

Self-Conscious Emotions

June Price Tangney

George Mason University

Jessica Tracy

University of British Columbia

Rev. 5/6/11

*To appear in Leary, M., & Tangney, J.P. (Eds) Handbook of self and identity. New York: Guilford Press.

All human emotions are, in a loose sense, “self-relevant.” Emotions arise when something self-relevant happens or is about to happen. In the language of appraisal theory (Lazarus, 1966), we experience emotions when we judge that events have positive or negative significance for our well-being. The specific type of emotional response is shaped both by such primary appraisals of events’ positive vs. negative implications for the individual, and by secondary appraisals (e.g., of one’s ability to cope with the events). But all emotions arise from events that in some way have relevance for oneself. There is, however, a special class of human emotions that are even more immediately self-relevant. This chapter focuses on these “self-conscious” emotions, which directly involve self-reflection and self-evaluation.

Self-Conscious Emotions

Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride are members of a family of “self-conscious emotions” that are evoked by self-reflection and self-evaluation. This self-evaluation may be implicit or explicit, consciously experienced or transpiring beyond our awareness. But in one way or another, these emotions fundamentally involve people’s reactions to their own characteristics or behavior. For example, when good things happen, we may feel a range of positive emotions -- joy, happiness, satisfaction or contentment. But we feel pride in our own positive attributes or actions. By the same token, when bad things happen, many negative emotions are possible – for example, sadness, disappointment, frustration, or anger. But feelings of shame and guilt typically arise from the recognition of one's own negative attributes or behaviors. Even when we feel shame due to another person's behavior, that person is almost invariably someone with whom we are closely affiliated or identified (e.g., a family member, friend or colleague closely associated with oneself). We experience shame because that person is part of our self-definition.

One way to understand the distinction between self-conscious and non-self-conscious emotions is to think about how every emotion is uniquely influenced, and in some cases dramatically shifted, by the involvement of self-processes, such as self-reflection and self-evaluation. These processes convert what would otherwise be sadness, fear, anger, disgust, and joy into the more self-relevant emotions of shame, guilt, hostility, contempt, and pride. For example, fear can become transmuted into guilt when we think about what our fear means for our identity; this may be why Franklyn Delano Roosevelt's famous statement, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," had a major impact on a generation of individuals who were at an age when identity concerns are highly prominent. Anger becomes hostility or aggression when it is directed toward someone who has threatened an individual's identity and made him or her feel insecure (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Another presidential quote, "You won't have Nixon to kick around anymore" reflects this sentiment. Happiness becomes pride when individuals credit themselves for a positive event (Tracy & Robins, 2004).

As these examples imply, self-conscious emotions are a special class of emotions that *critically* involve self-relevant thoughts, feelings, intentions, and behaviors (Campos, 1995; Fischer & Tangney, 1995). They drive people to work hard in achievement and task domains (Stipek, 1995; Weiner, 1985), and to behave in moral, socially appropriate ways in their social interactions and intimate relationships (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994; Leith & Baumeister, 1998). As a result, self-conscious emotions are important to a range of social outcomes. Guilt is centrally involved in reparative and pro-social behaviors such as empathy, altruism, and care-giving (Batson, 1987; Baumeister et al., 1994; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Shame punishes immoral behavior, as it is felt when individuals violate (or anticipate violating) important social standards. Pride motivates pro-social behaviors (Hart & Matsuba, 2007; Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010) and is the emotion (along with shame) that gives self-esteem its affective kick (Brown & Marshall, 2001). Together, self-conscious emotions function to provide immediate and salient feedback on our social and moral acceptability – our worth as a human being.

The primary distinctive characteristic of self-conscious emotions is that their elicitation

requires the ability to form stable self-representations (“me”), to focus attention on those representations (i.e., to self-reflect; “I”), and to put it all together to generate a self-evaluation (Tracy & Robins, 2004). Complex self-evaluative processes are both an important part of the direct causal processes that elicit self-conscious emotions (i.e., a proximal cause) and of the evolutionary processes through which these emotions became part of the human repertoire (i.e., a distal cause). These self-processes may mediate the relation between an emotion-eliciting event or environmental stimulus, and its emotional output (the self-conscious emotion).

Shame and Guilt

To many, shame and guilt are the quintessential “moral emotions” – woven inextricably in our imagery of the repentant sinner. Shame and guilt are typically mentioned in the same breath, as moral emotions that inhibit antisocial, morally objectionable behavior. But an extensive theoretical and empirical literature underscores striking differences in the phenomenology of these emotions (Lewis, 1971; Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Tangney, 1993; Tangney & Dearing 2002; Weiner, 1985; Wicker, Payne & Morgan, 1983) -- differences that have important and distinct implications for subsequent motivation and behavior. Most notably, a decade of research indicates that the shame and guilt are not equally “moral” or adaptive emotions. Evidence suggests that whereas guilt consistently motivates people in positive direction (Baumeister, et al., 1994; Eisenberg, 1986; Tangney, 1991; 1995a, b), shame is a moral emotion that can easily go awry (Tangney, 1991, 1995a, b, 1996).

What is the Difference Between Shame and Guilt?

Despite the general tendency among many to use the terms “shame” and “guilt” interchangeably, a large body of research suggests that these two emotions are in fact quite distinct. Two bases for distinguishing between shame and guilt stand out as especially influential – early anthropologists’ focus on public vs. private transgressions (e.g., Benedict, 1946), and Helen Block Lewis’s (1971) focus on self vs. behavior.

In distinguishing between shame and guilt, anthropologists focused on differences in the content or structure of events eliciting these emotions. The notion is that certain *kinds of situations* lead to shame, whereas other *kinds of situations* lead to guilt. More specifically, shame was viewed as a more "public" emotion than guilt (Benedict, 1946), arising from public exposure and disapproval of some shortcoming or transgression. Guilt, on the other hand, was conceived as a more "private" experience arising from self-generated pangs of conscience. As it turns out, empirical research has failed to support this public/private distinction (Tangney, Marschall, Rosenberg, Barlow & Wagner, 1994; Tangney, Miller, Flicker & Barlow, 1996). For example, we conducted a systematic analysis of the social context of personal shame and guilt eliciting events, described by several hundred children and adults (Tangney, et al., 1994). Results indicated that shame and guilt are equally likely to be experienced in the presence of others. "Solitary" shame experiences were about as common as "solitary" guilt experiences. Even more to the point, the frequency with which others were *aware* of the respondents' behavior did not vary as a function of shame and guilt, in direct contradiction to the anthropologists' conceptualization.

Might shame and guilt be distinguished by the types of the transgressions or failures that elicit them? Analyses of personal shame and guilt experiences provided by children and adults revealed few, if any, "classic" shame-inducing or guilt-inducing situations (Tangney, 1992; Tangney, et al., 1994). Guilt has been more narrowly linked to moral transgressions (e.g., behaviors that cause harm, violate the rights of others, or adversely affect the well-being of the community), whereas shame can be elicited by a broader range of situations including both "moral" and "non-moral" failures (Ferguson, Stegge, & Damhuis, 1991; Sabini & Silver, 1997; Smith, Webster, Parrott & Eyre, 2002). Another series of studies found that shame is more likely to be elicited by proscriptive violations (doing behaviors we should not), whereas guilt is more likely to be elicited by prescriptive violations (not doing things we should; Sheikh & Janoff-Bulman, 2010), but most types of potentially negative self-relevant events (e.g., lying, cheating, stealing, failing to help another, disobeying parents, sex, etc.) are

cited by some people in connection with feelings of shame and by others in connection with guilt. Consistent with the overall trend of these results, Keltner and Buswell (1996) and Tracy and Robins (2006) both measured shame- and guilt-eliciting events and found a high degree of overlap in the types of events that cause the two emotions.

How, then, do shame and guilt differ, if not in the types of situations that elicit them? Empirical research has been much more supportive of Helen Block Lewis's (1971) emphasis on a distinction between blaming the self vs. behavior. According to Lewis (1971), shame involves a negative evaluation of the global self; guilt involves a negative evaluation of a specific behavior. Although this distinction may, at first glance, appear rather subtle, this differential emphasis on self ("I did that horrible thing") vs. behavior ("I *did* that horrible *thing*") sets the stage for very different emotional experiences and very different patterns of motivations and subsequent behavior.

Shame is an acutely painful emotion that is typically accompanied by a sense of shrinking or "being small," and by a sense of worthlessness and powerlessness. Shamed people also feel exposed. Although shame does not necessarily involve an actual observing audience to witness one's shortcomings, there is often the imagery of how one's defective self would appear to others. Lewis (1971) described a split in self-functioning in which the self is both agent and object of observation and disapproval. An observing self witnesses and denigrates the observed self as unworthy and reprehensible. Not surprisingly, shame often leads to a desire to escape or to hide -- to sink into the floor and disappear.

Guilt, in contrast, is typically a less painful, devastating experience because the object of condemnation is a specific behavior, not the person as a whole. One's core identity or self concept is less at stake. Rather than feeling a need to defend a vulnerable self-image under attack, people experiencing guilt are focused on the offense and its consequences, feeling tension, remorse, and regret over the "bad thing done." People feeling guilt often report a nagging focus or pre-occupation with the transgression -- thinking of it over and over, wishing they had behaved differently or could somehow

undo the harm that was done. Rather than motivating avoidance and defense, guilt motivates reparative behavior – confession, apology, and attempts to fix the situation.

Lewis's (1971) self-vs.-behavior distinction between shame and guilt has received broad empirical support from studies employing diverse methodologies including qualitative case studies, content analyses of shame and guilt narratives, participants' quantitative ratings of personal shame and guilt experiences, analyses of attributions associated with shame and guilt, and analyses of participants' counterfactual thinking (for reviews, see Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney, Stuewig & Mashek, 2007; Tracy & Robins, 2006).

Shame and Guilt Are Not Equally “Moral” or Psychologically Adaptive Emotions

One of the consistent themes emerging from empirical research is that shame and guilt are not equally “moral” or psychologically adaptive emotions. On balance, guilt appears to be the more useful emotion, benefiting individuals and their relationships in a variety of ways (Baumeister, Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994, 1995a ,b; Tangney, 1991, 1995b). Five sets of findings illustrate the adaptive functions of guilt, in contrast to the hidden costs of shame.

Hiding vs. Amending. First, research shows that shame and guilt lead to contrasting motivations or “action tendencies” (de Hooge, Zeelenberg, & Breugelmans, 2007; Ferguson, et al., 1991; Ketelaar & Au, 2003; Lewis, 1971; Lindsay-Hartz 1984; Sheikh & Janoff-Bulman, 2010; Tangney, 1993; Tangney, et al., 1996; Wallbott & Scherer, 1995; Wicker, et al., 1983). In the face of failure or transgression, shame typically leads to attempts to deny, hide or escape the shame-inducing situation; guilt typically leads to reparative action – confessing, apologizing, undoing. For example, when people anonymously describe and rate personal shame and guilt experiences along a number of phenomenological dimensions (Tangney, 1993; Tangney, Miller, et al., 1996), their ratings indicate that they feel more compelled to hide from others and less inclined to admit what they had done when feeling shame as opposed to guilt. Feelings of guilt motivate people to restore wealth-based equity when resources are distributed unevenly in their favor (Gino & Pierce, 2009). Even when

unconsciously primed, guilt leads people to avoid over-indulgence and to help less fortunate others, especially among those dispositionally prone to guilt (Zemack-Rugar, Bettman & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Taken together, findings across studies suggest that guilt motivates people in a constructive, proactive, future-oriented direction, whereas shame motivates people toward separation, distance, and defense.

Other-oriented Empathy. Second, there appears to be a special link between guilt and empathy. Empathy is a highly valued, pro-social emotional process. Empathy motivates altruistic, helping behavior; that it fosters warm, close interpersonal relationships; and that it inhibits antisocial behavior and interpersonal aggression (Eisenberg, 1986; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Feshbach, 1987; Feshbach & Feshbach, 1969, 1982, 1986). Research also indicates that, at both the state and trait level, guilt and empathy go hand-in-hand, whereas feelings of shame often interfere with an empathic connection (Joireman, 2004; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Silfver, Helkama, Loonqvist, & Verkasalo, 2008; Stuewig, Tangney, Heigel, Harty, & McCloskey, 2010; Tangney, 1991; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney, et al., 1994). Across numerous independent studies of people of all ages, results are remarkably consistent: guilt-prone individuals are generally empathic individuals. Proneness to guilt consistently correlates with perspective-taking and empathic concern. In contrast, shame-proneness has been associated with an impaired capacity for other-oriented empathy and a propensity for problematic, "self-oriented" personal distress responses. Similarly, studies considering emotion states—feelings of shame and guilt “in the moment—have shown that when people describe personal guilt experiences, they convey greater empathy for others involved in the situation, compared to their descriptions of personal shame experiences (Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, et al., 1994). Moreover, when people are experimentally induced to feel shame, they exhibit less empathy and perspective-taking than non-shamed controls (Marschall, 1996; Yang, Yang & Chiou, 2010).

Why does shame, but not guilt, interfere with other-oriented empathy? In focusing on a bad behavior (as opposed to a bad person), people experiencing guilt are relatively free of the egocentric, self-involved process underlying shame. Instead, their focus on a specific behavior is likely to

highlight the consequences of that behavior for distressed others, further facilitating an empathic response (Tangney, 1991, 1995b). In contrast, the painful self-focus of shame is apt to “de-rail” the empathic process.

Anger and Aggression. Third, research has shown that there is a special link between shame and anger, again observed at both the dispositional and state levels. Helen Block Lewis (1971) first speculated on the dynamics between shame and anger (or humiliated fury), based on her clinical case studies, noting that clients’ feelings of shame often precede expressions of anger and hostility in the therapy room. In years since, numerous empirical studies have shown a robust link between shame and tendencies to externalize blame and anger, again observed at both the dispositional and state levels. Among individuals of all ages and from all walks of life, proneness to shame is positively correlated with anger, hostility, and the propensity to blame others (Andrews, Brewin, Rose & Kirk, 2000; Bear, Uribe-Zarain, Manning, & Shiomi, 2009; Bennett, Sullivan, & Lewis, 2005; Harper, Austin, Cercone & Arias, 2005; Harper & Arias, 2004; Heaven, Ciarrochi & Leeson, 2009; Luyten, Fontaine, & Corveleyn, 2002; Morrison & Gilbert, 2001; Paulhus, Robins, Trzesniewski, & Tracy, 2004; Tangney, 1994, 1995b; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney, Stuewig & Mashek, 2007; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher & Gramzow, 1992; but see Farmer & Andrews, 2009). Not only are shame-prone individuals more prone to externalize blame and anger than their non-shame-prone peers, but, once angered, they are also more likely to manage and express their anger in a destructive fashion. For example, in a cross-sectional developmental study of children, adolescents, college students, and adults (Tangney, Wagner, et al., 1996), proneness to shame was consistently correlated with malevolent intentions, and a propensity to engage in direct physical, verbal and symbolic aggression, indirect aggression (e.g., harming something important to the target, talking behind the target's back), displaced aggression, self-directed aggression, and anger held in (a ruminative unexpressed anger). Not surprisingly, shame-prone individuals reported that their anger typically results in negative long-term consequences – for themselves and for their relationships with others.

A similar link between shame and anger has been observed at the situational level, too. For example, Wicker, Payne, and Morgan (1983) found that college students reported a greater desire to punish others involved in personal shame vs. guilt experiences. Tangney, Miller, et al. (1996) found a similar trend among college students who reported more feelings of anger in connection with narrative accounts of shame vs. guilt experiences. In a study of male offenders, Wright, Gudjonsson, and Young (2008) found that offense-related shame was associated with anger difficulties. And in a study of adolescents, experimentally induced shame was associated with a laboratory measure of aggression, particularly among those high in narcissism (Thomaes, Bushman, Stegge, & Olthof, 2008). The link between shame and overt physical aggression, observed in many but not all studies (Tangney, Miller, et al., 1996; for a review see Tangney, Stuewig & Mashek, 2007), appears to be almost entirely mediated by externalization of blame (Stuewig, et al., 2010).

What accounts for this rather counterintuitive link between shame and anger? When feeling shame, people initially direct hostility inward (“*I’m such a bad person*”). But not infrequently, this hostility may be redirected outward, in a defensive attempt to protect oneself, by “turning the tables” to shift the blame elsewhere. In doing so, the shamed person attempts to regain some sense of control and superiority in his or her life, but the long-term costs can be steep. Friends, co-workers, and loved ones may feel confused and alienated by apparently irrational bursts of anger. Shame-fueled aggression can be especially harmful to romantic relationships.

In sharp contrast, guilt is associated with an inclination to take responsibility for transgressions and errors. Externalization of blame has been consistently negatively correlated with guilt at both the state and trait levels (Tangney, Stuewig & Mashek, 2007). Guilt-proneness is unrelated to anger – that is, guilt-prone people are just as prone to anger as anyone else. But when angered, guilt-prone individuals are inclined manage their anger constructively (e.g., non-hostile discussion, direct corrective action), and they are *disinclined* toward aggression (Ahmed & Braithwaite, 2004; Lutwak, Panish, Ferrari, & Razzino, 2001; Paulhus et al., 2004; Stuewig, et al., 2010; Tangney, Wagner, Hill-

Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996; Wright, et al., 2008) or related disruptive behaviors (Kochanska, Barry, Jimenez, Hollatz & Woodard, 2009). Moreover, guilt-prone individuals report that their anger typically results in positive long-term consequences (Tangney, Wagner, et al., 1996).

Psychological Symptoms. The research reviewed thus far suggests that guilt is, on balance, the more “moral” or adaptive emotion -- at least when considering social behavior and interpersonal adjustment. But is there a trade-off vis-a-vis individual psychological adjustment? Does the tendency to experience guilt over one’s transgressions ultimately lead to anxiety and depression, or to decreases in self-esteem? Is shame perhaps less problematic for intrapersonal as opposed to interpersonal adjustment?

In fact, researchers consistently report a positive relationship between proneness to shame and a host of psychological symptoms, including depression, generalized anxiety and social anxiety, low self-esteem, PTSD, eating disorder symptoms, Cluster C personality disorders, suicidal behavior and self-injurious behavior, and substance abuse (e.g., Allan, Gilbert, & Goss, 1994; Andrews et al. 2000; Ashby, Rice, & Martin, 2006; Brown, Linehan, Comtois, Murray, & Chapman, 2009; Cohen, Wolf, Panter & Insko, in press; Dearing, Stuewig & Tangney, 2005; Feiring & Taska, 2005; Ferguson, Valentiner, McGrath, & Jencius, 2010; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999; Ferguson, Stegge, Eyre, Vollmer, & Ashbaker, 2000; Gramzow & Tangney, 1992; Gupta, Rosenthal, Mancini, Cheavens & Lynch, 2008; Harder, 1995; Harder, et al., 1992; Harper & Arias 2004; Hoblitzelle, 1987; Luyten et al., 2002; Meehan et al., 1996; Mills, 2003; Murray, Waller, & Legg, 2000; Rüsck, Corrigan, Bohus, Kühler, Jacob, Lieb, 2007; Sanftner, Barlow, Marschall, & Tangney, 1995; Shoenleber & Berenbaum, 2010; Stuewig & McCloskey 2005; Tangney, 1993; Tangney, Burggraf, & Wagner, 1995; Tangney, et al., 1992; Thompson & Berenbaum, 2006; Tilghman-Osborne, Cole, Felton & Ciesla, 2008; Troop, Allan, Serpell & Treasure, 2008; Valentiner & Smith, 2008). This relationship appears to be robust across a range of measurement methods and across diverse age groups and populations. Moreover, Gratz, Rosenthal, Tull, Lejuez, and Gunderson (2010) presented evidence that the link between shame

and psychological maladjustment is context- and emotion-specific. In their experimental study, heightened affective reactivity and Borderline Personality Disorder were specifically linked to shame (as opposed to anxiety, hostility and irritability) and most evident in response to negative evaluation (as opposed to a stressful task).

In sum, shame is frequently part of the clinical picture when considering psychological maladjustment (Dearing & Tangney, in press). People who frequently experience feelings of shame about themselves seem vulnerable to a range of psychological symptoms. Furthermore, nonverbal displays of shame shown while discussing their addiction predict several measures of poor physical and mental health among recovering alcoholics (Randles & Tracy, in prep.)

There is less consensus regarding the implications of guilt for psychopathology. The traditional view is that guilt plays a significant role in psychological symptoms. Clinical theory and case studies make frequent reference to a maladaptive guilt characterized by chronic self-blame and obsessive rumination over one's transgressions (e.g., Blatt, D'Afflitti, & Quinlin, 1976; Freud, 1909/1955, 1917/1957; Piers & Singer, 1953; Weiss, 1993; Zahn-Waxler, Kochanska, Krupnick & McKnew, 1990). In contrast, recent theory and research has emphasized the adaptive functions of guilt, particularly for interpersonal behavior (Baumeister, Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994, 1995a; Hoffman, 1982; Tangney, 1991, 1994, 1995b; Tangney, Stuewig & Mashek, 2007).

Attempting to reconcile these perspectives, Tangney, et al. (1995) argued that once one makes the critical distinction between shame and guilt, there's no compelling reason to expect guilt over specific behaviors to be associated with poor psychological adjustment. Rather, guilt is most likely to be maladaptive when it becomes fused with shame. When a person begins with a guilt experience ("Oh, look at what a horrible *thing* I have *done*") but then magnifies and generalizes the event to the self ("...and aren't I a horrible *person*"), many of the advantages of guilt are lost. Not only is a person faced with tension and remorse over a specific behavior that needs to be fixed, he or she is also saddled with feelings of contempt and disgust for being a bad, defective person. And it is the shame

component of this sequence -- not the guilt component -- that poses the problem. Often, an objectionable behavior can be altered, the negative effects can be repaired, or at least one can offer a heart-felt apology. Even in cases where direct reparation or apology is not possible, one can resolve to do better in the future. In contrast, being defective as a person is much more difficult to transform or amend. Shame -- and, in turn, shame-fused guilt -- offers little opportunity for redemption. Thus, it is guilt *with an overlay of shame* that most likely leads to the interminable painful rumination and self-castigation so often described in the clinical literature.

The empirical results are quite consistent with this view. Studies employing adjective checklist-type (and other globally worded) measures of shame and guilt have found that both shame-prone and guilt-prone styles are associated with psychological symptoms (Harder, 1995; Harder, et al., 1992; Harder & Lewis, 1987; Jones & Kugler, 1993; Meehan, et al., 1996). On the other hand, when measures that are sensitive to Lewis's (1971) distinction (e.g., scenario-based methods, such as the TOSCA, assessing shame-proneness and guilt-proneness with respect to specific situations) are used instead, the tendency to experience "shame-free" guilt is essentially unrelated to psychological and behavioral symptoms. Numerous independent studies converge: guilt-prone children, adolescents and adults are not at increased risk for depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, etc. (Bybee, Zigler, Berliner, & Merisca, 1996; Cohen et al., in press; Dearing, et al., 2005; Fergus, et al, 2010; Gramzow & Tangney, 1992; Leskela et al. 2002; Quiles & Bybee, 1997; Rusch, et al, 2007; Tangney, 1994, 1999; Tangney, et al., 1995; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1992; Tilghman-Osborne, et al., 2008; Thompson & Berenbaum, 2006).

A recent meta-analysis of 108 studies examining the differential links of shame and guilt to depression (Kim, Thibodeau & Jorgensen, 2011) underscore these conclusions. Overall, shame was more strongly and consistently related to depression (mean weighted effect size $r=.43$) than was guilt ($r=.28$), and the propensity to experience "shame-free" guilt was unrelated to depression ($r=-.03$). Moreover, studies using TOSCA-type "contextualized" measures of guilt showed no relation to

depression ($r=.06$), whereas guilt measured by global affective checklists devoid of situational context showed a strong link to depression ($r=.42$), similar to shame. In all cases, findings generalized across age, sex, and ethnicity.

Deterring Transgression and Socially Undesirable Behavior. Shame may be very painful; it may interfere with other-oriented empathy; it may render us vulnerable to anxiety and depression. But there is a widely held assumption that because shame is so painful, at least it motivates people to avoid “doing wrong”, decreasing the likelihood of transgression and impropriety (Barrett, 1995; Ferguson & Stegge, 1995; Kahan, 1997; Zahn-Waxler & Robinson, 1995). As it turns out virtually no direct evidence supports this presumed adaptive function of shame. To the contrary, research suggests that shame may even make things worse.

In a study of college undergraduates, Tibbetts (2003) found that criminal offending was negatively related to guilt-proneness. Results involving shame-proneness were mixed. An overall shame-proneness index, comprising three dispositional measures of shame, was unrelated to illegal behavior, raising questions about the presumed inhibitory function of shame. Similar results were obtained in two prospective studies examining the degree to which shame and guilt-proneness predict criminal behavior in samples of adolescents. In one study, guilt-proneness assessed in the 5th grade negatively predicted arrests and convictions reported by the participant at age 18. In contrast, shame-proneness predicted neither (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). In another community sample of adolescents (Stuewig & McCloskey, 2005), proneness to “shame-free” guilt again emerged as a protective factor, negatively predicting delinquency assessed both by juvenile court records and by self-report; proneness to “guilt-free” shame did not.

A few studies have employed samples of juvenile or adult offenders. Robinson, Roberts, Strayer and Koopman (2007) found little difference in proneness to moral emotions comparing 64 incarcerated adolescent offenders with 60 high school students. However, the groups did not substantially differ in terms of antisocial behavior, and when combined, shame-proneness was largely

unrelated to self-reported antisocial attitudes and behavior, whereas guilt-proneness was consistently negatively related to antisocial attitudes and behaviors. In a large German sample of incarcerated adolescents and young adults, (Hosser, Windzio & Greve, 2008), single item shame ratings at the outset of incarceration predicted higher recidivism rates, whereas guilt ratings predicted lower recidivism. Among adult offenders (Morrison & Gilbert, 2001) shame was associated with psychopathy, especially secondary psychopathy, aggression, and other antisocial personality characteristics. In large sample of adult jail inmates, Tangney, Stuewig, Hastings and Mashek (in press) found that inmates' shame-proneness was associated with psychological symptoms, alcohol and drug problems, low self control, and the tendency to eschew responsibility and blame others, paralleling results from community samples. In contrast, inmates' guilt-proneness was positively associated with other-oriented empathy and self control, and negatively associated with externalization of blame and hostility. Furthermore, inmates' proneness to guilt was significantly negatively correlated with risk assessment measures and psychological factors known to predict violent and non-violent criminal recidivism. In contrast, inmates' shame-proneness was unrelated to clinician ratings of psychopathy and violent risk, and positively correlated with self-reported Antisocial Personality and criminogenic cognitions. Regarding actual criminal behavior, inmates' proneness to guilt, assessed shortly after incarceration, was negatively correlated with severity of current charges, prior jail experience, prior felony convictions, and custody level at the jail. In contrast, proneness to shame was unrelated to severity of current charges, prior jail experience, and custody level at the jail. Only proneness to "guilt-free" shame (the unique variance in shame, factoring out the variance in guilt) was modestly negatively correlated with serious offense history and prior felony convictions.

In sum, these studies of offenders indicate that the propensity to experience guilt about specific behaviors is a protective factor vis-à-vis severity of crime, involvement in the criminal justice system, and known predictors of recidivism. In contrast, there is little evidence that the propensity to experience shame serves an inhibitory function.

Understanding Adaptive and Maladaptive Effects of Shame and Guilt: Mediational Models

Across multiple domains evidence shows that shame and guilt are differentially related to a number of psychological and behavioral constructs. Recent research has begun to delve deeper by examining the mediational pathways that underlie these relationships. A number of studies have converged to suggest that anger and externalization of blame appear to mediate the relationship between shame and aggression. Specifically, men's anger has been found to mediate the relationship between shame-proneness and perpetration of psychological abuse in dating relationships (Harper et al., 2005). Stuewig et al. (2010) found that across four diverse samples (early adolescents, at-risk older adolescents, college students, and incarcerated adults), externalization of blame mediated the relationship between shame-proneness and both verbal and physical aggression. Guilt-proneness had the opposite effect; proneness to guilt was negatively related to aggression in three of the four samples, partially mediated through other-oriented empathy and accepting responsibility. Orth, Berking, and Burkhardt (2006) examined the role of rumination in the link between negative self-conscious emotions and depression. Rumination mediated the link between shame and depression, but once shame was taken into account, no relationship was observed between guilt and depression, nor did rumination emerge as a mediating factor. In another study, avoidant coping was found to mediate the link between shame and depression (De Rubeis & Hollenstein, 2009), and, along similar lines, problems with emotion regulation appear to mediate the link between chronic shame and symptoms of eating disorders (Gupta, Rosenthal, Mancini, Cheavens & Lynch, 2008).

In sum, the bivariate correlates of proneness to shame and guilt have been fairly well mapped out, but research examining more complex models involving mediation and moderation has just begun. We anticipate that future research will expand on this work considerably, clarifying the functional nature of the relationship of shame-proneness and guilt-proneness to a range of personality factors, psychological symptoms, and patterns of interpersonal behavior.

Why Do We Have The Capacity To Experience Shame?

The research summarized throughout this chapter underscores the dark side of shame. Empirical findings in five areas illustrate the adaptive functions of guilt, in contrast to the hidden costs of shame, when considering both interpersonal adjustment and psychological well-being. An obvious question, then, is “Why do we have the capacity to experience this emotion anyway?” What adaptive purpose does it serve? Is it a moral emotion after all?

Certainly a characterological propensity to experience shame on a daily basis is maladaptive. Common sense tells us that the vast majority of people’s quotidian transgressions and errors do not warrant a shameful, global condemnation of the self. It is overkill – rather like sending people to prison for a minor traffic violation. In the case of shame, the self-inflicted punishment often does not fit the crime.

Although a generalized proneness to shame is problematic, it is possible that state-specific feelings of shame can, in certain special circumstances, be useful. No doubt, there are occasional instances when individuals are faced with fundamental personal shortcomings (moral or otherwise) that would best be corrected. The acute pain of shame may, in some cases, motivate productive soul-searching and revisions to one’s priorities and values. The challenge, then, is to engage in such introspection and self-repair without becoming sidetracked by defensive reactions (e.g., denial, externalization, and anger) so often provoked by shame. Perhaps non-shame-prone, high “ego-strength” individuals with a solid sense of self may occasionally use shame constructively in the privacy of their own thoughts. Such adaptive uses of shame may be especially likely in the case of private, self-generated experiences of shame as opposed to public, other-generated shame episodes. But for most people, the debilitating, ego-threatening nature of shame makes such constructive outcomes difficult, if not impossible.

The more relevant question may not be “What adaptive purpose might shame serve now?” but rather “What purpose might it have served at earlier stages of evolution?” Shame may represent a relatively primitive emotion that more clearly served adaptive functions in the distant past, among

ancestors whose cognitive processes were less sophisticated in the context of a much simpler human society. This notion is consistent with the sociobiological approach, taken by Gilbert (1997), Fessler (1999), and others. Fessler, for example, describes a primitive form of shame – protoshame – as an early mechanism for communicating submission, thus affirming relative rank in the dominance hierarchy of early humans. Similarly, Gilbert (1997) has discussed the appeasement functions of shame and humiliation displays, noting continuities across human and nonhuman primates (see also Keltner, 1995; and Leary, Landel & Patton's, 1996, analysis of the appeasement functions of blushing and embarrassment). This perspective emphasizes the role of shame (and embarrassment) as a means of communicating one's acknowledgement of wrongdoing, thus diffusing anger and aggression. In a related fashion, the motivation to withdraw – so often a component of the shame experience – may be a useful response, interrupting potentially threatening social interactions until the shamed individual has a chance to regroup or the situation has blown over.

Fessler (2007) articulated an additional potentially adaptive function of shame, also arising from an evolutionary perspective. Drawing on a distinction between “dominance” hierarchies in which an elevated social position is acquired by threat or force, and “prestige” hierarchies, in which individuals are selected to elevated positions by observers (the lower rank and file; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001), Fessler argued that in prestige hierarchies, the appeasement functions of shame may be less a means of avoiding bodily injury, and more a signal that one is a trustworthy partner who takes seriously social norms. This is important in modern prestige hierarchies that rely heavily on cooperative ventures, where participants take risks by investing time, energy, and/or resources, and by passing up other opportunities. Because the potential for exploitation is high, one's reputation as a trustworthy partner is extremely important. When individuals who transgress express clear signs of shame, they protect their reputation as a trustworthy potential partner who is still “on the same page” as others. In contrast, the reputations of apparently shameless transgressors are tarnished; they are no longer attractive as trustworthy cooperative partners. Supporting this account, research on a sample of

over 1,000 North Americans ranging widely in age found that both men and women rated opposite-sex targets who displayed shame as sexually attractive, more so than men who displayed happiness and women who displayed pride (Tracy & Beall, in press). Our sense is that expressions of guilt (especially when accompanied by apologies and efforts to make reparation) can serve the same important reputation-repairing function – perhaps even more effectively.

Finally, in an intriguing series of studies, de Hooge, Breugelmans, and Zeelenberg (2008) showed that shame can prompt prosocial behavior but only under particular conditions – namely only toward people whom participants imagined were aware of the shaming event, and only among participants low in prosocial orientation, and. In follow-up studies, de Hooge, Zeelenberg, and Breugelmans (2010) showed that shame is associated with approach and repair motives specifically in academic contexts where the probability of subsequent success is high. Consistent with the notion that shame may be less problematic (and potentially positive) in circumscribed areas of life, Thompson and Berenbaum (2006) demonstrated that shame in interpersonal contexts but not academic contexts was associated with both current and past depressive disorders. In contrast, the conditions under which guilt motivates reparative or prosocial behavior are much broader in circumstance and personal attributes (de Hooge, et al., 2007).

From a variety of perspectives, then, guilt may be the more modern, adaptive moral emotion. Humankind has evolved in terms of emotional and cognitive complexity. With increasingly complex perspective-taking and attributional abilities, modern human adults have the capacity to distinguish between oneself and one's behavior, to take another person's perspective, and to empathize with others' distress. Whereas early moral goals centered on reducing potentially lethal aggression, clarifying social rank, and enhancing conformity to social norms, modern morality centers on the ability to acknowledge one's wrong-doing, accept responsibility, and take reparative action. Among the self-conscious emotions, guilt stands out as particularly well-suited to motivate reparative interpersonal behavior that strengthens our bonds and supports cooperative effort.

When Does Guilt Become Maladaptive?

Why is guilt frequently cited as a symptom in such psychological disorders as anxiety and depression? What is the chronic, ruminative guilt described by so many clinicians? One possibility is that problematic guilt experiences are actually feelings of guilt *fused with feelings of shame*. It seems likely that when a person begins with a guilt experience (“Oh, look at what a horrible *thing* I have *done*”) but then magnifies and generalizes the event to him- or herself (“...and aren’t I a horrible *person*”), many of the advantages of guilt are lost. Not only is the person faced with tension and remorse over a specific behavior that needs to be fixed, he or she is also saddled with feelings of contempt and disgust for being bad, defective person. In effect, shame-fused guilt may be just as problematic as shame itself. In fact, research shows that the unique variance in guilt (the part of guilt that is independent of shame) is most clearly related to positive interpersonal behaviors and adjustment. Co-occurring shame and guilt is associated with poor outcomes, much as is shame unaccompanied by guilt.

Problems are also likely to arise when people develop an exaggerated or distorted sense of responsibility for events beyond their control. Survivor guilt is a prime example of such a problematic guilt response that has been consistently linked to post-traumatic stress disorder and other psychological problems (O’Connor, Berry & Weiss, 2002; Kubany, et al., 1995, 2004). Research has also underscored the negative effects of care-giver guilt (Gallagher, Phillips, Oliver & Carroll, 2008; Gonyea, Paris & de Saxe Zerden, 2008; Spillers, Wellisch, Kim, Matthews & Baker, 2008), which presumably entails an exaggerated sense of responsibility for ailing elderly parents or disabled family members.

Some psychologists (Ferguson & Stegge, 1998; Luyten, et al., 2002) have suggested that the scenario-based measures such as the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989) fail to capture pathological forms of guilt. The TOSCA family of measures, for example, tap feelings of shame and guilt with respect to failures or transgressions for which the person

was responsible. The measures do not capture problematic tendencies to take responsibility for and feel intense guilt over situations that are beyond reasonable responsibility (e.g., many instances of survivor guilt, O'Connor, Berry, & Weiss, 1999; O'Connor, Berry, Weiss, Bush, & Sampson, 1997; a young child's sense of responsibility for a parent's psychological welfare, Zahn-Waxler & Robinson, 1995). In a telling experimental study of elementary school-aged children, Ferguson, et al. (2000) varied the degree to which situations in a scenario-based measure were ambiguous with respect to responsibility. They found a positive relationship between internalizing symptoms (e.g., depression) and proneness to guilt specifically in situations where responsibility was ambiguous. These findings are not unique. In their meta-analysis of studies of shame, guilt, and depression, Kim, et al. (2011) found that whereas measures assessing "legitimate" guilt (for events for which individuals have responsibility) showed little relationship to depression (mean weighted effect size $r=.06$), measures assessing guilt involving unrealistic responsibility for negative events were positively linked to depression ($r=.39$).

Finally, Nelissen and Zeelenberg (2009) found that guilt is apt to lead to self-denial or self-punishment when opportunities for reparation are blocked. In such instances, overcoming problematic guilt may require some creativity in identifying reparative paths. For example, although one may not be able to directly undo a past misdeed (a forgotten anniversary), one can take constructive future-oriented steps (developing a better system for tracking important dates, arranging an impromptu getaway with one's partner).

In sum, problems with guilt are apt to arise when people have an exaggerated or distorted sense of responsibility for events, when guilt becomes fused with shame, and when people fail to find a path toward reparation (Dearing & Tangney, in press; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). In contrast, guilt's benefits are most likely to be evident when people take appropriate responsibility for their misdeeds, acknowledge their failures and transgressions, and use the emotion's motivational force to develop and carry out a reparative plan commensurate with the magnitude of the transgression.

Embarrassment

Embarrassment is clearly an important component of our self-regulatory apparatus. Miller (1995a) defined embarrassment as “an aversive state of mortification, abashment, and chagrin that follows public social predicaments” (p. 322). Analyzing personal accounts of embarrassment from hundreds of high school students and adults, Miller (1992) found that the most common causes of embarrassment were “normative public deficiencies” -- situations in which the individual behaved in a clumsy, absent-minded, or hapless way (tripping in front of a large class, forgetting someone’s name, unintended bodily-induced noises). Other common types of embarrassing situations included awkward social interactions and just plain being conspicuous.

Some theorists believe that the crux of embarrassment is negative evaluation by others (Edelmann, 1981; Miller, 1996; Miller & Leary, 1992; Semin & Manstead, 1981) or transient drops in self-esteem secondary to negative evaluation by others (Modigliani, 1968). Other theorists subscribe to the “dramaturgic” account of embarrassment (Goffman, 1956; Gross & Stone, 1964; Silver, Sabini & Parrott, 1987) surmising that embarrassment occurs when implicit social roles and scripts are disrupted. In all cases, these events signal that something is amiss – some aspect of person’s identity behavior needs to be carefully monitored, hidden, or changed. Not surprisingly, research shows that when embarrassed, people are inclined to behave in conciliatory ways designed to win approval and (re)inclusion from others (Cupach & Metts, 1990, 1992; Leary, et al., 1996; Miller, 1996; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990).

Embarrassment apparently is less centrally relevant to the regulation of behavior in the moral domain. Whereas embarrassment often ensues in response to normative social faux-pas and transgressions (a forgotten name, an open fly, a flubbed performance), shame is more likely the response to serious failures and moral transgressions that reflect badly on global and enduring personal attributes. Consistent with this view, a comparison of adults’ ratings of personal shame and embarrassment experiences indicated that shame is a more intense, painful emotion that involves a

greater sense of moral transgression (Tangney, Miller, et al., 1996).

As with shame and guilt, people differ in the degree to which they are prone to experience embarrassment. Research has shown that embarrassability is associated with neuroticism, high levels of negative affect, self-consciousness, and a fear of negative evaluation from others (Edelmann & McCusker, 1986; Leary & Meadows, 1991; Miller, 1995b). Miller's (1996) research indicates that this fear of negative evaluation is not due to poor social skills, but rather to a sensitivity to social norms. Importantly with regard to self-regulation, people who are prone to embarrassment tend to be highly aware of and concerned with social rules and standards. Consistent with the notion that embarrassment serves a self-regulatory function, Keltner, Moffitt, and Stouthamer-Loeber (1995) found that aggressive and delinquent boys showed less embarrassment on a cognitive task than well adjusted boys.

Pride

Of the self-conscious emotions, pride was, until recently, the neglected sibling, having received the least attention by far. Mascolo and Fischer (1995) defined pride as an emotion "generated by appraisals that one is responsible for a socially valued outcome or for being a socially valued person" (p. 66). From their perspective, pride serves to enhance people's self-worth and, perhaps more importantly, to encourage future behavior that conforms to social standards of worth or merit. Indeed, a growing body of research suggests that pride plays a critical role in promoting social status and increasing an individual's inclusion within his or her social group.

Researchers adopting an evolutionary perspective argue that pride exists in humans to serve an important function: the promotion of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors oriented toward increasing or maintaining one's place within the social hierarchy (Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010). Pride has been argued to influence status and social worth by at least three different causal paths. First, experiencing pride in response to achievements motivates striving for future achievements, typically in socially valued domains. Pride feelings are pleasurable and thus reinforcing; there is no other emotion that not

only makes individuals feel good, but makes them feel good about *themselves*. Through socialization, children come to experience pride in response to praise for socially valued achievements—first by their parents, and later by teachers and peers. Eventually, individuals experience pride in response to these accomplishments even without others' evaluations (although positive feedback from others can certainly enhance a pride experience, by making the social value of a given achievement more apparent). The reinforcing properties of pride then motivate individuals to seek future achievements, so, without the need for external evaluations, individuals strive to develop an identity that coheres with social norms. Individuals who are successful in this pursuit are, in turn, rewarded with social approval, acceptance, and increased social status—all of which promote adaptive fitness.

This account of pride, as adaptive through its reinforcing and motivational properties, is supported by several findings. First, Ross, Heine, Wilson, and Sugimori (2005) found that pride (at least as experienced by European Canadians) improves memory for pride-eliciting events and makes these events seem temporally more recent. These cognitive changes likely facilitate behaviors oriented toward ensuring that similar events occur in the future. Second, Williams and DeSteno (2008) found that participants who were led to experience pride in response to task success are more likely to persevere at subsequent similar tasks, suggesting that the experience of pride directly promotes a desire and willingness to achieve. Similarly, Herrald and Tomaka (2002) found that participants manipulated to experience pride showed improved task performance both during and immediately following the pride experience, and Verbeke, Belschak, and Bagozzi (2004) found that salespeople who report a tendency to experience pride in response to work success show better job performance, exert more effort at work, and report greater motivation toward productivity and success.

In addition to motivating achievement, a second way in which pride likely promotes status is through its informational properties. According to the “affect as information” hypothesis (Schwarz & Clore, 1983; 1988), emotional feelings inform individuals of changes in their environment, and thereby allow them to respond knowingly and flexibly to significant events. Building on this account, pride

may inform individuals that they merit increased status and group acceptance. In fact, given that trait pride (along with shame) is the emotional disposition most strongly related to self-esteem (Brown & Marshall, 2001), over the long term pride may serve this informational function through its influence on self-esteem. Researchers have suggested that self-esteem functions as a social barometer, or “sociometer”, informing individuals of their social status and thereby ensuring that they behave in ways that maintain their status and others’ acceptance, and avoid group rejection (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995). Pride may be the affective mechanism that leads to increases in self-esteem, which feed into the sociometer. Specifically, when individuals experience a success, they feel pride in response, and over time and with repetition these feelings may promote positive feelings *and* thoughts about their personal characteristics, leading to the high self-esteem that informs individuals of their social value. (Indeed, shame’s negative impact on self-esteem may have a similar function, informing individuals that they are *not* socially valued, but rather are in danger of social rejection, and should seek to remove themselves from their current social context.) Supporting this account, pride is the positive emotion most strongly associated with (low) depression (Gruber, Oveis, Keltner, & Johnson, 2010); this link may be due to the knowledge acquired from pride feelings, that the proud individual is socially valued and thus need not fall prey to mental health problems.

The third way that pride seems to enhance social status is through its nonverbal expression. This distinct, cross-culturally recognized nonverbal display (Tracy & Robins, 2008) functions to inform observers (other social group members) that the proud individual deserves—or believes he/she deserves—higher status. Supporting this account, Tiedens and colleagues (2000) found that individuals who are believed to be experiencing pride are assumed by others to be high status, suggesting an intuitive association between others’ perceptions of pride and status. More directly supporting this link, Williams and DeSteno (2009) found that individuals manipulated to experience pride prior to engaging in a group task were perceived by others in the group and by outside observers as behaving in a more

“dominant” manner during the task, suggesting that something about the pride experience promoted interpersonal behaviors that increased perceived status (Williams & DeSteno, 2009).

Other findings indicate what the key interpersonal behaviors that generated these dominant perceptions are likely to be: the pride nonverbal expression. Using the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995), a series of studies found that the pride expression is rapidly and automatically perceived as a signal of high status (Shariff & Tracy, 2009). This automatic association between the pride expression and high status cannot be explained as an artifact of particular features of the pride display, such as extended arms making the individual appear larger, or as a general property of positive emotions or positive valence. In these studies, pride was more strongly associated with high status than a range of other positive and negative emotions—including happiness and anger. Furthermore, the automatic association between pride displays and high status generalizes across cultures; it emerged among both Canadian university students and Fijian villagers living in a geographically and culturally isolated small-scale traditional society (Tracy, Shariff, Zhao, & Henrich, 2011). Especially given evidence that Fijian social norms inhibit the open expression of any status displays, the generalization of this finding across these disparate populations suggests that the pride nonverbal expression may be an adaptation for automatically communicating a deserved status increase. This communication would clearly be adaptive to pride displayers, who would receive greater resources, attention, and other status-related benefits; but it would also benefit observers, who could more effectively navigate the status hierarchy by showing appropriate deference, knowing whom to emulate, forming productive alliances, and facilitating their own status jockeying.

In sum, a growing body of evidence suggests that pride evolved to promote and maintain an individual’s status and social worth. However, this conceptualization of pride – as a pro-social and achievement-reinforcing emotion – may be too narrow; philosophical and religious accounts have long held that pride is an amoral and even sinful emotion (see Tracy et al., 2010). Similarly, several psychologists have noted that pride has a “dark side”; despite its association with achievement and

altruism, pride –in its connection to narcissism-- has also been theoretically linked with relationship conflict and aggression (Kernberg, 1975; Lewis, 2000; McGregor, Nail, Marigold, & Kang, 2005; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). One study found that manipulated pride feelings promoted a sense of similarity to strong, but not weak others, suggesting that pride might even inhibit compassion for those in need (Oveis, Horberg, & Keltner, 2010).

A Tale of Two Facets.

Building on these findings, several researchers have proposed that there are two distinct kinds of pride: “authentic” and “hubristic” pride (Lewis, 2000; Tangney et al., 1989; Tracy & Robins, 2007).¹ A number of studies support this two-facet account. First, when asked to think about and list words relevant to pride, research participants consistently generate two very different categories of concepts, which empirically form two separate clusters of semantic meaning. The first cluster (authentic pride) includes words such as “accomplished” and “confident,” and fits with the pro-social, achievement-oriented conceptualization of pride. The second cluster (hubristic pride) includes words such as “arrogant” and “conceited,” and fits with a self-aggrandizing conceptualization. Second, when asked to rate their feelings during an actual pride experience, participants’ ratings consistently form two relatively independent factors, which closely parallel these two semantic clusters. Third, when asked to rate their general dispositional tendency to feel each of a set of pride-related emotional states (i.e., trait pride, or “pride-proneness”), participants’ ratings again form the same two factors. Further analyses have demonstrated that the two pride factors are not artifacts of participants’ tendency to group together good vs. bad, activated vs. deactivated, or trait vs. state words.

How might we understand the distinction between these two facets of pride? Like shame and guilt, the two facets of pride appear to be elicited by distinct causal attributions for events—though, in the case of pride, eliciting events tend to be largely about success and accomplishment, rather than failure and social transgression. Specifically, pride is elicited when individuals appraise a positive event as relevant to their identity (i.e., their important self-representations) and their goals for their

identity (i.e., their ideal self-representations), and as internally caused—that is, due to the self (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988; Lewis, 2000; Roseman, 1991; Tracy & Robins, 2004; Weiner, 1985).

Authentic and hubristic pride are further distinguished by attributions; authentic pride seems to result from attributions to internal but unstable, specific, and controllable causes, such as effort (“I won because I practiced”), whereas hubristic pride results from attributions to internal but stable, global, and uncontrollable causes, such as ability (“I won because I’m great”). In other words, the distinction between the two facets of pride mirrors the distinction between guilt and shame; it is the distinction between crediting (or blaming) one’s behavior versus one’s global characteristics.

One study supporting these links found that individuals who were told to attribute a hypothetical success experience (i.e., a positive, identity-relevant and identity-goal congruent event) to their hard work (unstable, specific attribution) expected to feel authentic pride in response, whereas those told to attribute the same success to their stable, global ability expected to experience relatively higher levels of hubristic pride. Another study found that individuals who tend to make internal but unstable and controllable attributions for a wide range of events also tend to be dispositionally prone to authentic pride, whereas those who tend to make internal but stable and uncontrollable attributions for a range of events tend to be prone to hubristic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Thus, authentic pride is more closely linked to attributions to effort, hard work, and specific accomplishments, whereas hubristic pride is more closely linked to attributions to talents, abilities, and global positive traits (Verbeke, Belschak, & Bagozzi, 2004). Research on perceptions of others’ pride mirrors these results; when participants view target individuals who display a nonverbal expression of pride and simultaneously suggest that their success was due to stable, global abilities (e.g., intelligence), observers tend to judge the pride displays hubristic; whereas the same nonverbal displays shown by targets who suggest that their success was due to unstable, specific efforts are more likely to be judged as authentic pride (Tracy & Prehn, in press).

Authentic and Hubristic Pride are Not Equally Moral

Like shame and guilt, hubristic and authentic pride do not seem to be equally moral emotions. In fact, the two pride facets appear to elicit markedly different social behaviors and have highly divergent effects on personality, parallel to the distinct effects of shame and guilt (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2011; Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010; Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007; Tracy, Cheng, Robins, & Trzesniewski, 2009). These findings help to resolve the longstanding question of whether pride is psychologically healthy and virtuous or narcissistic and “sinful; contradictory conceptions may exist because, at both the trait and state level, one facet is associated with a likeable and socially desirable personality profile and pro-social behaviors, whereas the other is associated with a more negative profile and antisocial behaviors. Specifically, authentic pride is positively related to the generally adaptive Big Five traits of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience, whereas hubristic pride is consistently negatively related to the two pro-social traits of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Tracy & Robins, 2007). In addition, authentic pride is positively related to both explicit and implicit self-esteem, whereas hubristic pride is negatively related to implicit and explicit self-esteem, yet positively related to narcissism and shame-proneness (Tracy et al., 2009).

Indeed, the two facets of pride seem to lie at the affective core of the distinction between narcissism and self-esteem, and may account for research suggesting that these two forms of self-favorability are associated with highly divergent outcomes (Paulhus et al., 2004). Specifically, hubristic pride may underlie narcissistic aggression, hostility, interpersonal problems, and other self-destructive behaviors (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996; Campbell, 1999; Kernberg, 1975; Kohut, 1977; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). In contrast, authentic pride may promote positive behaviors in the achievement domain (Weiner, 1985; Williams & DeSteno, 2008) and contribute to pro-social investments and the development of a genuine and deep-rooted sense of self-esteem (Herrald & Tomaka, 2002; Lazarus, 1991; Verbeke et al., 2004). In fact, at the trait level (i.e., pride-proneness), the two facets show divergent relations with constructs relevant to achievement,

mental health, social behavior, and relationship functioning (Carver et al., 2010; Tracy et al., 2009). Specifically, individuals high in dispositional authentic pride tend to be low in depression, trait anxiety, social phobia, aggression, hostility, and rejection sensitivity; and high in self-control, goal-engagement, relationship satisfaction, dyadic adjustment, and social support, and they typically are securely attached to their relationship partners. In contrast, individuals high in dispositional hubristic pride are more likely to demonstrate impulsivity, experience chronic anxiety, engage in aggression, hostility, and a range of other anti-social misbehaviors (e.g., drug use, petty crimes), and show poorer dyadic adjustment and social support. Given these divergent personality profiles, it is not surprising that the pride facets are located in different places on the Interpersonal Circumplex (i.e., the independent dimensions of agency and communion; Kiesler, 1983). Although individuals high in agency are prone to experiencing both facets of pride, individuals high in communion are only prone to authentic pride; hubristic pride shows a negative relationship with communal traits (Cheng et al., 2010). Together, these findings suggest that authentic pride is the more moral, pro-social, achievement-oriented facet of the emotion, whereas hubristic pride is the more anti-social and aggressive facet, which is related to self-aggrandizement and, in part, may be a defensive response to underlying feelings of shame.

The moral distinction between authentic and hubristic pride is further supported by studies demonstrating that the two facets have divergent effects on prejudice, in the form of bias against out-groups (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2011). This distinction was evidenced, first, at the trait-level; Caucasian Americans high in authentic-pride proneness tend to report low levels of racism against African Americans (based on the Modern Racism Scale; McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981), whereas Caucasian Americans high in hubristic pride report higher levels of racism. Second, Caucasian participants who were led to feel hubristic pride responded by describing Asian-Americans in less favorable terms compared to Caucasians manipulated to feel authentic pride and compared to those in a no-emotion control condition; similarly, heterosexual participants manipulated to feel hubristic pride

subsequently made more punitive judgments of a homosexual, compared to a heterosexual, prostitute. In contrast, individuals led to feel authentic pride demonstrated less bias against members of both out-groups, and judged out-group and in-group members equally, at times even demonstrating a slight preference toward the out-group. A final study revealed that the effects of both pride facets on prejudicial judgments and beliefs were mediated by empathic concern for the evaluative target. Specifically, hubristic pride decreases empathy for stigmatized others, which leads to increased prejudice. On the other hand, authentic pride increases empathy for stigmatized others, which reduces prejudice.

Why do We Have the Capacity to Experience Hubristic Pride?

If pride evolved as a moral emotion to serve the distal function of promoting high status and social worth and maintaining group inclusion, the question arises: why would such an adaptive emotional experience have a “dark side”? Why might an anti-social (hubristic) facet have evolved?

One answer may be found in Henrich and Gil-White’s (2001) distinction between dominance, the fear-based form of high status, and prestige, the respect-based form of high status. Authentic pride may have evolved to motivate the attainment of prestige, whereas hubristic pride may have evolved to motivate the attainment of dominance. Supporting this account, when individuals experience hubristic pride, they evaluate themselves as better in some way than others, and experience a subjective sense of dominance, superiority, and power. Hubristic pride thus may prepare people to assert their power (e.g., making internal, stable, uncontrollable attributions for success), and motivate behaviors that promote a reputation of dominance through hostility, aggression, and a tendency toward interpersonal conflict. This aggression, or threat of aggression, allows dominant individuals to retain their power, given that their high status is typically not merited on the basis of achievements or leadership abilities. The resulting sense of not quite deserving one’s status may be a cause of the shame and insecurity associated with hubristic pride. In contemporary society, dominant individuals may choose not to demonstrate their power through physical aggression, but rather through verbal and nonverbal cues of

aggression and hostility, such as behavioral displays of boredom, rudeness, and disengagement—a pattern recently found to typify the interpersonal interactions of individuals high in socioeconomic status (Kraus & Keltner, 2009).

In contrast, in order to retain subordinates' respect, prestigious individuals must avoid succumbing to feelings of power and superiority. Competition for prestige would likely favor individuals who demonstrate knowledge and a willingness to share it but do not arrogate their authority or lash out at subordinates; aggressive interpersonal behaviors would in some sense “raise the price” subordinates must pay to attain the valued knowledge. In fact, overly aggressive behaviors have been identified as attributes that can ‘break a leader’ in largely prestige-based hierarchies (Ames & Flynn, 2007; Bass, 1990). Authentic pride thus may have evolved to facilitate the attainment of prestige by promoting a focus on one's effort and accomplishments (i.e., making internal, unstable, controllable attributions for success), fostering humility, and inhibiting aggression and hostility. The findings that state and trait authentic pride are associated with pro-social behavior, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and voluntary moral action (Hart & Matsuba, 2007; Tracy et al., 2009; Tracy & Robins, 2007; Verbeke et al., 2004) are consistent with this account of authentic pride as promoting a prestigious (i.e., highly respected) reputation.

Two studies provide direct support for this functionalist explanation (Cheng et al., 2010). First, individuals high in trait authentic pride describe themselves as prestigious, whereas those high in trait hubristic pride describe themselves as dominant. Second, a study of varsity athletes who were high in trait authentic pride were viewed by their teammates as prestigious but not dominant, whereas those high in trait hubristic pride were viewed as dominant but not prestigious. That these findings emerged in peer-ratings from teammates points to their ecological validity; varsity teams are real-world groups where status hierarchies play a major role in shaping intragroup behaviors and emotions.

In sum, both facets of pride may increase an individual's social status, but only authentic pride does so in a way that promotes moral behavior and boosts a kind of high status that is likely to be

sustained over the long-term. Dominance may be an effective means of gaining power in the short term, at least among those who have the ability to wield control over valuable resources, but dominant leaders are unlikely to retain their power, because their hostile, aggressive, and overtly self-serving behaviors generate disliking and disrespect, and may even foment coalitions against them.

Nonetheless, high status—in the form of either prestige and dominance—has been associated with a range of outcomes that increase evolutionary fitness (e.g., improved physical and mental health, access to higher quality resources and mates; Ellis, 1995; Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000), making it likely that pride promotes fitness, at least in the short term, regardless of whether the pride experienced is authentic or hubristic. Indeed, in the context of a single short-term group interaction, both dominance and prestige promote perceptions of high status and effective social influence, despite their divergent effects on social goals and interpersonal behaviors (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2011). Hubristic pride thus may be an emotion that, like shame, benefits certain people in certain circumscribed situations, despite also being associated with both psychological and social maladjustment.

Cultural Differences in Shame, Guilt, and Pride

Shame, guilt, and pride are emotions experienced in reference to self. To the extent that the nature of the self differs across cultures and nations (Kitayama, Markus, & Matsumoto, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989), one might expect parallel differences in the experience and implications of self-conscious emotions. The research presented in this chapter thus far has been largely conducted in a Western context.

Cross-cultural questions about the self-conscious emotions can be asked at several levels. Do people from different cultures vary in their propensity to experience shame, guilt, embarrassment, authentic pride, or hubristic pride? Are there cultural differences in the *quality* of these emotions? In their valence or intensity? Or in the kinds of situations that give rise to them? Regarding individual differences within cultural groups, are there cultural differences in the types of parenting styles or

other early experiences that foster the propensity to experience shame, guilt, embarrassment, or pride? And are there cultural differences in the implications of those individual differences? Is proneness to shame less maladaptive, a more effective self-regulatory mechanism, in interdependent cultures? These are just a sampling of the kinds of questions that have begun to be examined by researchers interested in culture and the self-conscious emotions.

Most studies investigating cultural differences in the self-conscious emotions have compared Asian-Americans and Caucasian Americans. Research consistently shows that Asian-Americans report a greater propensity to experience shame, compared to their Non-Asian-American counterparts (Lutwak, Razzino, & Ferrari, 1998; Miller, 2002; Ratanasiripong, 1997), whereas cultural differences in guilt-proneness within U.S. samples has been mixed (Lutwak et al., 1998; Ratanasiripong, 1997; Miller, 2002). This is consistent with a cross-cultural study of shame nonverbal displays among Olympic athletes, which found that while congenitally blind individuals across cultures reliably displayed shame in response to failure—suggesting a universal and possibly innate propensity for shame—among sighted individuals, athletes from countries high in individualism (i.e., North American and Western European nations) were no more likely to display shame in response to failure compared to success (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008). This cultural difference suggests that athletes from individualistic societies may have inhibited or suppressed their shame response, or its corresponding behaviors, to conform to social norms during the highly public situation of a televised Olympic event.

Regarding pride, based on the study of Olympic athletes, the tendency to display the expression in response to success appears to be universal and innate; no cultural differences were found, and pride displays, like shame, were reliably shown by the congenitally blind (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008). However, there are cultural differences in conceptualizations of pride, and the value attached to the emotion. For example, although pride is a highly valued and sought-out emotion in individualistic cultures (i.e., U.S., Australia, the Netherlands), it is viewed as negative and undesirable in several collectivistic cultures (i.e., China, Spain, Taiwan; Eid & Diener, 2001; Mosquera, Manstead, &

Fischer, 2000). Similarly, Lieber and Yu (2003) reported that when describing achievement stories, Taiwanese students are less likely than Americans to report feelings of pride.

One possible explanation for this distinction is that, in collectivistic cultures, the predominant conceptualization of pride may be tilted more toward the hubristic facet, whereas in individualistic cultures, which place value on the individual over the group, the predominant conceptualization is tilted toward the authentic facet. Alternatively, both facets of pride may be accepted and valued in collectivistic cultures—as long as these pride experiences are about one's group instead of one's individual self (Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In fact, in a study comparing pride in China and the U.S., Chinese participants reported feeling more positively about pride experiences that resulted from others' accomplishments than from their own (Stipek, 1998).

Few studies have moved beyond a consideration of mean differences in proneness to shame, guilt, and pride, to consider the possibility of cultural differences in the *correlates* of self-conscious emotions. Fontaine et al. (2008) found that the structure of shame and guilt experiences were highly consistent across college students from Peru, Belgium and Hungary (see also Breugelmans & Poortinga, 2006). Moreover, shame-proneness was similarly associated with anger (Bruno, 2000), depression and anxiety (Hyangsook, 2002), and self-doubts (Lutwak, et al., 1998) among Asian-Americans and non-Asian-Americans. Regarding the correlates of guilt, the findings are mixed. El-Jamil (2003) found a negative relationship between guilt-proneness and hostility in a U.S. college sample but not among Lebanese college students. Lutwak et al. (2001) found no relationship between guilt-proneness and self-doubt among Asian-, European-, Latin-, and African-American students.

Two studies have examined cross-cultural continuities and discontinuities in the correlates of shame and guilt, comparing American-born children with Asian-born children living in their country of origin. Bear et al. (2009) reported a positive link between shame and anger among American children, but no such relationship among Japanese children. Comparing children residing in Japan, Korea and the U.S., Furukawa, Tangney, and Higashihara (2011) found substantial group differences the

propensity to experience self-conscious emotions. Japanese children scored highest on shame-proneness, Korean children scored highest on guilt-proneness, and U.S. children were highest on pride. Regarding the correlates of shame, it was hypothesized that shame would be less problematic among Japanese children relative to those raised in Korea and the U.S., because shame is more normative and would therefore be less painful in the self-critical Japanese culture. There were, however, surprisingly few differences in the relationship of shame to aggression-related cognitions, emotions, and behavior. In the face of failure or transgression, shame-prone children in Japan, Korea, and U.S. were all more inclined to blame others and feel anger, relative to their less shame-prone peers. Notably, in no case did shame seem to inhibit aggression-relevant cognitions, emotion or behavior. In short, although there were significant cultural differences in children's propensity to experience self-conscious emotions, the correlates of individual differences in shame and guilt were remarkably similar across these three cultures, at least with respect to anger and aggression.

New Directions in Research on the Self-Conscious Emotions

A profusion of research has emerged on self-conscious emotions over the past two decades, but in a very real sense, we have only scratched the surface and much work remains. Here, we mention just a few of the promising new directions that researchers have begun to embark upon. Not surprisingly given the vast difference in historical research attention on shame and guilt compared to pride, most of these new research trends focus on the negative, rather than the positive, self-conscious emotions. Thus, one important direction for future research is to expand the literature on pride, perhaps using the large and ever-growing literature on shame and guilt as a model.

“Vicarious” and Group-based Self-Conscious Emotions

Self-conscious emotions are typically experienced in reference to one's own attributes or behaviors. An intriguing phenomenon, then, is the vicarious experience of self-conscious emotions – people's experience of shame, guilt, embarrassment or pride owing to the actions of *other* individuals or groups. Some of the earliest research along these lines examined the causes and consequences of

“empathic” or vicarious embarrassment (for a review, see Miller, 1996). More recently, investigators have examined “vicarious” or “group-based” shame and guilt. This research represents an exciting integration of self-conscious emotions theory with the social psychological literature on social identity, group-related processes. To the extent that the self is, in part, defined by interpersonal relations and group memberships, it is possible to construe the behavior of an in-group member as reflecting on oneself. Thus, personal causality is not always necessary for the experience of shame or guilt.

In many ways, vicarious shame and guilt parallel personal shame and guilt experiences. Lickel, Schmader and colleagues (Lickel & Schmader, 2007; Lickel, Schmader, & Barquissau, 2004; Lickel, Schmader, Curtis, Scarnier, & Ames, 2005) have developed a process model linking specific types of appraisals with vicarious experiences of shame and guilt, respectively. They present compelling evidence that group-based shame is elicited when a threatened shared identity is salient. Vicarious guilt, on the other hand, is more likely when one’s interpersonal interdependence with the perpetrator is salient, and when relational-based concerns are highlighted by a focus on harm to another group or individual. The link between identity concerns and vicarious or group-based shame are evident in both correlational and experimental studies (Schmader & Lickel, 2006; Iyer, Schmader & Lickel, 2006). In addition, identification with the perpetrating group can also have implications for vicarious group-based guilt (Branscombe & Doosje, 2004; Doosje, Branscombe, Spears & Manstead, 1998), especially when individuals are prompted to focus on the harm done (Iyer, Leach & Crosby, 2003)

As with personal guilt experiences, group-based guilt has been associated with empathy (Zebel, Doosje, & Spears, 2004) and a motivation to repair or make amends (Brown, Gonzalez, Zagefka, Manzi & Cehajic, 2008; Iyer et al. 2003; Lickel et al, 2005; Swim & Miller, 1999; Zebel, et al., 2004). Moreover, group-based guilt mediates the link between group-based empathy and corrective action (Mallett, et al., 2008). And as with personal shame experiences, vicarious group-based shame (but not guilt) has been linked to a desire to distance oneself from the shame-eliciting event (Lickel, et al., 2005; Johns, Schmader, & Lickel, 2005) and shame appears to weaken the positive effects of group-

based guilt (Brown, et al., 2008). Furthermore, the link between anger and shame is evident when considering vicarious shame (Schmader & Lickel, 2006, Johns, et al., 2005; Iyer, et al., 2006). Nonetheless, there are some indications that vicarious or group-based shame may have a “kinder, gentler” side than personal shame (de Hooze, et al., 2008). For example, under some circumstances, group-based shame appears to motivate a desire to change the image of the group in a proactive fashion (Lickel, Rutchick, Hamilton, & Sherman, 2006).

“Guilt-tripping” and Other Efforts to Use Self-Conscious Emotions as a Form of Social Control.

People sometimes attempt to induce feelings of shame, guilt, and embarrassment in others as a form of interpersonal control. Sharkey (1991, 1992, 1993) made important inroads in our understanding of “intentional embarrassment” -- efforts to intentionally cause feelings of embarrassment in others. Based on data from over a thousand adult respondents, Sharkey concluded that fully half of people’s efforts to induce embarrassment are motivated by benign, friendly intentions – as a sign of affection. To date, only a handful of studies have explicitly examined guilt induction (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995a; Vangelisti, Daly & Rudnick, 1991). These initial studies indicate that deliberate attempts to induce guilt occur relatively frequently, particularly in the context of close relationships, and especially in response to real or perceived periods of neglect. But other questions remain. For example, do people use different methods to induce shame vs. guilt vs. embarrassment, and with what result? What are the relative costs and benefits inducing shame, guilt, and embarrassment? How do those costs and benefits vary as a function of transgression, type of relationship, and personality characteristics of the inducee? Are some people more vulnerable than others to guilt (or shame or embarrassment) inductions?

Context or Domain Specific Shame and Guilt.

A number of researchers have developed measures to assess shame and guilt with respect to specific domains. For example, researchers concerned with the psychology of eating disorders and those exploring hypotheses drawn from Frederickson and Robert’s (1997) Objectification Theory have

assessed feelings of shame specifically in reference to one's body. "Body shame" has been consistently associated with self-objectification and eating disorder symptoms (e.g., Breines, Crocker & Garcia, 2008; Grabe, Hyde & Lindberg, 2007; Calogero, 2009; Knauss, Paxton & Alsaker, 2008; Lindberg, Grabe & Hyde, 2007; Mercurio & Landry, 2008; Skarderud, 2007; Slater & Tiggemann, 2010; Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008; Wiseman & Moradi, 2010). Moreover, weight-related shame and guilt appear to be differentially related to coping and dietary restraint (Conradt, et al., 2008). Specifically, weight-related shame has been negatively associated with problem-focused coping, whereas weight-related guilt has been positively related to problem-focused coping.

Regarding guilt, researchers have examined the nature and implications of domain-specific feelings of guilt associated with trauma. Trauma-related guilt cognitions, such as false beliefs about responsibility or pre-outcome knowledge, are reliably associated with symptoms of depression among diverse samples of trauma survivors (Blacher, 2000; Kubany, et al., 1995; Kubany, et al., 2004; Lee, Scragg & Turner, 2001; Marx, et al., 2010). Moreover, cognitive processing therapy and prolonged exposure interventions appear effective at reducing trauma-related guilt cognitions (Resick, Nishith, Weaver, Astin, & Feuer, 2002; Nishith, Nixon & Resick, 2005). Perhaps owing to similar feelings of unrealistic responsibility, caregiver guilt has been repeatedly associated with high levels of stress and psychological symptoms (Gallagher, et al., 2008; Spillers, et al., 2008)

Psychobiological Correlates of the Self-Conscious-Emotions.

Researchers have begun to evaluate psychobiological markers of shame, examining biological responses to laboratory manipulations designed to threaten the social self (Dickerson, Kemeny, Aziz, Kim & Fahey, 2004; Gruenewald, Kemeny, Aziz, & Fahey, 2004; see Dickerson, Gruenewald, & Kemeny, 2004 for a review). Dickerson, Kemeny, et al. found that participants who wrote about incidents involving heavy doses of self-blame, compared to those who wrote about mundane daily activities, evidenced increased levels of self-reported shame (and guilt) from pre-test to post-test. Importantly, increases in shame (but not guilt or general negative affect) coincided with increased pro-

inflammatory cytokine activity (Dickerson, Kemeny, et al., 2004). At the trait level, proneness to shame has also been associated with inflammatory activity (Rohleder, Chen, Wolf, & Miller, 2008).

Other immunological research is equally suggestive: Among HIV positive individuals, persistent feelings of shame (but not other negative emotions) were positively related to prospective T-cell decline, an indicator of compromised immune function (Weitzman, Kemeny, & Fahey, 2004).

Experiences of shame have also been linked to elevated cortisol in studies of adults (Gruenewald et al., 2004) and children (Lewis & Ramsay, 2002). Importantly, Dickerson, Gruenewald, et al. (2004) noted that shame, cortisol and pro-inflammatory cytokine system activation increased specifically in response to social-evaluative threat (negative social evaluation and rejection), but not in response to more general negative affect or distress. They hypothesized that individual differences in shame-proneness may be correlated with individual differences in immuno-system responsivity, and that state experiences of shame and related emotions may be the mediating mechanism for biological response to social threat.

Cardiovascular reactivity is also associated with shame. For example, in addition to assessing cortisol response, Gruenewald et al. (2004) assessed heart rate and blood pressure changes in response to stressful speaking and arithmetic tasks. Although heart rate and systolic blood pressure increased in both the social evaluative and non-evaluative conditions, the response was more marked in the social evaluative condition. Extending this work with a clever laboratory manipulation of experienced emotions, Herrald and Tomaka (2002) evaluated cardiovascular reactivity in the wake of pride, shame, and anger. They found that shame and anger resulted in higher levels of cardiovascular reactivity than pride; importantly participants in the shame condition showed higher peripheral resistance (associated with hypertension) and participants in the anger condition showed higher cardiac contractility (associated with coronary disease).

In sum, there seem to be distinct physiological correlates corresponding to the experience of shame. Such physiological markers may prove useful as a measurement tool in future research on

situation-specific states of shame, but it will be important for such studies to adopt a multi-method approach, simultaneously assessing shame via physiology, self-report, and nonverbal behavior, given limitations associated with each method when applied to this complex and often hidden emotion.

Regarding brain regions associated with self-conscious emotions, Blair and Cipolotti (2000) found that damage to the right frontal lobe is associated with problems comprehending embarrassing situations, and orbitofrontal cortex damage is associated with an inability to experience embarrassment over inappropriate behavior, as well as excessive experiences of pride (Beer, Heerey, Keltner, Scabini, & Knight, 2003; Beer, John, Scabini, & Knight, 2006). Activation of medial prefrontal cortex and the posterior superior temporal sulcus have both been implicated in the experience of embarrassment and guilt, based on fMRI research (Takahashi, Yahata, Koeda, Matsuda, Asai, & Okubo, 2004; for a review see Robins & Schriber, 2009). Each of these regions appears to be associated with self-referential processes (see Beer, this volume). An fMRI study of pride found greater activation in the posterior superior temporal sulcus and left temporal lobe—two brain regions thought to be involved in theory of mind—when participants imagined themselves in pride-eliciting scenarios, compared to when they imagined themselves in neutral scenarios. Although theory of mind may be an important cognitive pre-requisite for pride (self-evaluations require the understanding that others can evaluate oneself), these researchers had expected to find greater medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) activation, given previous findings of mPFC activity during experiences of embarrassment, guilt, and shame, as well as research indicating that the mPFC is central to self-referential thought (e.g., Kircher, Brammer, Bullmore, Simmons, Bartels, & David, 2002; Fossati, Hevenor, Graham, Grady, Keightley, Craik, et al., 2003). The failure to find mPFC activity in imagined pride experiences raises a number of questions, but these findings need to be replicated, ideally in studies that compare activation during pride to activation during other positive emotional experiences, to control for shared effects of positivity and reward. Using EEG methods, Amodio, Devine, and Harmon-Jones (2007) showed that prejudice-related guilt is initially associated with right-sided frontal cortical asymmetry thought to be

associated with reduced approach motivation, but shortly thereafter is associated with reparative behavior and with left-sided asymmetry thought to be associated with increased approach motivation.

Conclusions

Understanding the self-conscious emotions is critical to understanding the self. The field has made much progress in both theory and empirical work since the first comprehensive volume addressing the science of shame, guilt, embarrassment and pride (Tangney & Fischer, 1995) but there remains much fertile ground and many unanswered questions ripe for inquiry. Perhaps more than other emotions, the measurement of self-conscious emotions poses some real challenges. Although a number of measurement methods have been developed in recent years (see Robins, Nofle, & Tracy, 2007, for a review), the coming decade will no doubt see improvements in our ability to capture these emotions, further fueling this burgeoning area of research.

References

- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *Health Psychology, 19*, 586-592.
- Ahmed, E., & Braithwaite, V. (2004). 'What, me ashamed?': Shame management and school bullying. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 41*, 269-294.
- Allan, S., Gilbert, P., & Goss, K. (1994). An exploration of shame measures II: Psychopathology. *Personality and Individual Differences, 17*, 719-722.
- Ames, D. R., & Flynn, F. J. (2007). What breaks a leader: The curvilinear relation between assertiveness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 307-324.
- Amodio, D. M., Devine, P. G., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2007). A dynamic model of guilt: Implications for motivation and self-regulation in the context of prejudice. *Psychological Science, 18*, 524-530.
- Andrews, B., Brewin, C. R., Rose, S., & Kirk, M. (2000). Predicting PTSD symptoms in victims of violent crime: The role of shame, anger, and childhood abuse. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 109*, 69-73.
- Ashby, J. S., Rice, K. G., & Martin, J. L. (2006). Perfectionism, shame, and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 84*, 148-156.
- Ashton-James, C. E., & Tracy, J. L. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Feelings about the self influence judgments of others. *Manuscript submitted*.
- Barrett, K. C. (1995). A functionalist approach to shame and guilt. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 25-63). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31.
- Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 65-122). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review, 103*, 5-33.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 243-267.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1995a). Interpersonal aspects of guilt: Evidence from narrative studies. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 255-273). New York: Guilford Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1995b). Personal narratives about guilt: Role in action control and interpersonal relationships. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*,

173-198.

- Bear, G. G., Uribe-Zarain, X., Manning, M. A., & Shiomi, K. (2009). Shame, guilt, blaming, and anger: Differences between children in Japan and the US. *Motivation and Emotion, 33*, 229-238.
- Beer, J. S. (in press). The self: A social neuroscience perspective. In M. Leary, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.) *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 3-14). New York: Guilford Press.
- Beer, J. S., Heerey, E. A., Keltner, D., Scabini, D., & Knight, R. T. (2003). The regulatory function of self-conscious emotion: Insights from patients with orbitofrontal damage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 594-604.
- Beer, J. S., John, O. P., Scabini, D., & Knight, R. T. (2006). Orbitofrontal Cortex and Social Behavior: Integrating Self-monitoring and Emotion-Cognition Interactions. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 18*, 871-879.
- Benedict, R. (1946). *The chrysanthemum and the sword*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bennett, D. S., Sullivan, M. W., & Lewis, M. (2005). Young children's adjustment as a function of maltreatment, shame, and anger. *Child Maltreatment, 10*, 311-323.
- Blacher, R. (2000). "It isn't fair:" Postoperative depression and other manifestations of survivor guilt. *General Hospital Psychiatry, 22*, 43-48.
- Blair, R. J. R., & Cipolotti, L. (2000). Impaired social response reversal. A case of 'acquired sociopathy'. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology, 123*, 1122-1141.
- Blatt, S. J., D'Afflitti, J. P., & Quinlin, D. M. (1976). Experiences of depression in normal young adults. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 86*, 203-223.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Doojse, B. (2004). *Collective guilt: International perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Breines, J. G., Crocker, J., & Garcia, J. A. (2008). Self-objectification and well-being in women's daily lives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 583-598.
- Breugelmans, S. M., & Poortinga, Y. H. (2006). Emotion without a word: Shame and guilt among Rara'muri Indians and rural Javanese. *Personality Process and Individual Differences, 91*, 1111-1122.
- Brown, J. D., & Marshall, M. A. (2001). Self-esteem and emotion: Some thoughts about feelings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 575-584.
- Brown, M. Z., Linehan, M. M., Comtois, K. A., Murray, A., & Chapman, A. L. (2009). Shame as a prospective predictor of self-inflicted injury in borderline personality disorder: A multi-modal analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 47*, 815-822.
- Brown, R., Gonzalez, R., Zagefka, H., Manzi, J., & Cehajic, S. (2008). Nuestra culpa: Collective guilt and shame as predictors of reparation for historical wrongdoing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 75-90.

- Bruno, R. F. (2000). Cultural differences in the relationship between shame and anger. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 11-B. (UMI No. 3032171)
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219-229.
- Bybee, J., Zigler, E., Berliner, D., & Merisca, R. (1996). Guilt, guilt-evoking events, depression, and eating disorders. *Current Psychology*, 16, 113-127.
- Calogero, R. M. (2009). Objectification processes and disordered eating in British women and men. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 14, 394-402.
- Campbell, W. K. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1254-1270.
- Campos, J. J. (1995). Foreward. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. ix-xi). New York: Guilford.
- Carver, C. S., Sinclair, S., & Johnson, S. L. (2010). Authentic and hubristic pride: Differential relations to aspects of goal regulation, affect, and self-control. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 698-703.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Henrich, J., Foulsham, T., & Kingstone, A. (2011). The emergence of dominance and prestige hierarchies in unacquainted social groups. *Manuscript submitted*.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 334-347.
- Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (in press). Introducing the GASP Scale: A new measure of guilt and shame proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Conradt, M., Dierk, J., Schlumberger, P., Rauh, E., Hebebrand, J., & Rief, W. (2008). Who copes well? Obesity-related coping and its associations with shame, guilt, and weight loss. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 64, 1129-1144.
- Cupach, W. R., & Metts, S. (1990). Remedial processes in embarrassing predicaments. In J. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 13* (pp. 323-352). Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Cupach, W. R., & Metts, S. (1992). The effects of type of predicament and embarrassability on remedial responses to embarrassing situations. *Communications Quarterly*, 40, 149-161.
- Dearing, R. L., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. P. (2005). On the importance of distinguishing shame from guilt: Relations to problematic alcohol and drug use. *Addictive Behaviors*, 30, 1392-1404.
- Dearing, R. L., & Tangney, J. P. (Eds.) (in press). *Shame in the Therapy Hour*. Washington DC: APA Books.
- de Hooge, I. E., Breugelmans, S. M., & Zeelenberg, M. (2008). Not so ugly after all: When shame acts as a commitment device. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 933-943.

- de Hooge, I. E., Zeelenberg, M., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2007). Moral sentiments and cooperation: Differential influences of shame and guilt. *Cognition and Emotion, 21*, 1025-1042.
- de Hooge, I. E., Zeelenberg, M., and Breugelmans, S. M. (2010). Restore and protect motivations following shame. *Cognition and Emotion, 24*, 111-127.
- De Rubeis, S., & Hollenstein, T. (2009). Individual differences in shame and depressive symptoms during early adolescence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 477-482.
- Dickerson, S. S., Gruenewald, T. L., & Kemeny, M. E. (2004). When the social self is threatened: Shame, physiology, and health. *Journal of Personality, 72*, 1192-1216.
- Dickerson, S. S., Kemeny, M. E., Aziz, N., Kim, K. H., & Fahey, J. L. (2004). Immunological effects of induced shame and guilt. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 66*, 124-131.
- Doojse, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 872-886.
- Edelmann, R. J. (1981). Embarrassment: The state of research. *Current Psychological Reviews, 1*, 125-138.
- Edelmann, R. J., & McCusker, G. (1986). Introversion, neuroticism, empathy, and embarrassability. *Personality and Individual Differences, 7*, 133-140.
- Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2001). Norms for experiencing emotions in different cultures: Inter- and intranational differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 869-885.
- Eisenberg, N. (1986). *Altruistic cognition, emotion, and behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). Empathy, sympathy, and altruism: Empirical and conceptual links. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 292-316). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- El-Jamil, F. M. (2003). Shame, guilt, and mental health: A study on the impact of cultural and religious orientation. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*, 3-B. (UMI No.3086857)
- Ellis, L. (1995). Dominance and reproductive success among nonhuman animals: A cross-species comparison. *Ethology & Sociobiology, 16*(4), 257-333.
- Ellsworth, P. C., & Smith, C. A. (1988). Shades of joy: Patterns of appraisal differentiating pleasant emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 2*, 301-331.
- Farmer, E., & Andrews, B. (2009). Shameless yet angry: Shame and its relationship to anger in male young offenders and undergraduate controls. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 20*, 48-65.
- Feiring, C., & Taska, L. (2005). The persistence of shame following sexual abuse: A longitudinal look at risk and recovery. *Child Maltreatment, 10*, 337-349.
- Fergus, T. A., Valentiner, D. P., McGrath, P. B., & Jencius, S. (2010). Shame- and guilt-proneness:

- Relationships with anxiety disorder symptoms in a clinical sample. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 24, 811-815.
- Ferguson, T. J., & Stegge, H. (1995). Emotional states and traits in children: The case of guilt and shame. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 174-197). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ferguson, T. J., & Stegge, H. (1998). Measuring guilt in children: A rose by any other name still has thorns. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 19-74). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., & Damhuis, I. (1991). Children's understanding of guilt and shame. *Child Development*, 62, 827-839.
- Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., Eyre, H. L., Vollmer, R., & Ashbaker, M. (2000). Context effects and the (mal)adaptive nature of guilt and shame in children. *Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs*, 126, 319-345.
- Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., Miller, E. R., & Olsen, M. E. (1999). Guilt, shame, and symptoms in children. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 347-357.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1987). Parental empathy and child adjustment/maladjustment. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 271-291). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (1969). The relationship between empathy and aggression in two age groups. *Developmental Psychology*, 1, 102-107.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (1982). Empathy training and the regulation of aggression: Potentialities and limitations. *Academic Psychology Bulletin*, 4, 399-413.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (1986). Aggression and altruism: A personality perspective. In C. Zahn-Waxler, E. M. Cummings, & R. Iannotti (Eds.), *Altruism and aggression: Biological and social origins* (pp. 189-217). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Fessler, D. M. T. (1999). Toward an understanding of the universality of second order emotions. In A. L. Hinton (Ed.), *Biocultural approaches to the emotions*. (pp. 75-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fessler, D. M. T. (2007). From appeasement to conformity: Evolutionary and cultural perspectives on shame, competition, and cooperation. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 174-193). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fischer, K. W., & Tangney, J. P. (1995). Self-conscious emotions and the affect revolution: Framework and overview. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 3-22). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fontaine, J. R., Luyten, P., De Boeck, P., Corveleyn, J., Fernandez, M., Herrera, D., Ittzes, A., & Tomcsanyi, T. (2006). Untying the Gordian knot of guilt and shame: The structure of guilt and shame reactions based on situation and person variation in Belgium, Hungary, and Peru. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37, 273-292.

- Fossati, P., Hevenor, S. J., Graham, S. J., Grady, C., Keightley, M. L., Craik, F., et al. (2003). In Search of the Emotional Self: An fMRI Study Using Positive and Negative Emotional Words. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *160*(11), 1938-1945.
- Fredrickson, B.L., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 173-206.
- Freud, S. (1955). Notes upon a case of obsessional neurosis. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 10, pp. 155-318). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1909).
- Freud, S. (1957). Mourning and melancholia. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 243-258). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1917).
- Furukawa, E., Tangney, J. P., & Higashihara, F. (in press). Cross-cultural continuities and discontinuities in shame, guilt, and pride: A study of children residing in Japan, Korea and the U.S. *Self and Identity*.
- Gallagher, S., Phillips, A. C., Oliver, C., & Carroll, D. (2008). Predictors of psychological morbidity in parents of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *33*, 1129-1136.
- Gilbert, P. (1997). The evolution of social attractiveness and its role in shame, humiliation, guilt, and therapy. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, *70*, 113-147.
- Gino, F., & Pierce, L. (2009). Dishonesty in the name of equity. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 1153-1160.
- Goffman, E. (1956). Embarrassment and social organization. *American Journal of Sociology*, *62*, 264-271.
- Gonyea, J. G., Paris, R., & de Saxe Zerden, L. (2008). Adult daughters and aging mothers: The role of guilt in the experience of caregiver burden. *Aging & Mental Health*, *12*, 559-567.
- Grabe, S., Hyde, J. S., & Lindberg, S. M. (2007). Body objectification and depression in adolescents: The role of gender, shame, and rumination. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*, 164-175.
- Gramzow, R., & Tangney, J. P. (1992). Proneness to shame and the narcissistic personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*, 369-376.
- Gratz, K. L., Rosenthal, M. Z., Tull, M. T., Lejeuz, C. W., & Gunderson, J. G. (2010). An experimental investigation of emotional reactivity and delayed emotional recovery in borderline personality disorder: The role of shame. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *51*, 275-285.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 4-27.
- Gross, E., & Stone, G. P. (1964). Embarrassment and the analysis of role requirements. *American*

Journal of Sociology, 70, 1-15.

- Gruber, J., Oveis, C., Keltner, D., & Johnson, S. L. (2011). A discrete emotions approach to positive emotion disturbance in depression. *Cognition and Emotion*, 25, 40-52.
- Gruenewald, T. L., Kemeny, M. E., Aziz, N., & Fahey, J. L. (2004). Acute threat to the social self: Shame, social self-esteem, and cortisol activity. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 66, 915-924.
- Gupta, S., Rosenthal, M. Z., Mancini, A. D., Cheavens, J. S., Lynch, T. R. (2008). Emotion regulation skills mediate the effects of shame on eating disorder symptoms in women. *Eating Disorders: The Journal of Treatment & Prevention*, 16, 405-417.
- Haidt, J., & Keltner, D. (1999). Culture and facial expression: Open-ended methods find more expressions and a gradient of recognition. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13, 225-266.
- 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: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 368-392). New York: Guilford Press.
- Harder, D. W., Cutler, L., & Rockart, L. (1992). Assessment of shame and guilt and their relationship to psychopathology. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 59, 584-604.
- Harper, F. W. K., & Arias, I. (2004). The role of shame in predicting adult anger and depressive symptoms among victims of child psychological maltreatment. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 367-375.
- Harper, F. W. K., Austin, A. G., Cercone, J. J., & Arias, I. (2005). The role of shame, anger, and affect regulation in men's perpetration of psychological abuse in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 1648-1662.
- Hart, D., & Matsuba, M. K. (2007). The development of pride and moral life. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 114-133). New York: Guilford Press.
- Heaven, P. C. L., Ciarrochi, J., & Leeson, P. (2009). The longitudinal links between shame and increasing hostility during adolescence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 841-844.
- Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 22, 165-196.
- Herrald, M. M., & Tomaka, J. (2002). Patterns of emotion-specific appraisal, coping, and cardiovascular reactivity during an ongoing emotional episode. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 434 - 450.
- Hoblitzelle, W. (1987). Attempts to measure and differentiate 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.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg-

- Berg (Ed.), *Development of prosocial behavior* (pp. 281-313). New York: Academic Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hosser, D., Windzio, M., & Greve, W. (2008). Guilt and shame as predictors of recidivism: A longitudinal study with young prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*, 138-152.
- Hyangsook, J. (2002). Shame as a mediator between parenting and psychological adjustment for Caucasian and Korean students: A structural equation modeling approach. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64, 04B*. (UMI No.3088086)
- Iyer, A., Leach, C. W., & Crosby, F. J. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 117-129.
- Iyer, A., Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2006). Predicting American and British opposition to the occupation of Iraq: The role of group-based anger, shame, and guilt. Unpublished manuscript.
- Johns, M., Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2005). Ashamed to be an American? The role of identification in predicting vicarious shame for Anti-Arab prejudice after 9-11. *Self and Identity, 4*, 331-348.
- Joireman, J. (2004). Empathy and the self-absorption paradox II: Self-rumination and self-reflection as mediators between shame, guilt, and empathy. *Self and Identity, 3*, 225-238.
- Jones, W. H., & Kugler, K. (1993). Interpersonal correlates of the Guilt Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61*, 246-258.
- Kahan, D. M. (1997). Ignorance of law is an excuse - But only for the virtuous. *Michigan Law Review, 96*, 127-154.
- 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.
- Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. N. (1996). Evidence for the distinctness of embarrassment, shame, and guilt: A study of recalled antecedents and facial expressions of emotion. *Cognition and Emotion, 10*, 155-171.
- Keltner, D., Moffitt, T., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1995). Facial expressions of emotion and psychopathology in adolescent boys. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 104*, 644-652.
- Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Ketelaar, T., & Au, W. T. (2003). The effects of feelings of guilt on the behavior of uncooperative individuals in repeated social bargaining games: An affect-as-information interpretation of the role of emotion in social interaction. *Cognition & Emotion, 17*, 429-453.
- Kiesler, D. J. (1983). The 1982 Interpersonal Circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review, 90*, 185-214.

- Kim, J., Talbott, N. L., & Cicchetti, D. (2009). Childhood abuse and current interpersonal conflict: The role of shame. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *33*, 362-371.
- Kim, S., Thibodeau, R., & Jorgensen, R. S. (2011). Shame, guilt, and depressive symptoms: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*, 68-96.
- Kircher, T. T. J., Brammer, M., Bullmore, E., Simmons, A., Bartels, M., & David, A. S. (2002). The neural correlates of intentional and incidental self processing. *Neuropsychologia*, *40*(6), 683-692.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Matsumoto, H. (1995). Culture, self, and emotion: A cultural perspective on "self-conscious" emotion. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 439-464). New York: Guilford Press.
- Knauss, C., Paxton, S. J., & Alsaker, F. D. (2008). Body dissatisfaction in adolescent boys and girls: Objectified body consciousness, internalization of the media body ideal and perceived pressure from media. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 633-643.
- Kochanska, G., Barry, R. A., Jimenez, N. B., Hollatz, A. L., & Woodard, J. (2009). Guilt and effortful control: Two mechanisms that prevent disruptive developmental trajectories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 322-333.
- Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kraus, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2009). Signs of socioeconomic status: A thin-slicing approach. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 99-106.
- Kubany, E. S., Abueg, F. R., Owens, J. A., Brennan, J. M., Kaplan, A. S., & Watson, S. B. (1995). Initial examination of a multidimensional model of trauma-related guilt: Applications to combat veterans and battered women. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *17*, 353-376.
- Kubany, E. S., Hill, E. E., Owens, J. A., Iannce-Spencer, C., McCaig, M. A., Tremayne, K. J., & Williams, P. L. (2004). Cognitive Trauma Therapy for Battered Women With PTSD (CTT-BW). *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, *72*, 3-18.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological Stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leary, M. R., Landel, J. L., & Patton, K. M. (1996). The motivated expression of embarrassment following a self-presentational predicament. *Journal of Personality*, *64*, 619-637.
- Leary, M. R., & Meadows, S. (1991). Predictors, elicitors, and concomitants of social blushing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 254-262.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 518-530.
- Lee, D., Scragg, P., & Turner, S. (2001). The role of shame and guilt in traumatic events: A clinical model of shame-based and guilt-based PTSD. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, *74*, 451-466.

- Leith, K. P., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 1-37.
- 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.
- Lewis, M., & Ramsay, D. (2002). Cortisol response to embarrassment and shame. *Child Development, 73*, 1034-1045.
- Lickel, B., Rutchick, A. M., Hamilton, D. L., & Sherman, S. J. (2006). Intuitive theories of group types and relational principles. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*, 28-39.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Spanovic, M. (2007). Group-conscious emotions: Implications of others' wrongdoing for identity and relationships. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney, *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and Research* (pp. 351-370). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Barquissau, M. (2004). The evocation of moral emotions in intergroup contexts: The distinction between collective guilt and collective shame. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje, (Eds.), *Collective guilt: International perspectives* (pp. 35-55). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., Curtis, M., Scarnier, M., & Ames, D. R. (2005). Vicarious shame and guilt. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 8*, 145-147.
- Lieber, E., & Yu, A. B. (2003). Individual differences and prototypical stories: Achievement motivation in Taiwan and the United States. In K. S. Yang, K. K. Hwang, P. B. Pedersen, & I. Daibo (Eds.), *Progress in Asian Social Psychology* (pp.135-154). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Lindberg, S. M., Grabe, S., & Hyde, J. S. (2007). Gender, pubertal development, and peer sexual harassment predict objectified body consciousness in early adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 17*, 723-742.
- Lindsay-Hartz, J. (1984). Contrasting experiences of shame and guilt. *American Behavioral Scientist, 27*, 689-704.
- Lutwak, N., Panish, J. B., Ferrari, J. R., & Razzino, B. E. (2001). Shame and guilt and their relationship to positive expectations and anger expressiveness. *Adolescence, 36*, 641-653.
- Lutwak, N., Razzino, B. E., & Ferrari, J. R. (1998). Self-perceptions and moral affect: An exploratory analysis of subcultural diversity in guilt and shame emotions. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13*, 333-348.
- Luyten, P., Fontaine, J. R. J., & Corveleyn, J. (2002). Does the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA) measure maladaptive aspects of guilt and adaptive aspects of shame? An empirical investigation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 1373-1387.
- Mallett, R. K., Huntsinger, J. R., Sinclair, S., & Swim, J. K. (2008). Seeing through their eyes: When majority group members take collective action on behalf of an outgroup. *Group Processes &*

Intergroup Relations, 11, 451-470.

- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Marschall, D. E. (1996). *Effects of induced shame on subsequent empathy and altruistic behavior*. Unpublished Masters' thesis, George Mason University, Fairfax VA.
- Marx, B. P., Foley, K. M., Feinstein, B. A., Wolf, E. J., Kaloupek, D. G., & Keane, T. M. (2010). Combat-related guilt mediates the relations between exposure to combat-related abusive violence and psychiatric diagnoses. *Depression and Anxiety*, 27, 287-293.
- Mascolo, M. F., & Fischer, K. W. (1995). Developmental transformation in appraisals for pride, shame, and guilt. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 64-113). New York: Guilford Press.
- McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked? *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 25, 563-579.
- McGregor, I., Nail, P. R., Marigold, D. C., & Kang, S. (2005). Defensive pride and consensus: Strength in imaginary numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 978-996.
- Meehan, M. A., O'Connor, L. E., Berry, J. W., Weiss, J., Morrison, A., & Acampora, A. (1996). Guilt, shame, and depression in clients in recovery from addiction. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 28, 125-134.
- Mercurio, A. E., & Landry, L. J. (2008). Self-objectification and well-being: The impact of self-objectification on women's overall sense of self-worth and life satisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 58, 458-466.
- Miller, R. S. (1992). The nature and severity of self-reported embarrassing circumstances. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 190-198.
- Miller, R. S. (1995a). Embarrassment and social behavior. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 322-339). New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, R. S. (1995b). On the nature of embarrassability: Shyness, social-evaluation, and social skill. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 315-339.
- Miller, R. S. (1996). *Embarrassment: Poise and peril in everyday life*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, R. S., & Leary, M. R. (1992). Social sources and interactive functions of emotion: The case of embarrassment. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 202-221). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Miller, T. R. (2002). Culture, gender, and moral emotions: The role of interdependent self-construal. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 03B. (UMI No. 3045180).
- Mills, R. (2003). Possible antecedents and developmental implications of shame in young girls. *Infant & Child Development*, 12, 129-349.

- Modigliani, A. (1968). Embarrassment and embarrassability. *Sociometry*, *31*, 313-326.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*, 177-196.
- Morrison, D., & Gilbert, P. (2001). Social rank, shame and anger in primary and secondary psychopaths. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, *12*, 330-356.
- Mosquera, P. M. R., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2000). The role of honor-related values in the elicitation, experience, and communication of pride, shame, and anger: Spain and the Netherlands compared. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 833-844.
- Murray, C., Waller, G., & Legg, C. (2000). Family dysfunction and bulimic psychopathology: The mediating role of shame. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *28*, 84-89.
- Nelissen, R. M. A., & Zeelenberg, M. (2009). Moral emotions as determinants of third-party punishment: Anger, guilt, and the functions of altruistic sanctions. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *4*, 543-553.
- Nishith, P., Nixon, R., & Resick, P. (2005). Resolution of trauma-related guilt following treatment of PTSD in female rape victims: A result of cognitive processing therapy targeting comorbid depression? *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *86*, 259-265.
- O'Connor, L. E., Berry, J. W., & Weiss, J. (1999). Interpersonal guilt, shame, and psychological problems. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, *18*, 181-203.
- O'Connor, L. E., Berry, J. W., & Weiss, J. (2002). Guilt, fear, submission, and empathy in depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *71*, 19-27.
- 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.
- Orth, U., Berking, M., & Burkhardt, S. (2006). Self-conscious emotions and depression: Rumination explains why shame but not guilt is maladaptive. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*, 1608-1619.
- Oveis, C., Horberg, E. J., & Keltner, D. (2010). Compassion, pride, and social intuitions of self-other similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*, 618-630.
- Paulhus, D. L., Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Tracy, J. L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*, 303-328.
- Piers, G., & Singer, A. (1953). *Shame and guilt*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Quiles, Z. N., & Bybee, J. (1997). Chronic and predispositional guilt: Relations to mental health, prosocial behavior and religiosity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *69*, 104-126.
- Randles, D., & Tracy, J. L. (in preparation). Nonverbal displays of shame and pride predict mental and physical health in recovering alcoholics. *University of British Columbia*.
- Ratanasiripong, P. P. (1997). Effects of culture and religious belief on self-conscious emotions and

depression: Acculturation, self-construal, belief in grace, shame, guilt, and depression among Asian-American and European-American Protestants. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 11B. (UMI No. 9712723)

- Resick, P. A., Nishith, P., Weaver, T. L., Astin, M. C., & Feuer, C. A. (2002). A comparison of cognitive-processing therapy with prolonged exposure and a waiting condition for the treatment of chronic posttraumatic stress disorder in female rape victims. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70, 867-879.
- Robins, R. W., Nofhle, E. E., & Tracy, J. L. (2007). Assessing self-conscious emotions: A review of self-report and nonverbal measures. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 443-467). New York: Guilford Press.
- Robins, R. W., & Schriber, R. A. (2009). The self-conscious emotions: How are they experienced, expressed, and assessed? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3, 887-898.
- Robinson, R., Roberts, W. L., Strayer, J., & Koopman, R. (2007). Empathy and emotional responsiveness in delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents. *Social Development*, 16, 555-579.
- Rohleder, N., Chen, E., Wolf, J. M., & Miller, G. E. (2008). The psychobiology of trait shame in young women: Extending the social self preservation theory. *Health Psychology*, 27, 523-532.
- Roseman, I. J. (1991). Appraisal determinants of discrete emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 5, 161-200.
- Ross, M., Heine, S. J., Wilson, A. E., & Sugimori, S. (2005). Cross-cultural discrepancies in self-appraisals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1175-1188.
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C. R. (1999). Disgust: The body and soul emotion. In T. Dalgleish & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 429-445). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rüsch, N., Corrigan, P. W., Bohus, M., Kühler, T., Jacob, G. A., Lieb, K. (2007). The impact of posttraumatic stress disorder on dysfunctional implicit and explicit emotions among women with borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 195, 537-539.
- Sabini, J., & Silver, M. (1997). In defense of shame: Shame in the context of guilt and embarrassment. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 27, 1-15.
- Sanftner, J. L., Barlow, D. H., Marschall, D. E., & Tangney, J. P. (1995). The relation of shame and guilt to eating disorders symptomatology. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14, 315-324.
- Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2006). Stigma and shame: Emotional responses to the stereotypic actions of one's ethnic ingroup. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Approaches* (pp 261-285). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1983). Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 513-523.

- Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1988). How do I feel about it? Informative functions of affective states. In K. Fiedler & J. Forgas (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and social behavior* (pp. 44-62). Toronto: Hogrefe International.
- Semin, G. R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1981). The beholder beheld: A study of social emotionality. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 11*, 253-265.
- Shariff, A. F., & Tracy, J. L. (2009). Knowing who's boss: Implicit perceptions of status from the nonverbal expression of pride. *Emotion, 9*, 631-639.
- Sharkey, W. F. (1991). Intentional embarrassment: Goals, tactics, and consequences. In W. R. Cupach & S. Metts (Eds.), *Advances in interpersonal communication research—1991* (pp. 105-128). Normal, IL: Personal Relationships Interest Group.
- Sharkey, W. F. (1992). Uses of and responses to intentional embarrassment. *Communication Studies, 43*, 257-275.
- Sharkey, W. F. (1993). Who embarrasses whom? Relational and sex differences in the use of intentional embarrassment. In P. J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Interpersonal Communication: Evolving interpersonal relationships* (pp. 147-168). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sharkey, W. F., & Stafford, L. (1990). Responses to embarrassment. *Human Communication Research, 17*, 315-342.
- Sheikh, S., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (2010). The “shoulds” and “should nots” of moral emotions: A self-regulatory perspective on shame and guilt. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 213-224.
- Schoenleber, M., & Berenbaum, H. (2010). Shame aversion and shame proneness in Cluster C personality disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 119*, 197-205.
- Silfver, M., Helkama, K., Lonnqvist, J., & Verkasalo, M. (2008). The relation between value priorities and proneness to shame, guilt, and empathy. *Motivation and Emotion, 32*, 69-80.
- Silver, M., Sabini, J., & Parrott, W. G. (1987). Embarrassment: A dramaturgic account. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 17*, 47-61.
- Skarderud, F. (2007). Shame and pride in anorexia nervosa: A qualitative descriptive study. *European Eating Disorders Review, 15*, 81-97.
- Slater, A., & Tiggemann, M. (2010). Body image and disordered eating in adolescent girls and boys: A test of objectification theory. *Sex Roles, 63*, 42-49.
- Smith, R. H., Webster, J. M., Parrot, W. G., & Eyre, H. L. (2002). The role of public exposure in moral and nonmoral shame and guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 138-159.
- Spillers, R. L., Wellisch, D. K., Kim, Y., Matthews, B. A., & Baker, F. (2008). Family caregivers and guilt in the context of cancer care. *Psychosomatics: Journal of Consultation Liaison Psychiatry, 49*, 511-519.
- Stipek, D. (1995). The development of pride and shame in toddlers. In J. P. Tangney & K. W.

- Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 237-252). New York: Guilford Press.
- Stipek, D. (1998). Differences between Americans and Chinese in the circumstances evoking pride, shame, and guilt. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 616-629.
- Stuewig, J., & McCloskey, L. A. (2005). The relation of child maltreatment to shame and guilt among adolescents: Psychological routes to depression and delinquency. *Child Maltreatment, 10*, 324-336.
- Stuewig, J., Tangney, J. P., Heigel, C., Harty, L., & McCloskey, L. (2010). Shaming, blaming, and maiming: Functional links among the moral emotions, externalization of blame, and aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*, 91-102.
- Swim, J. K., & Miller, D. L. (1999). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 500-514.
- Takahashi, H., Yahata, N., Koeda, M., Matsuda, T., Asai, K., & Okubo, Y. (2004). Brain activation associated with evaluative processes of guilt and embarrassment: an fMRI study. *NeuroImage, 23*, 967-974.
- Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 598-607.
- Tangney, J. P. (1992). Situational determinants of shame and guilt in young adulthood. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 199-206.
- Tangney, J. P. (1993). Shame and guilt. In C. G. Costello (Ed.), *Symptoms of depression* (pp. 161-180). New York: John Wiley.
- Tangney, J. P. (1994). The mixed legacy of the super-ego: Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of shame and guilt. In J. M. Masling & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on object relations theory* (pp. 1-28). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tangney, J. P. (1995a). Recent advances in the empirical study of shame and guilt. *American Behavioral Scientist, 38*, 1132-1145.
- Tangney, J. P. (1995b). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 114-139). New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P. (1996). Conceptual and methodological issues in the assessment of shame and guilt. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 34*, 741-754.
- Tangney, J. P. (1999). The self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment and pride. In T. Dalgleish & M. Power (Eds.), *A handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 541-568). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Tangney, J. P., Burggraf, S. A., & Wagner, P. E. (1995). Shame-proneness, guilt-proneness, and psychological symptoms. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions:*

- Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 343-367). New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. (2002). *Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., & Fischer, K. W., (Eds.). (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Marschall, D. E., Rosenberg, K., Barlow, D. H., & Wagner, P. E. (1994). *Children's and adults' autobiographical accounts of shame, guilt and pride experiences: An analysis of situational determinants and interpersonal concerns*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. H. (1996). Are shame, guilt and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 1256-1269.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Barlow, D. H., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). The relation of shame and guilt to constructive vs. destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 797-809.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., 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 (TOSCA)*. George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Proneness to shame, proneness to guilt, and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *103*, 469-478.
- Thomaes, F., Bushman, B. J., Stegge, H., & Olthof, T. (2008). Trumping shame by blasts of noise: Narcissism, self-esteem, shame, and aggression in young adolescents. *Child Development*, *79*, 1792-1801.
- Thompson, R. J., & Berenbaum, H. (2006). Shame reactions to everyday dilemmas are associated with depressive disorder. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *30*, 415-425.
- Tibbetts, S. G. (2003). Self-conscious emotions and criminal offending. *Psychological Reports*, *93*, 101-126.
- Tiedens, L. Z., Ellsworth, P. C., & Mesquita, B. (2000). Stereotypes about sentiments and status: Emotional expectations for high- and low-status group members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 560-574.
- Tiggemann, M., & Boundy, M. (2008). Effect of environment and appearance compliment on college women's self-objectification, mood, body shame, and cognitive performance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *32*, 399-405.
- Tilghman-Osborne, C., Cole, D. A., Felton, J. W., & Ciesla, J. A. (2008). Relation of guilt, shame, behavioral and characterological self-blame to depressive symptoms in adolescents over time. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *27*, 809-842.

- Tracy, J. L., & Beall, A. (in press). Nice guys finish last: The impact of emotion expressions on sexual attraction. *Emotion*.
- Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., Robins, R. W., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2009). Authentic and hubristic pride: The affective core of self-esteem and narcissism. *Self and Identity*, 8, 196-213.
- Tracy, J. L., & Matsumoto, D. (2008). The spontaneous expression of pride and shame: Evidence for biologically innate nonverbal displays. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 11655-11660.
- Tracy, J. L., & Prehn, C. (in press). Arrogant or self-confident? The use of contextual knowledge to differentiate hubristic and authentic pride from a single nonverbal expression. *Cognition & Emotion*.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103-125.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006). Appraisal antecedents of shame and guilt: Support for a theoretical model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1339-1351.
- 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.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2008). The nonverbal expression of pride: Evidence for cross-cultural recognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 516-530.
- Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., & Cheng, J. T. (2010). A naturalist's view of pride. *Emotion Review*, 2, 163-177.
- Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., Zhao, W., & Henrich, J. (2011). Cross-cultural evidence that the pride expression is a universal automatic status signal. *Manuscript submitted*.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.
- Troop, N. A., Allan, S., Serpell, L., & Treasure, J. L. (2008). Shame in women with a history of eating disorders. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 16, 480-488.
- Valentiner, D. P., & Smith, S. A. (2008). Believing that intrusive thoughts can be immoral moderates the relationship between obsessions and compulsions for shame-prone individuals. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 32, 714-720.
- Vangelisti, A. L., Daly, J. A., & Rudnick, J. R. (1991). Making people feel guilty in conversations: Techniques and correlates. *Human Communication Research*, 18, 3-39.
- Verbeke, W., Belschak, F., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2004). The adaptive consequences of pride in personal selling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32, 386-402.
- Wallbott, H. G., & Scherer, K. R. (1995). Cultural determinants in experiencing shame and guilt. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and*

pride (pp. 465-487). New York: Guilford Press.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548-573.

Weiss, J. (1993). *How psychotherapy works*. New York: Guilford Press.

Weitzman, O., Kemeny, M. E. and Fahey, J. L. (2008) *HIV-related shame and guilt predict CD4 decline* Manuscript in preparation

Wicker, F. W., Payne, G. C., & Morgan, R. D. (1983). Participant descriptions of guilt and shame. *Motivation and Emotion*, 7, 25-39.

Williams, L.A., & DeSteno, D. (2008). Pride and perseverance: The motivational role of pride. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 1007-1017.

Williams, L. A., & DeSteno, D. (2009). Pride: Adaptive social emotion or seventh sin? *Psychological Science*, 20, 284-288.

Wiseman, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2010). Body image and eating disorder symptoms in sexual minority men: A test and extension of objectification theory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57, 154-166.

Wright, K., Gudjonsson, G. H., & Young, S. (2008). An investigation of the relationship between anger and offence-related shame and guilt. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 14, 415-423.

Wright, M. O., Crawford, E., & Del Castillo, D. (2009). Childhood emotional maltreatment and later psychological distress among college students: The mediating role of maladaptive schemas. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 59-68.

Yang, M., Yang, C., & Chiou, W. (2010). When guilt leads to other orientation and shame leads to egocentric self-focus: Effects of differential priming of negative affects on perspective taking. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38, 605-614.

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.

Zahn-Waxler, C., & Robinson, J. (1995). Empathy and guilt: Early origins of feelings of responsibility. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 143-173). New York: Guilford Press.

Zebel, S., Doojse, B., & Spears, R. (2004). It depends on your point of view: Implications of perspective-taking and national identification for Dutch collective guilt. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doojse, (Eds.), *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives* (pp. 148-168). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zemack-Rugar, Y., Bettman, J. R., & Fitzsimmons, G. J. (2007). The effects of nonconsciously priming emotion concepts on behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 927-939.

Footnotes

¹ We have adopted the terms “authentic” and “hubristic” to emphasize that the first facet (authentic pride) is based on actual accomplishments and is likely accompanied by genuine feelings of self-worth. This label also connotes the full range of academic, social, moral, and interpersonal accomplishments that may be important elicitors [in previous work (Tracy & Robins, 2004), this facet of pride was labeled with the narrower descriptor of “achievement-oriented”]. However, the label “hubristic pride” should not be taken to imply that this facet is not an authentic emotional experience. Rather, from our theoretical perspective at least, the *elicitors* of hubristic pride may be more loosely tied to actual accomplishments, and may involve a self-evaluative process that reflects a less authentic sense of self (e.g., distorted and self-aggrandized self-views), but the subjective experience is likely to be as genuine as that of any other emotion.