exploration of shame measures. I. The Other as Shamer scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17, 713–717. [includes full scale]

This statement-based scale is a modification of a subset of the items from the Internalized Shame Scale (Cook, 1994). The original statements were rewritten to reflect a person's perception of what others feel about him or her rather than what he or she feels about him- or herself. This scale has been used in both the clinical and personality literatures. Gilbert and Allan (1994) have also constructed a measure to assess the submissive behavior that often accompanies experiences of shame (see below in part C of the Shame measures). [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (18 items), inferiority (seven items), emptiness (four items), how others behave when they see me make mistakes (six items) [one item included in total scale is not an item on any of the subscales].

*Sample item:* “I think that other people look down on me.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (0 = “never”; 1 = “seldom”; 2 = “sometimes”; 3 = “often”; 4 = “almost always”).

#### A9. BRIEF SHAME RATING SCALE (BSRS)

Hibbard, S. (1994). An empirical study of the differential roles of libidinous and aggressive shame components in normality and pathology. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 11*, 449–474. [includes full scale]

A set of items were taken from Hoblitzelle’s (1987) Adapted Shame/Guilt Scale (ASGS; see A3, above) and Harder and Lewis’s (1987) Personal Feelings Questionnaire (PFQ; see A5, above) to examine libidinous and aggressive aspects of shame. The two facets of shame were validated with relevant existing scales. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (11 items; .96), disgraced/humiliated (BSRS1; seven items: disgraced, mortified, helpless/paralyzed, abashed, humiliated, ashamed, depressed;  $\alpha = .96$ ), bashful/shy (BSRS2; four items: bashful, shy, embarrassed, blushing/near blushing;  $\alpha = .97$ ).

*Response format:* Adjective-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “rarely, not much like this”; 5 = “often, very much like this”)

#### A10. SHAME–GUILT SCALE [NO SPECIFIC TITLE GIVEN]

Diener, E., Smith, H., & Fujita, F. (1995). The personality structure of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 130–141. [includes full scale]

A set of items were generated to measure “shame-guilt” using the rational method, including adjectives that varied in intensity. This is a measure of negative self-conscious emotions, which has been used as a brief measure in the personality literature. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* shame (four items: shame, guilt, regret, embarrassment;  $\alpha = .78$ ).

*Response format:* Adjective-based measure with a 7-point rating scale (1 = “never”; 4 = “about half the time”; 7 = “always”).

#### A11. TEST OF SELF-CONSCIOUS AFFECT–3 (TOSCA-3)

Tangney, J. P., Dearing, R. L., Wagner, P. E., & Gramzow, R. (2000). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect–3 (TOSCA-3)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University. [includes full scale; current version]

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press. [includes TOSCA-3 and also TOSCA-A and TOSCA-C for assessing the same dimensions in adolescents and children, respectively]

Hanson, R. K., & Tangney, J. P. (1995). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect—Socially Deviant Populations (TOSCA-SD)*. Ottawa, Canada: Corrections Research, Department of the Solicitor General of Canada. [includes full scale]

The original scale was generated from participants’ (college students and other adults) descriptions of personal experiences of pride, guilt, and shame. These descriptions formed the basis for the fifteen scenarios (five positive and 10 negative) that comprise the scale. A separate set of descriptions written by adults not attending college formed the basis for the multiple-choice-styled response set. The current version (TOSCA-3) drops one of the original scenarios and adds two new scenarios. These scales are dispositional mea-

asures, and are very frequently used in the social-personality literature to assess shame and guilt-proneness. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* alpha pride (five items,  $\alpha = .48$ ), beta pride (five items,  $\alpha = .51$ ), guilt (16 items,  $\alpha = .78$ ), shame (16 items,  $\alpha = .77$ ); also externalization (16 items,  $\alpha = .75$ ) and detachment (11 items,  $\alpha = .72$ ). [alphas from Tangney & Dearing, 2002]

*Sample item:* “You are driving down the road and you hit a small animal. (A) You would think the animal shouldn’t have been on the road. (B) You would think: ‘I’m terrible.’ (C) You would feel: ‘Well, it’s an accident.’ (D) You’d feel bad you hadn’t been more alert driving down the road.”

*Response format:* Scenario-based measure that includes sets of responses, each representing a different affective tendency (guilt-proneness, shame-proneness, externalization, pride in one’s self (alpha pride), pride in one’s behavior (beta pride), and detachment. All responses are rated on a 5-point scale (1 = “not likely”; 5 = “very likely”).

#### A12. SHAME AND EMBARRASSMENT SCENARIOS [NO SPECIFIC TITLE GIVEN]

Sabini, J., Garvey, B., & Hall, A. L. (2001). Shame and embarrassment revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 104–117. [includes full scales]

Two sets of items were generated by the rational method to describe scenarios that were likely to elicit shame and embarrassment. In the first set, 10 scenarios were written for shame and 10 were written for embarrassment. In the second set, six items were written for shame, which were turned into embarrassment scenarios by adding one additional sentence to each scenario. For all scenarios, participants rate their expected levels of shame and embarrassment (as well as other affects listed below). Although the measure was designed to contrast the eliciting conditions of shame and embarrassment, it can also be used as a trait measure of shame and embarrassment. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale 1 characteristics:* Shame Scenarios (10 items), Embarrassment Scenarios (10 items). [For shame and embarrassment experienced in both types of scenarios,  $\alpha$ s = .85–.91.]

*Scale 2 characteristics:* Shame Scenarios [six items; shame ( $\alpha = .73$ ), embarrassment ( $\alpha = .74$ )], Embarrassment Scenarios [six items; shame ( $\alpha = .61$ ), embarrassment ( $\alpha = .78$ )].

*Sample item:* “You are at a public beach and you feel like going for a swim. The waves are rough but there are other people swimming near you. As you dive in, you realize that your bathing suit has fallen down and that people are staring at you.”

*Response format:* Situation-based measures with 7-point rating scales for six emotions (anger, shame, fear, guilt, embarrassment, and regret; 1 = “not at all”; 7 = “extremely”).

#### A13. SHAME–GUILT PROPENSITY SCALE [ITALIAN LANGUAGE ONLY]

Battacchi, M. W., Codispoti, O., Marano, G. F., & Codispoti, M. (2001). Toward the evaluation of susceptibility to shame and sense of guilt: The Shame–Guilt Propensity Scale/Per la valutazione delle suscettibilità alla vergogna e al senso di colpa: La scala SSCV. *Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata*, 233, 19–31. [RARELY USED]

#### A14. EXPERIENCE OF SHAME SCALE (ESS)

Andrews, B., Qian, M., & Valentine, J. D. (2002). Predicting depressive symptoms with a new measure of shame: The Experience of Shame Scale. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41, 29–42. [includes full scale]

[*Chinese version*] Qian, M., Andrews, B., Zhu, R., & Wang, A. (2000). The development of the Shame Scale for Chinese college students. *Chinese Mental Health Journal, 14*, 217–221.

A set of items were devised, based on interviews with depressed populations and the rational method, to measure characterological shame (four aspects), behavioral shame (three aspects), and bodily aspects of shame. For each type of shame, items reflecting experiential, cognitive, and behavioral aspects were written. This scale has been used in the personality and clinical literatures. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (25 items;  $\alpha = .92$ ); characterological (12 items;  $\alpha = .90$ ); behavioral (nine items;  $\alpha = .87$ ); bodily (four items;  $\alpha = .86$ ).

*Sample item:* “Have you tried to conceal from others the sort of person you are?”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 4-point scale (1 = “not at all”; 2 = “a little”; 3 = “moderately”; 4 = “very much”)

#### A15. COMPASS OF SHAME SCALE (COSS)

Elison, J., Lennon, R., & Pulos, S. (2006). Investigating the Compass of Shame: The development of the Compass of Shame Scale. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*, 221–238. [includes full scale]

Elison, J., Pulos, S., & Lennon, R. (2006). Shame-focused coping: An empirical study of the compass of shame. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*, 161–168.

A set of items were developed to assess use of the four shame-coping styles described by Nathanson (1992). For each scenario, participants indicate the frequency with which they tend to make each of four responses, representing each of the four subscales (see below). [RARELY USED, BUT NEW SCALE]

*Scale characteristics:* Withdrawal (12 items;  $\alpha = .89$ ); Attack Other (12 items;  $\alpha = .85$ ); Attack Self (12 items;  $\alpha = .91$ ); Avoidance (12 items;  $\alpha = .74$ ).

*Sample item:* “When I feel others think poorly of me . . . I want to escape their view.”

*Response format:* Scenario-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “Never”; 2 = “Seldom”; 3 = “Sometimes”; 4 = “Often”; 5 = “Almost Always”).

## B. State Measures of Shame

### B1. STATE SHAME AND GUILT SCALE (SSGS)

Marschall, D., Sanftner, J., & Tangney, J. P. (1994). *The State Shame and Guilt Scale*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University. [includes full scale]

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press. [includes full scale]

A set of items were written using the rational method, based on Lewis’s (1971) theory, to assess phenomenological aspects of shame and guilt. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* shame (five items;  $\alpha = .89$ ), guilt (five items;  $\alpha = .82$ ), pride (five items;  $\alpha = .87$ ).

*Sample item:* “I want to sink into the floor and disappear.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “not feeling this way at all”; 3 = “feeling this way somewhat”; 5 = “feeling this way very strongly”).

### C. Measures of Constructs Related to Shame

*Note:* For space reasons, we do not include the many measures of shyness, even though some conceptions of shame include shyness as a low-intensity variant of shame (for an elaboration on this distinction, see Mosher & White, 1981).

#### C1. SOCIAL AVOIDANCE AND DISTRESS SCALE

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 448–457.

Leary, M. R. (1991). Watson and Friend's Social Avoidance and Distress Scale. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 177–179). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. [includes full scale]

A set of items were devised to measure (behavioral) social avoidance using the rational method. Thus, the scale does not measure shame directly, but measures social avoidance, which is a behavioral aspect of shame. The scale is primarily used in the anxiety literature. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (28 items;  $\alpha = .90$ ), social avoidance (14 items;  $\alpha = .87$ ).

*Sample item:* "I often want to get away from people."

*Response format:* True–false statement measure, but many researchers have used it with a 5-point rating scale (Leary, 1991).

#### C2. FEAR OF NEGATIVE EVALUATION SCALE (FNE)

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 448–457.

Leary, M. R. (1983). A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 371–375. [includes abbreviated scale]

Corcoran, K., & Fischer, J. (1987). *Measures for clinical practice: A sourcebook*. New York: Free Press.

Leary, M. R. (1991). Watson and Friend's Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 165–167). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. [includes full scale]

The Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (FNE; Watson & Friend, 1969) is a 30-item instrument that measures a specific aspect of social anxiety: the fear of loss of social approval. Each item is answered true or false. The FNE is highly reliable and correlates with social approval, desirability, and measures of anxiety (Corcoran & Fischer, 1987). Leary (1983) created an abbreviated (12-item) version of the FNE. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics* (Watson & Friend, 1969): total scale (30 items; KR-20 = .92).

*Scale characteristics* (Leary, 1983): total scale (12 items;  $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Sample item:* "I become tense or jittery if I know someone is sizing me up."

*Response format:* The original scale (Watson & Friend, 1969) uses a true–false statement format; the abbreviated scale (Leary, 1983) uses a 5-point scale (1 = "not at all characteristic of me"; 5 = "extremely characteristic of me").

## C3. FEAR OF APPEARING INCOMPETENT SCALE

Good, L., & Good, K. (1973). An objective measure to avoid appearing incompetent. *Psychological Reports*, 32, 1075–1078.

A set of items were written to assess trait aspects of the fear of appearing incompetent. This scale does not directly assess shame, but has been used as a proxy measure of shame (Hoblitzelle, 1987). [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (36; .89).

*Sample item:* “I would very much like to be less apprehensive about my capabilities.”

*Response format:* True–false statement measure.

## C4. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS SCALES

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43, 522–527. [includes full scale]

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). The Self-Consciousness Scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 687–699. [includes full scale]

[*Swedish version*] Nystedt, L., & Smari, J. (1989). Assessment of the Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss Self-Consciousness Scale: A Swedish translation. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53, 342–352.

[*Turkish version*] Ruganci, R. N. (1995). Private and public self-consciousness subscales of the Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss Self-Consciousness Scale: A Turkish translation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18, 279–282.

A set of items was devised using the rational method to describe behaviors indicative of a self-conscious person. Scheier and Carver (1985) revised the items for use with the general population. This scale is a frequently used measure of both public and private aspects of self-consciousness. Public self-consciousness has been found to be positively related to shame-proneness (Tangney & Dearing, 2002), and both aspects are negatively related to self-esteem (Turner, Scheier, Carver, & Ickes, 1978). [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (23), Private Self-Consciousness (10), Public Self-Consciousness (7).

*Sample item:* “I’m always trying to figure myself out.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (0 = “extremely uncharacteristic”; 4 = “extremely characteristic”).

*Response format for Scheier and Carver’s revision.* 4-point scale (0 = “not at all like me”; 3 = “a lot like me”)

## C5. DEVALUATION–DISCRIMINATION, SECRECY, AND WITHDRAWAL

Link, B. G., Cullen, F. T., Struening, E., Shrout, P. E., & Dohrenwend, B. P. (1989). A modified labeling theory approach to mental disorders: An empirical assessment. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 400–423. [includes full scale]

These three statement-based measures are stigma-related measures for current and former mental patients, and are highly relevant to shame measurement. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* devaluation–discrimination (12 items;  $\alpha = .76$ ), secrecy (five items;  $\alpha = .71$ ), withdrawal (seven items;  $\alpha = .67$ ).

*Sample item:* “Most people would willingly accept a former mental patient as a close friend.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 6-point scale (1 = “strongly agree”; 6 = “strongly disagree”).

#### C6. SUBMISSIVE BEHAVIOUR SCALE (SBS)

Allan, S., & Gilbert, P. (1997). Submissive behaviour and psychotherapy. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 36, 467–488. [includes full scale]

Gilbert, P., & Allan, S. (1994). Assertiveness, submissive behaviour and social comparison. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 33, 295–306.

[Adolescent version] Irons, C., & Gilbert, P. (2005). Evolved mechanisms in adolescent anxiety and depression symptoms: The role of the attachment and social rank systems. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 325–341. [includes full scale]

This scale was developed from open-ended descriptions of behavioral acts originally collected by Buss and Craik (1986), which were then rated for “submissiveness.” Gilbert and Allan (1994) retained the 16 items rated as most prototypical of this dimension for the scale. This scale has been used in both the clinical and personality literatures. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (18 items), inferiority (seven items), emptiness (four items), how others behave when they see me make mistakes (six items). [one item included in total scale is not an item on any of the subscales]

*Sample item:* “I think that other people look down on me.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (0 = “never”; 1 = “seldom”; 2 = “sometimes”; 3 = “often”; 4 = “almost always”).

#### C7. EDUCATIONAL SOCIALIZATION SCALE (ESS)

Bempechat, J., Graham, S. E., & Jimenez, N. V. (1999). The socialization of achievement in poor and minority students: A comparative study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 139–158. [includes full scale]

This statement-based measure assesses shame and guilt in the context of academic achievement. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (17 items), shame (four items: “My parents make me feel ashamed if I do badly in school,” “I feel ashamed if I do badly in school,” “My parents feel ashamed if I do badly in school,” “My parents punish me when I don’t do well in school”;  $\alpha = .73$ ) guilt (two items: “I feel badly because my parents work so hard to give me a good education,” “I feel badly that my parents have to work so hard”;  $\alpha = .65$ )

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “never”; 5 = “almost every day”).

#### C8. HUMILIATION INVENTORY (HI)

Hartling, L. M., & Luchetta, T. (1999). Humiliation: Assessing the impact of derision, degradation, and debasement. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 19, 259–278. [includes full scale]

A set of items were generated through interviews, expert consultations, and litera-

ture reviews pertaining to relevant constructs. This scale assesses the shame-related emotion of humiliation, but not shame directly. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (32 items;  $\alpha = .96$ ), fear of humiliation (FHS; 20 items;  $\alpha = .94$ ), cumulative humiliation (CHS; 12 items;  $\alpha = .95$ ).

*Sample item:* “At this point in your life, how much do you fear being laughed at?”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “not at all”; 5 = “extremely”).

## C9. BODY IMAGE GUILT AND SHAME

(See description in item C4 of the Guilt measures section.)

## Guilt

A number of self-report scales have been developed to measure guilt. Some of them tap into specific subdomains, such as Mosher’s Sex Guilt Scale, but many are aimed at domain-general measurement of trait and state guilt. Shame scales A2–A6, A11, and A13 also have subscales for trait guilt and thus are not listed below; Shame scale B1 also has a subscale for state guilt and thus is not listed below.

### A. Trait Measures of Guilt

#### A1. GUILT SUBSCALE OF THE BUSS–DURKEE HOSTILITY–GUILT INVENTORY

Buss, A. H., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 343–349. [includes full scale]

A set of items were developed using the rational method, with guilt defined as “feelings of being bad, having done wrong, or suffering pangs of conscience” (Buss & Durkee, 1957, p. 344). This scale is a supplementary measure of guilt developed as part of a widely used hostility measure because of clinical links between the two constructs. It is rarely used as an independent measure of guilt, in part because it seems to assess a blend of guilt and shame (e.g., Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992, p. 675). [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* guilt (nine items).

*Sample item:* “When I do wrong, my conscience punishes me severely.”

*Response format:* True–false statement-based measure.

#### A2. MOSHER TRUE–FALSE AND FORCED-CHOICE GUILT INVENTORIES

Mosher, D. L. (1966). The development and multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis of three measures of three aspects of guilt. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 30, 25–29.

Mosher, D. L. (1968). Measurement of guilt in females by self-report inventories. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 32, 690–695.

Mosher, D. (1987). Revised Mosher Guilt Inventory. In C. M. Davis, W. L. Yarber, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Sexuality-related measures: A compendium* (pp. 152–155). Lake Mills, IA: Graphic. [includes full scale]

*True–false version.* A set of items were taken from the Mosher Incomplete Sentences Test (MIST) and administered to students in a true–false format: items representing the top and bottom 27% were chosen.

*Forced-choice version.* Guilt-prone and non-guilt-prone completions of the incomplete sentences that were matched on social desirability were selected. Subscales were developed from the original MIST categorizations for both the true-false and forced-choice inventories. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics (true-false version):* sex guilt (35 items;  $\alpha = .91$ ), hostile guilt (37 items;  $\alpha = .84$ ), morality-conscience guilt (31 items;  $\alpha = .84$ ).

*Scale characteristics (forced choice):* sex guilt (28 items;  $\alpha = .97$ ), hostile guilt (29 items;  $\alpha = .96$ ), morality-conscience guilt (22 items;  $\alpha = .92$ ).

*Sample items:* “I punish myself when I make mistakes.” (*true-false version*). “A guilty conscience . . . a) does not bother me too much; b) is worse than a sickness to me.” (*forced choice*).

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a true-false or forced-choice response option.

### A3. PERCEIVED GUILT INDEX

Otterbacher, J. R., & Munz, D. C. (1973). State-trait measure of experiential guilt. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40*, 115–121. [includes full scale]

A set of adjectives and phrases describing subjective experiences of guilt were generated by students, and were then rated for the extremity with which they described a guilty reaction. Items representing a spectrum from “not guilty” to “extremely guilty” were then derived based on factor analyses. This scale has been used in the applied and clinical realms. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* Participants select one item out of the following 11 items to either describe how they feel “at the moment” (state version) or how they “normally feel” (trait version): 1 = innocent, 2 = undisturbed, 3 = restrained, 4 = pent-up, 5 = fretful, 6 = chagrined, 7 = reproachable, 8 = marred, 9 = degraded, 10 = disgraceful, 11 = unforgivable.

*Response format:* Adjective-based measure.

### A4. REACTION INVENTORY—GUILT

Evans, D. R., Jessup, B. A., & Hearn, M. T. (1974, April). *Development of a reaction inventory to measure guilt* (Research Bulletin No. 287). London, Canada: Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario. [includes full scale]

Evans, D. R., Jessup, B. A., & Hearn, M. T. (1975). Development of a reaction inventory to measure guilt. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 39*, 421–423. [includes subscale items but not full measure]

A set of items were developed from interviews with students about situations that had made them feel guilty. Situations named by at least two students were retained for the inventory. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (50 items;  $\alpha = .52$ ), intentional behavior disrupting interpersonal relations (seven items), self-destructive behavior (four items), behavior contrary to moral or ethical principles (seven items), unintentional behavior disrupting interpersonal relationships (six items).

*Sample item:* “Finding out you have hurt someone’s feelings.”

*Response format:* Situation-based measure with a 5-point scale of how much guilt each situation made the person feel (1 = “not at all”; 2 = “a little”; 3 = “a fair amount”; 4 = “much”; 5 = “very much”).

## A5. GUILT MEASURE [PORTUGUESE LANGUAGE ONLY]

Sigelmann, E., & Fernandes, L. M. (1986). Development of a guilt measure/Desenvolvimento de uma medida de culpa. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia*, 38, 76–83. [includes full scale (in Portuguese)] [RARELY USED]

## A6. SITUATIONAL GUILT SCALE (SGS)

Klass, E. T. (1987). Situational approach to assessment of guilt: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 9, 35–48. [for the complete scale, contact Ellen Tobey Klass at [eklass@hunter.cuny.edu](mailto:eklass@hunter.cuny.edu)]

A set of items were generated from students' descriptions of situations in which they experienced guilt. These were then rated by a separate sample of students for the degree to which they would likely produce guilt. The best items were retained and factor-analyzed to create subscales. In this scale, participants rate how guilty they anticipate they would feel in response to guilt-inducing situations. It is used primarily in the clinical literature. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total guilt (22 items;  $\alpha = .92$ ), interpersonal harm guilt (nine items;  $\alpha = .88$ ), norm violation guilt (five items;  $\alpha = .74$ ), self-control failure guilt (six items;  $\alpha = .76$ ).

*Sample item:* "You have always given a present at holidays to one of your relatives, who always gives one to you. However, this year you did not get around to buying a present and didn't give anything though he/she gave you a present. It is now the middle of February, and you still haven't done anything about getting a present for him/her."

*Response format:* Situation-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = "not at all"; 2 = "slightly"; 3 = "moderately"; 4 = "considerably"; 5 = "very") for each of four terms (regretful, disappointed in myself, guilty, and ashamed), rated for each situation.

## A7. FEAR OF PUNISHMENT/NEED FOR REPARATION SCALES

Caprara, G. V., Manzi, J., & Perugini, M. (1992). Investigating guilt in relation to emotionality and aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 519–532. [includes full scale]

[*Italian version*] Caprara, G. V., Perugini, M., Pastorelli, C., & Barbaranelli, C. (1990). Esplorazione delle dimensioni comuni della colpa e dell'aggressività: Contributo empirico [Exploration of the common dimensions of guilt and aggression: Empirical contribution]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, 17, 665–681.

A set of items were generated from students' descriptions of characteristics they thought were most typical of guilt, which were then rated for guilt-prototypicality by a second sample of students. The highly prototypical guilt items were then given to a third sample and factor-analyzed, resulting in two factors, which served as the basis for two subscales. It has primarily been used in personality research. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* Fear of Punishment (23 items;  $\alpha = .91$ ), Need for Reparation (15 items;  $\alpha = .80$ ). The two scales include additional filler items.

*Sample item:* "It sometimes happens that I feel my conscience is not completely clear."

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 6-point scale (0 = "completely false for me"; 5 = "completely true for me").

#### A8. GUILT (AND SELF-ASSURANCE) SUBSCALES OF THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE—EXPANDED FORM

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule—Expanded form*. University of Iowa. [includes full scale; also available at [www.psychology.uiowa.edu/faculty/Clark/PANAS-X.pdf](http://www.psychology.uiowa.edu/faculty/Clark/PANAS-X.pdf)]

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford Press.

Developed through factor analyses of a set of 60 mood adjectives from Zevon and Tellegen (1982) and 16 additional positive mood terms. The PANAS-X can be used as both a state and a trait measure, and is frequently used in personality and social psychology to measure specific affects, as well as general positive and negative affect. The self-assurance subscale identifies someone who is feeling (or tends to feel) not only confident but also daring. The guilt subscale, despite its label, appears to be a general measure of negative self-conscious emotions; for example, it includes both “ashamed” and “guilty.” [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* guilt (six items: guilty, ashamed, blameworthy, angry at self, disgusted with self, dissatisfied with self;  $\alpha = .87$ ), self-assurance (six items: proud, strong, confident, bold, daring, fearless;  $\alpha = .83$ ).

*Response format:* Adjective-based measure with a 5-point scale (1= “very slightly or not at all”; 2 = “a little”; 3 = “moderately”; 4 = “quite a bit”; 5 = “extremely”).

#### A9. INTERPERSONAL GUILT QUESTIONNAIRE (IGQ-45 AND IGQ-67)

O’Connor, L. E., Berry, J. W., Weiss, J., Bush, M., & Sampson, H. (1997). Interpersonal guilt: The development of a new measure. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 53, 73–89. [for the complete scale, contact Lynn O’Connor at [LynnOC@aol.com](mailto:LynnOC@aol.com)]

[*German version*] Albani, C., Blaser, G., Körner, A., Geyer, M., Volkart, R., O’Connor, L., et al. (2002). The German Short Version of the Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire: Validation in a population-based sample and clinical application/Der “Fragebogen zu interpersonellen schuldgefühlen.” *Psychotherapie Psychosomatik Medizinische Psychologie*, 52, 189–197.

A set of items were generated by clinicians, based on clinical observation and theory, to measure irrational and damaging aspects of guilt. This measure has been used in the clinical literature. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics (IGQ-45):* survivor guilt (26 items;  $\alpha = .79$ ), separation/disloyalty guilt (five items;  $\alpha = .64$ ), omnipotent responsibility guilt (eight items;  $\alpha = .74$ ), and self-hate guilt (six items;  $\alpha = .85$ ).

*Scale characteristics (IGQ-67):* survivor guilt (22 items;  $\alpha = .85$ ), separation/disloyalty guilt (15 items;  $\alpha = .82$ ), omnipotent responsibility guilt (14 items;  $\alpha = .83$ ), and self-hate guilt (16 items;  $\alpha = .87$ ).

*Sample item:* “If something bad happens to me I feel I must have deserved it.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale.

### B. State Measures of Guilt

#### B1. GUILT INVENTORY (GI)

Jones, W. H., & Kugler, K. (1990). *Preliminary manual for the Guilt Inventory (GI)*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. [includes full scale]

Jones, W. H. (2000). The Guilt Inventory. In J. Maltby, C. A. Lewis, & A. Hill (Eds.), *A handbook of psychological tests* (pp. 723–724). Lampeter, Wales, UK: Edwin Mellen Press. [includes full scale]

Kugler, K., & Jones, W. H. (1992). On conceptualizing and assessing guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 318–327.

A set of items were developed using the rational method to assess trait and state guilt and general moral standards. This scale assesses both recent experiences of, and general tendencies to experience, maladaptive forms of guilt and regret. It is used primarily in clinical and personality research. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* trait guilt (20 items;  $\alpha = .89$ ), state guilt (10 items;  $\alpha = .84$ ), moral standards (15 items;  $\alpha = .88$ ).

*Sample item:* “I have recently done something that I deeply regret.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = “strongly disagree”; 2 = “disagree”; 3 = “undecided”; 4 = “agree”; 5 = “strongly agree”).

## B2. GUILT SCALE [NO TITLE GIVEN]

Berrios, G. E., Bulbena, A., Bakshi, N., Dening, T. R., Jenaway, A., Markar, H., et al. (1992). Feelings of guilt in major depression: Conceptual and psychometric aspects. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 160, 781–787. [includes full scale]

A set of items were developed through the rational method (with reference to clinical observations) to assess the guilt that sometimes accompanies clinical depression. This scale seems to measure aspects of both guilt and shame. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* cognitive/attitudinal guilt (four items: been ashamed of something done; feeling as if you have committed a sin; feeling you must die to pay for your sins; feeling like praying to God for forgiveness), mood/feeling guilt (three items: feeling wicked for no reason; feeling guilty for no reason; feeling people know that you’re a bad person).

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 4-point scale.

## B3. GUILT SUBSCALE OF THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE—EXPANDED FORM

(See description in A8, above.)

## C. Measures of Constructs Related to Guilt

### C1. CHILDREN’S INTERPRETATIONS OF INTERPERSONAL DISTRESS AND CONFLICT (CIIDC)

Zahn-Waxler, C., Kochanska, G., Krupnick, J., & Mayfield, A. (1988). *Coding manual for Children’s Interpretations of Interpersonal Distress and Conflict*. Bethesda, MD: Laboratory of Developmental Psychology, National Institute of Mental Health.

Zahn-Waxler, C., Kochanska, G., Krupnick, J., & McKnew, D. (1990). Patterns of guilt in children of depressed and well mothers. *Developmental Psychology*, 26, 51–59. [includes sample items]

This measure is an interview designed for use with children. Guilt can be assessed

through a complex and rigorous system for coding children's verbal responses to stories. [RARELY USED]

#### C2. TRAUMA-RELATED GUILT INVENTORY (TRGI)

Kubany, E. S., Haynes, S. N., Abueg, F. R., Manke, F. P., Brennan, J. M., & Stahura, C. (1996). Development and validation of the Trauma-Related Guilt Inventory (TRGI). *Psychological Assessment, 8*, 428–444. [includes full scale]

Structured interviews were performed in order to assess trauma-related guilt in Vietnam veterans. Based on these interviews, a team of psychologists generated an item pool, which was then refined through factor analyses and reliability analyses. This scale assesses three broad aspects of a trauma-related guilt experience, as well as more specific subfacets. It is used primarily in the clinical and counseling literatures. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* global guilt (four items;  $\alpha = .90$ ), distress (six items;  $\alpha = .86$ ), guilt cognitions (22 items;  $\alpha = .86$ ). Subscales of guilt cognitions scale: Hindsight-Bias/Responsibility (seven items;  $\alpha = .82$ ), Wrongdoing (five items;  $\alpha = .75$ ), Lack of Justification (four items;  $\alpha = .67$ ).

*Sample item:* "I blame myself for what happened."

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale.

#### C3. BODY IMAGE GUILT AND SHAME

Thompson, T., Dinnel, D. L., & Dill, N. J. (2003). Development and validation of a Body Image Guilt and Shame Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 59–75. [for the complete scale, contact Ted Thompson at [t.thompson@utas.edu.au](mailto:t.thompson@utas.edu.au)]

A set of items focused on guilt- and shame-proneness about one's body and body-related behaviors were devised using the rational method and formed into a scale using the TOSCA (Tangney & Dearing, 2002) as a model. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* guilt (14 items;  $\alpha = .88$ ), shame (14 items;  $\alpha = .91$ ).

*Sample item:* "You find that your clothes from last summer are very tight around your waist (A) You would feel undisciplined and overweight. (B) You would go out and buy a six-month membership to a gym. (C) You would think: 'Well, it's time to buy some new clothes anyway!' (D) You would think: 'I've been very busy over the last year, with no time to exercise.'"

*Response format:* Scenario-based measure that includes sets of responses, each representing a different affective tendency (guilt-proneness and shame-proneness; also included, similar to Tangney & Dearing, 2002, externalization and detachment). All responses are rated on a 5-point scale (1 = "not likely"; 5 = "very likely").

#### C4. EDUCATIONAL SOCIALIZATION SCALE (ESS)

(See C7 in the Shame measures section.)

### Embarrassment

In contrast to guilt and shame, there are relatively few scales designed to measure embarrassment, as either a state or a trait. This is, in part, because researchers have tended to view embarrassment as a mild form of shame.

## A. Trait Measures of Embarrassment

### A1. EMBARRASSABILITY SCALE

Modigliani, A. (1968). Embarrassment and embarrassability. *Sociometry*, 31, 313–326.

Leary, M. R. (1991). Modigliani's Embarrassability Scale. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 173–176). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. [includes full scale]

Modigliani, A. (1971). Embarrassment, facework, and eye contact: Testing a theory of embarrassment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 17, 15–24.

A set of items were devised to represent embarrassing situations using the rational method. This scale measures trait embarrassment, as well as embarrassment in response to different social situations. It is used in both the social and the personality literatures. [OCCASIONALLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (26 items;  $\alpha = .88$ ).

*Sample item:* "Suppose you tripped and fell while entering a bus full of people."

*Response format:* Situation-based measure with a 5-point scale (1 = "I would not feel the least embarrassed: not awkward or uncomfortable at all"; 5 = "I would feel strongly embarrassed: extremely self-conscious, awkward, and uncomfortable").

### A2. SUSCEPTIBILITY TO EMBARRASSMENT SCALE

Kelly, K. M., & Jones, W. H. (1997). Assessment of dispositional embarrassability. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 10, 307–333. [includes full scale]

Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2000). The reliability and validity of a susceptibility to embarrassment scale among adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 749–756.

A set of items were developed using the rational method to assess "the tendency to feel emotionally exposed, vulnerable, and concerned about making mistakes in front of other people" (Kelly & Jones, 1997, p. 321). The scale thus measures the personality attributes of easily embarrassed people, and has been used primarily in the social-personality literature. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (25 items;  $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Sample item:* "I often worry about looking stupid."

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 7-point scale (1 = "Not at all like me"; 7 = "Very much like me").

### A3. EMBARRASSMENT SCALE OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EMOTIONS SCALE (DES-II)

(See description in A1 of the Shame measures section.)

### A4. EMBARRASSMENT SCENARIOS [NO SPECIFIC TITLE GIVEN]

(See description in A12 of the Shame measures section.)

## B. State Measures of Embarrassment

### B1. SITUATIONAL EMBARRASSMENT SCALE [ARABIC LANGUAGE ONLY]

Alansari, B. M. (1996). *Situational Embarrassment Scale manual*. Kuwait: University Book Home.

Alansari, B. M. (2002). Situational Embarrassment Scale. In B. M. Alansari (Ed.), *Sourcebook of objective personality scales: Standardization for Kuwaiti society* (pp. 70–89). Kuwait: New Book Home. [RARELY USED]

## B2. EMBARRASSMENT SCALE OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EMOTIONS SCALE (DES-II)

(See description in A1 of the Shame measures section.)

## C. Measures of Constructs Related to Embarrassment

*Note:* For space reasons, we do not include the many measures of shyness and social anxiety, even though these constructs are conceptually related to embarrassment (e.g., Cheek & Briggs, 1990; Leary, 1991; Miller, 1986).

### Pride

#### A. Trait Measures of Pride

##### A1. ALPHA AND BETA PRIDE SUBSCALES OF THE TEST OF SELF-CONSCIOUS AFFECT

(See description in A11 of the Shame measures section.)

##### A2. SELF-ASSURANCE SUBSCALE OF THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE—EXPANDED FORM

(See description in A8 of the Guilt measures section.)

##### A3. AUTHENTIC AND HUBRISTIC PRIDE SCALES

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 506–525.

The scales were empirically derived from a series of studies assessing participants' subjective feelings during a pride experience and their chronic dispositional tendencies to experience pride. The initial item set came from three sources: (1) labels applied to the pride nonverbal expression (Tracy & Robins, 2004a); (2) words listed in response to a request to list all pride-related words (Tracy & Robins, 2007); and (3) thesaurus synonyms for words that emerged from (1) and (2) and that were rated as highly prototypical of pride. The scales measure two empirically derived facets of pride, which the authors have labeled “authentic” and “hubristic,” but which are based on earlier theoretical accounts (Lewis, 2000; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1989; Tracy & Robins, 2004b). Each scale can be used to assess state or trait pride. In the trait version, participants are asked to rate the extent to which they “generally feel” each of the items. In the state version, participants are asked to rate the extent to which each item describes their current feelings. The two scales are fairly independent (for trait pride,  $r = .09$ , n.s.; for state pride,  $r = .14$ ,  $p < .05$ ). [NEWLY DEVELOPED]

*Scale characteristics:* Authentic pride scale (seven items, including “accomplished,” “like I am achieving,” “confident,” “fulfilled,” “productive,” “like I have self-worth,” and “successful”;  $\alpha = .88$ ); Hubristic pride scale (seven items, including “arrogant,” “conceited,” “egotistical,” “pompous,” “smug,” “snobbish,” and “stuck-up”;  $\alpha = .90$ )

*Response format:* 5-point scale (1 = “not at all”; 2 = “somewhat”; 3 = “moderately”; 4 = “very much”; 5 = “extremely”).

## B. State Measures of Pride

### B1. SELF-ASSURANCE SUBSCALE OF THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE—EXPANDED FORM

(See description in A8 of the Guilt measures section.)

### B2. PRIDE SUBSCALE OF THE STATE SHAME AND GUILT SCALE (SSGS)

(See description in B1 of the Shame measures section.)

### B3. AUTHENTIC AND HUBRISTIC PRIDE SCALES

(See description in A3 of the Pride trait measures section.)

## C. Measures of Constructs Related to Pride

### C1. NARCISSISTIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY (NPI)

[*Note:* There are numerous measures of narcissism. We include only the NPI because it is the most widely used scale and assesses individual differences in the normal range of narcissistic tendencies, rather than clinical levels of narcissism.]

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 890–902. [for the complete scale, contact Richard W. Robins at [rwrapins@ucdavis.edu](mailto:rwrapins@ucdavis.edu)]

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 11–17.

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *45*, 159–162.

Items were developed based on the DSM-III behavioral criteria for the narcissistic personality disorder, however the scale is assumed to assess subclinical levels of narcissistic tendencies. Most researchers use Raskin and Terry’s (1988) 40-item version of the original 54-item scale. Raskin and Terry (1988) and Emmons (1987) both developed subscales of the NPI, a subset of which are relevant to pride and are described below. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics* (Raskin & Terry, 1988): total scale (40 items;  $\alpha = .83$ ), superiority (five items;  $\alpha = .54$ ), self-sufficiency (six items;  $\alpha = .50$ ), vanity (three items;  $\alpha = .64$ ).

*Scale characteristics* (Emmons, 1987): total scale (54 items;  $\alpha = .87$ ), Self-Absorption/Self-Admiration (nine items;  $\alpha = .81$ ), Superiority/Arrogance (11 items;  $\alpha = .70$ ).

*Sample item:* “(A) The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me. (B) If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a forced-choice response option (for each pair of statements, participants are required to select the statement they agree with more strongly).

## C2. REGULATORY FOCUS QUESTIONNAIRE (RFQ)

Harlow, R. E., Friedman, R. S., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). *The Regulatory Focus Questionnaire*. New York: Department of Psychology, Columbia University.

Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 3–23. [includes full scale]

A set of items was generated using the rational method, and was validated on several large samples of undergraduates using a variety of criteria. This measure is used in both basic and applied social psychology to measure regulatory styles and strategies to achieve success, but is not typically used as a trait measure of pride. [RARELY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* promotion pride (six items;  $\alpha = .73$ ), prevention pride (five items;  $\alpha = .80$ ).

*Sample item:* “How often have you accomplished things that got you ‘psyched’ to work even harder?”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale.

## C3. STATE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE (SSES)

Heatherton, T. F., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 895–910. [includes full scale]

Linton, K. E., & Marriott, R. G. (1996). Self-esteem in adolescents: Validation of the State Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *21*, 85–90.

Developed from factor analyses of the Janis and Field (1959) Feelings of Inadequacy Scale and its revisions. This scale does not measure pride directly, but assesses the related construct of momentary feelings of self-worth. This scale is used primarily in the social-personality literature. [FREQUENTLY USED]

*Scale characteristics:* total scale (20 items;  $\alpha = .92$ ), performance (seven items;  $\alpha = .80$ ), social (seven items;  $\alpha = .80$ ), appearance (six items;  $\alpha = .83$ ). [alphas from Lakey & Scoboria, 2005]

*Sample item:* “I feel that others respect and admire me.”

*Response format:* Statement-based measure with a 5-point scale (1= “not at all”; 2 = “a little bit”; 3 = “somewhat”; 4 = “very much”; 5 = “extremely”).

## NONVERBAL INDICATORS OF SELF-CONSCIOUS EMOTIONS

Building on the large body of research demonstrating that each so-called basic emotion (i.e., anger, fear, disgust, happiness, sadness, surprise) is associated with a distinct, universally recognized facial expression (Ekman, 2003), several researchers have attempted to find reliably identified nonverbal expressions for the self-conscious emotions. As with the basic emotions, a key criterion for determining whether a particular self-conscious emotion has a distinct nonverbal expression is whether such an expression is recognizable; thus, researchers have conducted judgment studies showing that embarrassment, pride, and shame are associated with expressions that observers reliably agree signify each emotion (Izard, 1971; Keltner, 1995; Tracy & Robins, 2004a). In

these studies, participants are typically shown photographs of posed expressions and asked to choose which, if any, emotion is conveyed by each expression. If agreement levels are higher than what would be expected by chance (usually defined by the number of options presented), it is then assumed that the expression does, in fact, signify a particular emotion (but see Russell, 1994). Embarrassment, pride, and shame have nonverbal expressions that are recognized across cultures (Haidt & Keltner, 1999; Izard, 1971; Tracy & Robins, 2004a), and, in the case of pride and shame, by members of a preliterate culture that is highly isolated from the Western world (Tracy & Robins, 2006). These findings suggest the expressions are not simply culture-specific socialized gestures (like the “thumb’s up” sign) and may in fact be a universal part of human nature.

Posed, recognizable expressions for each self-conscious emotion were derived from anecdotal observations and observational studies in which participants’ nonverbal behaviors were recorded or coded during an embarrassing, prideful, or shaming experience (Keltner, 1995; Belsky & Domitrovich, 1997; Lewis, Alessandri, & Sullivan, 1992; Stipek, Recchia, & McClintic, 1992; Weisfeld & Beresford, 1982).

The finding of universal basic emotion recognition led to the development of an elaborate coding scheme for each basic emotion, based on the specific facial muscle movements involved in each expression (i.e., the Facial Action Coding Scheme, or FACS; Ekman & Friesen, 1978). In this scheme, each critical facial muscle movement is assigned an “action unit” (AU). Notably, the self-conscious emotion expressions seem to involve more than the face; they cannot be accurately identified without the perception of head movements, postural positions, or arm positions. FACS includes codes for head movements, but not for body and postural movements, so elements of certain self-conscious emotion expressions (e.g., pride) are not captured by the extant scheme.

In Table 24.1, we describe the facial and nonfacial actions that have been found to be associated with the recognizable expression of each self-conscious emotion; where possible, we also report the relevant AUs.

In general, the availability of a nonverbal coding scheme for an emotion greatly enhances a researcher’s ability to study that particular emotion by circumventing the limitations of self-report. Self-report measures of emotions require that participants (1) be aware of their emotions, (2) be willing to disclose their emotions, and (3) can distinguish among different yet similar emotional experiences. Research suggests that all three of these assumptions are frequently not met: emotions are often experienced at an implicit level (Kihlstrom, Mulvaney, Tobias, & Tobis, 2000; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2005); research participants are often unwilling to openly discuss their feelings, particularly feelings of shame (H. B. Lewis, 1971; Scheff, Retzinger, & Ryan, 1989), and in many situations it is not socially acceptable for them to do so (Zammuner, 1996; Zammuner & Frijda, 1994); and similar emotions, such as shame and guilt, are frequently confused by laypeople (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). For these reasons, nonverbal expressions, which are less under voluntary control than are verbal self-reports, may be crucial to an accurate assessment of an individual’s emotional response to a particular event (Ekman, 2003). However, given that expressions occur very quickly, are more difficult to assess (videotaping is typically required), are time-consuming to code (several distinct expressions can occur within a matter of seconds), and can only be used to assess states, not traits, researchers may want to use both approaches and seek convergences (or psychologically meaningful divergences) across methods.

TABLE 24.1. Facial and Nonfacial Actions Associated with Self-Conscious Emotions

Emotion	Nonverbal expression	Mean recognition rates (Western samples)	Cross-cultural recognition	Relevant citations
Embarrassment (dynamic display)	Gaze down, followed by lip press, then smile, then head turn away, then gaze shift	53–61%		Keltner, D. (1995). Signs of appeasement: Evidence for the distinct displays of embarrassment, amusement, and shame. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 68, 441–454.
Embarrassment (static “snapshot image” display)	Non-Duchenne smile, lip press, gaze down, head movement to the left and down, face touch (AUs 12, 24, 51, 54, 64)	40–56%	United States, India	Haidt, J., & Keltner, D. (1999). Culture and facial expression: Open-ended methods find more expressions and a gradient of recognition. <i>Cognition and Emotion</i> , 13, 225–266. Keltner, D. (1995). Signs of appeasement: Evidence for the distinct displays of embarrassment, amusement, and shame. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 68, 441–454. Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. (1997). Embarrassment: Its distinct forms and appeasement functions. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 122, 250–270.
Pride	Head tilted back approximately 15 degrees (AU 53b or 53c), small non-Duchenne smile (AU 12a or 12b), expanded posture (shoulders back, chest out), and arms either (a) akimbo with hands on hips; (b) raised above the head with hands in fists; or (c) crossed on chest	74–84%; recognition is highest for arm position (a), then (b), then (c)	United States, Italy, Burkina Faso (preliterate)	Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Show your pride: Evidence for a discrete emotion expression. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 15, 194–197. Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006). <i>The nonverbal expression of pride: Evidence for cross-cultural recognition</i> . Manuscript under review.
Shame	Head and gaze down (AUs 54, 64)	47–73%	United States, England, Germany, Sweden, France, Switzerland, Greece, Japan, Burkina Faso (preliterate)	Izard, C. E. (1971). <i>The face of emotion</i> . East Norwalk, CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts. Keltner, D. (1995). Signs of appeasement: Evidence for the distinct displays of embarrassment, amusement, and shame. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 68, 441–454. Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006). <i>The nonverbal expression of pride: Evidence for cross-cultural recognition</i> . Manuscript under review.

Note. Two recognizable embarrassment expressions have been documented, so both are included here. The dynamic version, which takes place over a 5-second time course, is typically better recognized, but the static version shares a central feature with all other recognizable emotion expressions—it can be recognized from a single snapshot image. To date, no research has found a reliably recognizable nonverbal expression of guilt.

## REFERENCES

- Belsky, J., & Domitrovich, C. (1997). Temperament and parenting antecedents of individual difference in three-year-old boys' pride and shame reactions. *Child Development, 68*, 456–466.
- Buss, D. M., & Craik, K. H. (1986). Acts, dispositions, and clinical assessment: The psychopathology of everyday conduct. *Clinical Psychology Review, 6*, 387–406.
- Cheek, J. M., & Briggs, S. R. (1990). Shyness as a personality trait. In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), *Shyness and embarrassment: Perspectives from social psychology* (pp. 315–337). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ekman, P. (2003). *Emotions revealed: Recognizing faces and feelings to improve communication and emotional life*. New York: Times Books.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1978). *Facial action coding system: Investigator's guide*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gioiella, P. P. (1979). The relationship of relative shame/guilt proneness to the attribution of responsibility under no shame and shame arousal (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 40*, 24–32.
- Izard, C. E. (1971). *The face of emotion*. East Norwalk, CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Izard, C. E. (1991). *The psychology of emotions*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Izard, C. E., Dougherty, F. E., Bloxom, B. M., & Kotsch, W. E. (1974). *The Differential Emotions Scale: A method of surveying the subjective experience of discrete emotions*. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University.
- Janis, I. L., & Field, P. B. (1959). A behavioral assessment of persuasibility: Consistency of individual differences. In C. Hovland & I. Janis (Eds.), *Personality and persuasibility* (pp. 29–54). Oxford, UK: Yale University Press.
- Keltner, D. (1995). Signs of appeasement: Evidence for the distinct displays of embarrassment, amusement, and shame. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 441–454.
- Kihlstrom, J. F., Mulvaney, S., Tobias, B. A., & Tobis, I. P. (2000). The emotional unconscious. In E. Eich, J. F. Kihlstrom, G. H. Bower, J. P. Forgas, & P. M. Niedenthal (Eds.), *Cognition and emotion* (pp. 30–86). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakey, B., & Scoboria, A. (2005). The relative contribution of trait and social influences to the links among perceived social support, affect, and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 361–388.
- Leary, M. R. (1991). Social anxiety, shyness, and related constructs. In J. Robinson, P. Shaver, & L. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 161–194). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed., pp. 623–636). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. M., & Sullivan, M. W. (1992). Differences in shame and pride as a function of children's gender and task difficulty. *Child Development, 63*, 630–638.
- Miller, R. S. (1986). Embarrassment: Causes and consequences. In W. H. Jones, J. M. Cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment* (pp. 295–311). New York: Plenum Press.
- Nathanson, D. L. (1992). *Shame and pride*. New York: Norton.
- Russell, J. A. (1994). Is there universal recognition of emotion from facial expressions?: A review of the cross-cultural studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 102–141.
- Scheff, T. J., Retzinger, S. M., & Ryan, M. T. (1989). Crime, violence, and self-esteem: Review and proposals. In A. M. Mecca, N. J. Smelser, & J. Vasconcellos (Eds.), *The social importance of self-esteem* (pp. 165–199). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Attachment theory and research: Resurrection of the psychodynamic approach to personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 39*, 22–45.

- Stipek, D., Recchia, S., & McClintic, S. (1992). Self-evaluation in young children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 57 (Serial No. 226).
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger?: The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 669–675.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., & Gramzow, R. (1989). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004a). Show your pride: Evidence for a discrete emotion expression. *Psychological Science*, 15, 194–197.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004b). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103–125.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006). *The nonverbal expression of pride: Evidence for cross-cultural recognition*. Manuscript under review.
- Turner, R. G., Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Ickes, W. (1978). Correlates of self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42, 285–289.
- Weisfeld, G. E., & Beresford, J. M. (1982). Erectness of posture as an indicator of dominance or success in humans. *Motivation and Emotion*, 6, 113–131.
- Zammuner, V. L. (1996). Felt emotions, and verbally communicated emotions: The case of pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 233–245.
- Zammuner, V. L., & Frijda, N. H. (1994). Felt and communicated emotions: Sadness and jealousy. *Cognition and Emotion*, 8, 37–53.
- Zevon, M., & Tellegen, A. (1982). The structure of mood change: An idiographic/nomothetic analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 111–122.