Psychometric Properties of the Turkish Version of Trait Shame and Guilt Scale

Aslı Bugay[*]
Ayhan Demir[**]

Abstract

Problem Statement: In Turkey, there is no scale to measure one's shame and guilt level as a trait. Therefore, translating and adapting The Trait Shame and Guilt Scale into Turkish language and culture expected to fill the gap regarding the understanding of guilt and shame as a trait.

Purpose of the Study: The aim of the study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the Turkish version of Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (Rohleder, Chen, Wolf, & Miller, 2008).

Method of the Research: The Trait Shame and Guilt Scale and The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) were administered to two independent university students samples. Sample 1 consisted of 310 (172 female, 138 male) university students and sample 2 consisted of 205 (100 female, 105 male) university students who were not the participants of the study 1. Participants of the study were recruited via convenient sampling. In the first study, the process of translating and face validity of the Turkish version of TSGS as well as the reliability and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) results were reported. In the second study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to verify the factor structure suggested by EFA results. In sum, factor structure assessments, convergent validity, and internal reliability were examined to determine the applicability of Turkish version of TSGS.

Findings of the Research: The results of this study indicated high reliability (internal consistency) and satisfactory criterion-related validity of the Turkish version TSGS. In addition, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) confirmed the original three factors structure for the Turkish version of TSGS.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The findings of the study provided empirical evidence for applicability of Turkish version of TSGS in Turkish

[*] Assist. Prof. Dr., Akdeniz University, Faculty of Education, abugay00@gmail.com

[**] Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, aydemir@metu.edu.tr

university samples. The findings of the study are restricted the convenient sampling procedure. Thus, the Turkish version of the TSGS needs to be replicated using a random sampling procedure in future research.

Key words: Shame, guilt, pride, psychometric properties, reliability, validity.

Shame can be defined as "an emotion that appears when one violates self-imposed moral standards" (Bear, Uribe-Zarain, Manning, & Shiomi, 2009, p.230). In the vein of shame, guilt is also "the emotion that an individual experiences after committing an act that violates one's moral standards and attributes responsibility for the violation to oneself" (Bear et al., 2009, p.230). Even though shame and guilt are usually considered together and used interchangeably (e.g. Hoblitzelle, 1987; Marschall, Saftner, & Tangney, 1994; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989), a well-known difference between these two emotions was established over the last decade. For instance, Gehm and Scherer (1988) asserted that "shame is usually dependent on the public exposure of one's frailty or failing, whereas guilt may be something that remains a secret with us…" (p.74). According to Lewis (1971), "in guilt, the self is not the central object of the negative evaluation, but rather the thing done or undone is the focus" (p.30). Tangney, Miller, Flicker, and Barlow (1996) showed this differentiation by defining shame as "… a global negative feeling about the self", and referring to guilt as "…a negative feeling about a specific event rather than about self" (p.1257).

Recently, Tangney and Dearing (2002) asserted that while shame happens as a result of an awareness of one's inadequacy, impropriety, or dishonor, guilt appears after a specific bad and immoral experience. That is, one experiences shame when they completely perceive themselves as bad or immoral; however, one feels guilt when they perceive the specific event as wrong or something as a fault. Furthermore, this distinction can be seen in individuals' approaches toward repairing their offenses in which shame drives individuals to act in a defensive manner by hiding their flow against any threat of the self; however, guilt causes people to damage the relationship (Tangney et al., 1996; Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

The arguments for this basic distinction between shame and guilt have also been supported by empirical studies (e.g., Lindsay-Hartz, de Rivera, & Mascolo, 1995; Niedenthal, Tangney, & Gavanski, 1994; Tangney, 1993; Tangney et al., 1996; Wallbott & Scherer, 1995). As Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, and Gramzow (1992) revealed, whereas shame was associated with indirect expressions of hostility, suspiciousness, irritability, and a tendency to blame others for negative events; guilt was linked with externalization of blame and anger. Leith and Baumeister (1998) reported that shame was correlated to personal distress; however, guilt was associated with recognizing the perspectives of others. That is to say, shame increased the possibility of negative outcomes, while guilt contributed to the improvement of understanding another's perspective. In addition, some studies (e.g., Fontaine, Luyten, De Boeck, & Corveleyn, 2001; Harder, Cutler, & Rockart, 1992; Stuewig & McCloskey, 2005; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992) indicated that only shame but not guilt had a significant impact on depression. Thus,

the nature of the relationships of these emotions to such psychological variables seemed to show variations, and these moral emotions may lead to different outcomes. Overall, despite this basic distinction between guilt and shame, they were found to be highly correlated with each other as they occurred as a result of violating an ethical and/or social code (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995; Eisenberg, 2000; Keltner & Harker, 1998; Tangney & Fischer, 1995). Taken as a whole, these findings suggest that shame and guilt are significantly related to a variety of topics, which highlights the importance of these moral emotions in psychological assessments.

In spite of the given differences between shame and guilt, several instruments have been constructed in order to measure both of them simultaneously (e.g., Hoblitzelle, 1987; Marschall et al., 1994; Tangney et al., 1989). Some were developed as scenario-based measures (Stegge & Ferguson, 1990; Tangney, 1990; Tangney, Wagner, Gavlas, & Gramzow, 1991; Tangney, 1995). Among them, most commonly used is the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (Tangney et al., 1989), which includes 15 different scenarios with various different responses for each specific situation. Some others were developed as adjective checklists for shame and guilt (Hoblitzelle, 1987; Harder & Lewis, 1987; Harder & Zalma, 1990). The Adapted Shame/Guilt Scale (Hoblitzelle, 1987), for instance, consists of 16 shame adjectives and 20 guilt adjectives. According to Tangney (1996), these adjective checklists for shame and guilt need advanced verbal skills, which tend to restrict its use in a wide range of populations.

Furthermore, some scales were developed as state measures of shame and guilt (Izard, 1977; Marschall et al., 1994). The State Shame and Guilt Scale (SSGS; Marschall et al., 1994) is one of the few scales used to identify shame, guilt, and pride in the given moment. More recently, a modified version of SSGS was created by Rohleder et al. (2008) in order to measure rather stable experiences of shame, guilt, and pride by asking participants about how they felt during the past few months. Because of this modification, they called it the Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (TSGS). The modified version was reported to have adequate psychometric properties (Rohleder et al., 2008). Since the TSGS is a relatively new scale, there is currently insufficient knowledge regarding the psychometric characteristics of the scale.

When Turkey is taken into consideration, there is no scale to measure one's shame and guilt level as a trait. The Guilt and Shame Scale (Şahin & Şahin, 1992) has only been used to assess one's shame and guilt based on the specific situation. This scale was utilized in a few studies in order to measure one's shame and guilt level as a state (e.g., Deniz, 2006; Kalyoncu et al., 2002; Karataş, 2008). Thus, translating and adapting the Trait Shame and Guilt Scale into the Turkish language was expected to fill the gap regarding the understanding of shame and guilt as a trait. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (TSGS). In the first study, the process of translating and determining the face validity of the Turkish version of the TSGS as well as the reliability and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) results were reported. In the second study, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to verify the factor structure suggested by the EFA results.

STUDY 1
Method

Participants and Procedure

In Study 1, participants consisted of 302 (166 female, 136 male) Turkish university students. Age of the students ranged from 18 to 24 with a mean of 20.93 (*SD* = 1.55). In order to reach the participants of the study, a convenient sampling method was utilized. Before administering the instruments, the necessary ethical permissions and consent for data collection were obtained from the university's human subjects ethics committee. All of the participants volunteered to participate in the current study. The completion of the survey took approximately 10-15 minutes.

Instruments

The Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (TSGS): Marschall et al. (1994) developed the State Shame and Guilt Scale (SSGS) to assess one's state shame, guilt, and pride level. More recently, Rohleder et al. (2008) modified the SSGS to measure trait shame, guilt, and pride by asking participants about how they felt during the past few months. Because of this change, they called it the Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (TSGS). Sample items of the modified version of the shame subscale reads as "I've wanted to sink into the floor and disappear", "I've felt like I am a bad person", and "I've felt humiliated, disgraced". The modified version of the guilt subscale reads as "I've felt tension about something I did", "I've felt remorse, regret", and "I've felt like apologizing, confessing". The modified version of the pride subscale reads as "I felt good about myself", "I felt proud", and "I felt pleased about what I had done". The TSGS is a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "not feeling this way at all" to "feeling this way very strongly". Higher scores on each subscale reflect a higher level of shame, guilt, and pride in each domain. The TSGS has satisfactory internal reliability with Cronbach's alpha: for the shame subscale, *a* = .74, for the guilt subscale, *a* = .76, and for the pride subscale, *a* = .74. An acceptable test-retest reliability (*r* = .49) of six-month intervals was reported by Rohleder et al. (2008). The translation and adaptation of the Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (TSGS) into Turkish was conducted by the authors. Translation procedures and reliability, validity, and the factor structure studies are presented in the following section.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) to assess one's overall life satisfaction level with 5 items. The SWLS is a 7-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate a higher level of life satisfaction. The two-month test-retest correlation coefficient was found at .82, and the alpha coefficient was .87 (Diener et. al., 1985). The Turkish version of the scale was adapted by Köker (1991) who reported sufficient psychometric properties, including an internal consistency coefficient of .80, and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .85. In the current study, the internal reliability coefficient was .86.

Findings and Results

The Process of Translating the Turkish Version of the TSGS

In the first step of the translation procedure, five experts, who held PhDs in counseling and were competent in the English language, independently translated the scale into Turkish. Later, the five translated versions of the TSGS and its English version were subjected to the opinions of three academics of a counseling department. After these experts independently selected the best translation of each item, the Turkish translation of the TSGS was given to two English language teachers with MS degrees, in order to ensure the equivalence of the TSGS in the two languages. Then, a Turkish language teacher evaluated the final form and final modifications were made accordingly. A pilot study of the Turkish translation of the scale was conducted with university student sample ($n = 25$). Based on the feedback from students, the final version of the translation, which was used in Study 1 and Study 2, was created.

Factor Structure of the Turkish Version of the TSGS

A Principal Components Analysis with a Varimax rotation was performed to identify the possible underlying factor structure with Sample 1. The resulting factor loadings of the Turkish version of the TSGS are shown in Table 1. An examination of the Eigen values and Scree test suggested a three-factor solution for the Turkish version of the TSGS. Examination of factor loadings over .40 proposed that each scale was loaded on a single factor.

Table 1

Factor Loadings of the Turkish Version of the TSGS

Item Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
TSGS 2	**.678**	.312	-.114
TSGS 5	**.706**	.191	-.299
TSGS 8	**.470**	.225	-.151
TSGS 11	**.808**	.103	-.094
TSGS 14	**.756**	.295	-.244
TSGS 3	.323	**.652**	-.069
TSGS 6	.175	**.772**	-.107
TSGS 9	.053	**.793**	-.170
TSGS 12	.185	**.476**	.063
TSGS 15	.368	**.746**	-.226
TSGS 1	-.258	-.081	**.738**
TSGS 4	-.167	-.021	**.836**
TSGS 7	-.116	-.110	**.839**
TSGS 10	-.040	-.070	**.861**
TSGS 13	-.146	-.300	**.747**

Note: Bolded values represent the greater loading of the item. Factor 1 = Shame; Factor 2 = Guilt; Factor 3 = Pride.

The results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) indicated three factors, accounting for 63.52% of the total variance. The first factor, shame, included five items and accounted for 23.59% of the variance. The second factor, guilt, included five items and explained 20.19% of the variance. The third factor, pride, included five items and accounted for 19.72% of the total variance. Eigen values that were related with the factors were 6.08, 3.38, and 2.13, respectively. All items of the three subscales were loaded in an estimated way, as in the original scale proposed by Rohleder et al. (2008). In addition, all subscales of the TSGS were found to be significantly interrelated. In fact, there was an inverse correlation between shame and pride ($r = -.41$, $p < .01$), and guilt and pride ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$); whereas the correlation between shame and guilt was positive ($r = .65$, $p < .01$).

Reliability of the Turkish version of the TSGS

In order to provide evidence of reliability, the internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach alpha) was calculated for each subscale of the TSGS. The resulting Cronbach's alpha for the shame subscale was $a = .83$, for the guilt subscale, $a = .81$, and for the pride subscale, $a = .87$, indicating high internal consistency.

Criterion-related validity of the Turkish version of the TSGS

Criterion-related validity of the scale was tested based on the correlation between the Turkish versions of the TSGS and the SWLS. The Pearson correlation coefficient showed a significant negative correlation between the shame subscale of the TSGS and SWLS scores ($r = -.48$, $p < .01$) and between the guilt subscale of the TSGS and SWLS scores ($r = -.46$, $p < .01$), suggesting that participants with a high shame or guilt score tended to score lower on the SWLS. In contrast, there was a significant positive correlation between the pride subscale of the TSGS and SWLS scores ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), indicating that participants with a high pride score also scored higher on the SWLS.

STUDY 2

In Study 2, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to test the factor structure of a set of observed variables with Sample 2, to gather further evidence for constructing the validity of the Turkish TSGS.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Study 2 was carried out with a sample of 205 (100 female, 105 male) undergraduate students from an urban Turkish university. Their mean age was 20.6 years ($SD = 1.96$). A convenient sampling method was used in order to gather data. After obtaining the necessary ethical permissions from the university's human subjects ethics committee, the Turkish version of the TSGS was administered in a new sample via Study 1 during class hours. All of the participants volunteered to participate in the study. Participants were guaranteed anonymity of their responses and confidentiality of the data. Completing the Turkish version of the TSGS took approximately 10-15 minutes.

Findings and Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Turkish Version of The TSGS

AMOS Version 16.0 software (Arbuckle, 2007) was used to perform a CFA with Sample 2. Maximum likelihood and covariance matrices were analyzed as the estimation method to test the original three-factor of the TSGS. In order to evaluate the results of the CFA, the use of multiple indices was recommended by several researchers (Kline, 2005; Klem, 2000; Thompson, 2000). Therefore, the fit for the current model was evaluated using a number of fit indices: Chi square/df ratio, the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). The following criteria were used to indicate goodness-of-fit: GFI and CFI .90 and higher, RMSEA .08 or lower, SRMR .10 and lower and Chi-square/df ratio 3 or lower (Bentler, 1990).

In the current study, the original three-factor structure of the TSGS with 15 items was tested. CFA results yielded following goodness-of-fit indices: [χ^2 (87) = 218.33, *p* = .00; χ^2/df- *ratio* = 2.62; *GFI* = .92, *CFI* = .94, *RMSEA* = .06, *SRMR* = .05]. Overall, the goodness-of-fit indices (*GFI, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR*) suggested that the model fit was satisfactory for the current data.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability of the Turkish Version 0f the TSGS

Descriptive statistics indicated that the mean for the shame subscale was 10.26 (*SD* = 4.89), for the guilt subscale was 13.34 (*SD* = 4.82), and for the pride subscale was 17.51 (*SD* = 4.73). In Study 2, Cronbach's alpha for shame, guilt, and pride subscales of Turkish version of the TSGS were *a* = .84, *a* = .80 and *a* = .89, respectively.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In the present study, the Trait Shame and Guilt Scale (TSGS) was standardized for use in Turkish university populations, including validity and reliability studies by using two different samples. The factor structure of the Turkish version of the TSGS was assessed by explanatory factor analyses and following confirmatory factor analyses across two different samples. The results suggested that the three-factor structure of the TSGS was confirmed with the present data, providing evidence for the construct validity of the scale.

In addition, criterion-related validity of the scale was established by using correlational inquiry. A Pearson correlation coefficient between the TSGS and SWLS scores revealed satisfactory correlations. As expected, while shame and guilt were negatively correlated to life satisfaction, pride was positively correlated to life satisfaction. Furthermore, the TSGS presented high internal consistency for the subscales of the TSGS as in the original scale. Therefore, this scale can be used as a reliable and valid measure of trait guilt and shame in Turkish university samples.

Several implications can be drawn based on the results of the study. First of all, the current study provided evidence for the applicability of the Turkish version of

the TSGS in Turkish university samples. In addition, the results presented initial knowledge regarding cross-cultural validity of this scale. Since the TSGS is a rather new scale to measure shame and guilt as a trait, the cultural validation of the scale in different cultural contexts has not yet been established. Therefore, empirical evidence is needed for its cultural validity as the expressions of emotions can shift from culture to culture (Mesqutta & Frijda, 1992; Russell, 1991). Thus, the result of this study can contribute to the cultural validation process, with the goal of stimulating research on this topic. In addition, in the absence of cross-validated of the Turkish version of shame and guilt scale, very little is known about cross-cultural similarities and differences about the experience of the emotions. Thus, translating and adapting the TSGS into the Turkish language and culture is quite important to understand the cultural influence on the emotions. Moreover, this scale can be utilized by counselors as a tool to help clients who have difficulty in analyzing and clarifying the meaning of their emotions.

In sum, the findings of the study provided empirical evidence of psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the TSGS by using two different university samples. However, the findings of the study are restricted the convenient sampling procedure. Thus, the Turkish version of the TSGS needs to be replicated using a random sampling procedure in future research.

References

Arbuckle, J. L. (2007). *Amos 16.0 User's Guide*. Chicago: SPSS.

Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1995). 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., Maureen A., Manning, M. A., & Shiomi, K. (2009). Shame, guilt, blaming, and anger: Differences between children in Japan and the US. *Motivation and Emotion, 33*(3), 229-238.

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 238-246.

Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Reviews Psychology, 51*, 665-697.

Deniz, M. E. (2006). The relationships between attachment styles with child abuses and guilt shame in adolescence. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 22*, 89-99.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.

Fontaine, J. R. J., Luyten, P., De Boeck, P., & Corveleyn, J. (2001). The Test of Self-Conscious Affect: Internal structure, differential scales and relationships with long-term effects. *European Journal of Personality, 15*, 449-463.

Gehm, T., & Scherer, K. R. (1988). Relating situation evaluation to emotion differentiation: Nonmetric analysis of cross-cultural questionnaire data. In K. R. Scherer (Ed.), *Facets of emotion: Recent research* (pp. 61-77). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Harder, D. W., Cutler, L., & Rockart, L. (1992). Assessment of shame and guilt and their relationships to psychopathology. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 59*, 584-604.

Harder, D. W., & Lewis, S. J. (1987). The assessment of shame and guilt. In Butcher, J. N. & Spielberger, C. D. (Eds.), *Advances in Personality Assessment* (pp. 89-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Hoblitzelle, W. (1987). Attempts to measure and differentiate shame and guilt. In H.B. Lewis (ed.), *The Role of Shame in Symptom Formation*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 29-50.

Izard, C. E. (1977). *Human emotions*. New York: Plenum Press.

Kalyoncu, A.Ö., Mırsal H., Pektaş, Ö., Gümüş, Ö., Tan, D., & Beyazyürek, M. (2002). The feelings of guilt and shame in alcohol dependent patients. *Journal of Dependence, 3*(3), 160-164.

Karataş, Z. (2008). An investigation of high school students' guilt and shame scores in terms of gender and whether they have had discipline punishment or not. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, *4*(2), 103-114.

Keltner, D., & Harker, L. (1998). The forms and functions of the nonverbal signal of shame. In P. Gilbert (Ed.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 78   98). New York: Oxford University Press.

Klem, L. (2000). Structural equation modeling. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.),*Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 227-260). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*, *2nd Edition*: N.Y.: Guilford.

Köker, S. (1991). *A comparison of life satisfaction of normal and delinquent adolescence.* (Unpublished master's thesis), Ankara University.

Leith, K. P., & R. F. Baumeister (1998). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality 66*(1), 1-38.

Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Lindsay-Hartz, J., de Rivera, J., & Mascolo, M. (1995). Differentiation shame and guilt and their effects on motivation. In J. P. Tagney & K. W. Fisher (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 274-300). New York: Guildford.

Marschall, D. E., Saftner J., & Tangney, J. P. (1994). *The State Shame and Guilt Scale*, George   Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Mesqutta, B., & Frijda, N. H. (1992). Cultural variations in emotions: a review. *Psychological Bulletin 112,* 179-204.

Niedenthal, P., Tangney, J. P., & Gavanski, I. (1994). "If only I weren't" versus "if only I   hadn't". Distinguishing shame and guilt in counterfactual thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 585-595.

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.

Russell, J. (1991). Culture and the categorization of emotions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 426-450.

Stegge, H., & Ferguson, T. J. (1990). *Child-child attribution and reaction survey (C-CARS).* Utah State University.

Şahin, N. H., & Şahin, N. (1992, June). *Guilt, shame and depression in adolescence.* WorldCongress of Cognitive Therapy, Toronto, Canada.

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.

Tangney, J. P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the Self-Conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 102-111.

Tangney, J. P. (1993). Shame and guilt. In C.G. Costello (Ed.), *Symptoms of depression* (pp. 161-80). New York:Wiley.

Tangney, J. P. (1995). Recent advances in the empirical study of shame and guilt. *American Behavioral Scientist, 38*, 1132-1146.

Tangney, J. P. (1996). Conceptual and methodological issues in shame and guilt. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 34*, 741-754.

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. (2002). *Shame and guilt.* New York: Guilford.

Tangney, J. P., & Fischer, K. W. (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment and pride.* New York: Guilford Press.

Tangney, J., Miller, R., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. (1996). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 1256-1269.

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. E., Gavlas, J., & Gramzow, R. (1991). *The test of self-consciousaffect for adolescents (TOSCA-A).* Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.

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., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Proneness to shame, proneness to guilt, and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101,* 469-578.

Thompson, B. (2000). Ten commandments of structural equation modeling. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 261- 283). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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.

Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği Türkçe Formu'nun
Psikometrik Özellikleri
(Özet)

Problem Durumu

Utanç ve suçluluk birçok psikolojik değişkenle olan güçlü ilişkisi nedeniyle araştırmacıların son yıllarda artan bir şekilde ilgisini çekmekte ve bu değişkenlerin işevuruk tanımları gittikçe önem kazanmaktadır. Bu nedenle ilgili alanyazında utanç ve suçluluğu farklı şekillerde ölçmeyi amaçlayan ölçekler geliştirilmiştir. Bu ölçeklerden biri olan Durumluk Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği bireyin o anki utanç, suçluluk ve gururu verilen durumlar esas alınarak ölçme amacıyla geliştirilmiştir. Daha sonra orijinal ölçek üzerinde bazı değişiklikler yapılarak, bireyin sürekli utanç, suçluluk ve gurur durumunu ölçme amacıyla kullanılacak hale dönüştürülmüştür. Ölçeğin bu son hali bireyin maddelerde verilen özel durumlar karşısında o anki tepkisini değil sürekli duygu durumunu ölçtüğü için ölçeğin adı Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği olarak değiştirilmiştir. Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği utanç, suçluluk ve gurur olmak üzere 3 alt ölçekten ve toplam 15 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Ölçeklerde yer alan her bir madde "Bunu hiç hissetmedim" den "Bunu çok güçlü hissettim"e doğru değişen 5'li ölçek üzerinde değerlendirilmektedir. Her bir alt ölçekten alınan yüksek puan o özelliğin yüksek olduğuna işaret etmektedir. Ölçeğin yeterli düzeyde psikometrik uygunluğa sahip olduğu rapor edilmesine rağmen ölçeğin bu yeni halinin faktör yapısı, geçerlilik ve güvenirlik özellikleri hakkında henüz yeterli bilgi bulunmamaktadır.

İlgili alanyazın göz önüne alındığında, Türkiye'de bireyin sürekli utanç ve suçluluk durumunu ölçmek için geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması yapılmış bir ölçeğe rastlanmamaktadır. Ülkemizde utanç ve suçlulukla ilgili bireyin durumsal tepkilerini ölçmek amacıyla Suçluluk ve Utanç Ölçeği bulunmaktadır. Ancak bu ölçek sadece bireyin özel durumlar için hissettiği durumsal suçluluk ve utanç hakkında bilgi vermektedir. Bu nedenle, Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği'nin Türkçeye çevirilmesi ve psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesinin bu konuyla ilgili çalışmalara temel oluşturacağı düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu araştırmanın amacı Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği'nin Türkçe Form'un psikometrik özelliklerini incelemektir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi

Bu araştırmada Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği'nin faktör yapısını, geçerlilik ve güvenirliliğini test etmek amacıyla iki farklı örneklemden veri toplanmıştır. Araştırma örneklemleri, 310 (172 kız, 138 erkek) ve 205 (100 kız, 105 erkek) üniversite öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmaya katılan öğrencilerin yaş aralığı 18-24 arasındadır. Araştırmada gerekli bilgileri toplamak amacı ile Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeğinin Türkçe Formu ve Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Ölçeğin önce çeviri çalışması yapılmış ve uzman görüşü alınarak görünüm geçerliliğine bakılmıştır. Ölçeğin faktör ve yapı geçerliliğini test etmek amacıyla önce açıklayıcı

faktör analizi, daha sonra doğrulayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Ayrıca her alt ölçek için Cronbach alfa iç tutarlık katsayıları hesaplanmış ve ölçüt bağlantılı geçerliğini hesaplamak de için Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği ile arasındaki ilişkiye bakılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları

Bulgulara göre, çalışma 1'de önce ölçeğin çeviri süreciyle ilgili bilgileri rapor edilmektedir. Ayrıca çalışma 1'de ölçeğin faktör yapısını test etmek için ana bileşenler yöntemi ve varimax rotasyonuyla açıklayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Özdeğeri 1'den büyük olan faktörler ve faktör yükleri 0.4'ten büyük maddeler dikkate alınarak, ölçeğin Türkçe çevirisi için orijinal yapısı ile benzer olarak 3 faktörlü yapı bulunmuştur. Ayrıca ölçeğin ölçüt bağlantılı geçerliğini hesaplamak için kullanılan Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği ile alt ölçekler arasında anlamlı ilişki olduğu görülmüştür. Buna göre, suçluluk ($r = -.48$) ve utanç alt ölçeği ($r = -.46$) ile ters yönde gurur alt ölçeği ($r = -.39$) ile doğru yönde ilişki bulunmuştur Ölçeğin güvenirliği Cronbach alfa iç tutarlık katsayıları hesaplanarak incelenmiştir. Utanç alt boyutu için .83, suçluluk alt boyutu için .81 ve gurur alt boyutu için .87 olarak bulunmuştur. Daha sonra çalışma 2'de ölçeğin faktör yapısı AMOS programında doğrulayıcı faktör analizi ile test edilmiştir. Elde edilen uyum indeks değerleri 15 maddelik ölçek için kabul edilebilir düzeyde olduğu ve Türkçe formu için faktör yapısının orijinal faktör yapısıyla tutarlı sonuçlar gösterdiği bulunmuştur. Sonuç olarak, Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği Türkçe Formu'nun yüksek güvenirlik ve ölçüt bağlantılı geçerlik değerlerine sahip olduğu görülmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra, faktör yapısını test etmek amacıyla yapılan açıklayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizleri sonuçları da ölçeğin orijinaliyle tutarlı olup 3 faktörlü yapısını doğrulamaktadır. Ayrıca bu sonuçlar ölçeğin yapı geçerliliği için de destek sağlamaktadır.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri

Bu araştırmada Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği'nin Türkçeye çeviri çalışması yapılarak, psikometrik özelliklerine bakılmıştır. Bu amaçla ölçeğin yapı geçerliği, ölçüt geçerliği ve iç tutarlılığı incelenmiştir. Yapı geçerliğinin belirlenmesi için açıklayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizi uygulanmıştır. Açıklayıcı faktör analizinde üç faktörlü olarak ortaya çıkan yapı, doğrulayıcı faktör analizinde de aynen desteklenmiştir. Sonuç olarak, yapılan istatistiksel değerlendirmeler Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği'nin Türkçe formunun ülkemiz için geçerli ve güvenirli olduğu konusunda kanıtlar sağlamıştır.

Özet olarak, Sürekli Utanç ve Suçluluk Ölçeği Türkçe Formu psikometrik uygunluğunun yeterli düzeyde olduğu görülmektedir. Ayrıca bu araştırma sonuçlarının, ölçeğin kültürel geçerliliği konusunda veri sağlayarak, kültürler arası çalışmalara temel olacağı beklenmektedir. Bununla birlikte, bu ölçeğin hem araştırmacılar ve hem de uygulamada çalışan uzmanlar tarafından bireylerin sürekli utanç, suçluluk ve gurur özelliklerini tanımlamakta kullanılabileceği de varsayılmaktadır.

Ancak bu araştırma sonuçları kolay ulaşılabilir (convenient sampling) örneklemenin sahip olduğu bazı sınırlılıklara sahiptir. Bu sınırlılıkları gidermek amacıyla, seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemi kullanılarak sonuçlar tekrar test edilmelidir. Ayrıca ölçeğin

psikometrik özelliklerini farklı yaş gruplarında incelenmesinin ölçeğin normlarının oluşması açısından önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Utanç, suçluluk, gurur, psikometrik uygunluk, güvenirlik, geçerlilik