How Do Personality Traits Effect Shame and Guilt?: An Evaluation of the Turkish Culture

Seval ERDEN[1]

Müge AKBAĞ[2]

Abstract

Problem Statement: Feelings of shame and guilt as negative social emotions have a deep and continuous impact throughout our lives, particularly on our behaviors in both intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships. It was widely accepted that these feelings originate from a person's early period of life's interpersonal experiences in the family and other key relationships. According to literature, shame and guilt are also related to personality traits; however, research findings were not consistent with each other. At this point, owing to the possible effect of the culture on shame and guilt, it can be considered that the relationship between these emotions and personality needs to be investigated in the cultural context.

Purpose of the Study: The aim of the present study is to investigate the predictive power of the Big Five Model's personality traits on shame and guilt in Turkish culture.

Methods: The study was designed according to the Relational Survey Model. The sample of the study consisted of 360 (F= 183, M=177) students who studied in several faculties and departments of a city university located in the western part of Turkey. The participants' age ranged between 17–30 years (M=21.35, SD= 1.64). The Shame-Guilt Scale and Five-Factor Personality Inventory (NEO FFI) were used as measurements.

Findings and Results: Results showed that shame and guilt were predicted by personality traits. In terms of shame, it was found that neuroticism had the largest effect on both genders. The greater the scores were for neuroticism, the greater was shame. Shame was also predicted by

[1] *Corresponding author, Dr., Marmara University, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, seval.erden@marmara.edu.tr*

[2] *Dr., Marmara University, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, makbag@marmara.edu.tr*

openness to experience for both genders, negatively. Moreover, the results revealed that shame was predicted by conscientiousness and agreeableness among only women. We also determined that guilt was predicted by agreeableness for both genders, but was predicted by conscientiousness among only men.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In conclusion, personality traits play a key role in the formation of individuals' shame and guilt. However, the predictive power of personality traits were differentiated in terms of gender, and the findings should be discussed in a cultural context. The findings of the study give clear evidence that besides personality traits based on biological origins, cultural context also has an impact on the development of these feelings. Therefore, the cultural meanings and construction of both these feelings and personality traits should be clearly defined by conducting quantitative research besides qualitative research for further studies.

Keywords: Shame, guilt, Big Five personality traits, personality development, Turkish culture.

Introduction

Feelings of shame and guilt have long been an area of interest and practice for psychologists working in the sub-disciplines of psychology, such as clinical, social and developmental psychology. There are various theoretical and empirical studies stating that these feelings originate from a person's early-life period of interpersonal experiences in the family and other key relationships (Akbağ & Erden-İmamoğlu, 2010; Fossum & Mason, 1986; Hoffman, 1998; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Feelings of shame and guilt have long been known to have a deep and continuous impact throughout our lives, particularly on our behaviors in interpersonal relationships. Tangney and Dearing (2002) point out that these feelings involve self-assessment and play a key role in the development of moral (ethical) behaviors. Both of these feelings are defined as complicated, negative and painful emotions targeted at the self.

In addition to the similarities, researchers also highlight the differences between these two emotions. Shame is reported to carry out non-adaptive functions and is associated with psychological disharmony, skepticism, temper, aggression, reactions towards the self and anger in a scientific sense (Tangney, 1991; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992). These feelings are also claimed to be associated with the development of internalized reactions and emerge in environments that explicitly create acute emotional reactions evoking humiliation and failure (Lewis, 1987).

However, feelings of guilt are known to carry out remedial functions for individuals such as confession, apologizing and giving empathic reactions (Bybee & Quiles, 1998; Niedenthal, Tangney, & Gavanski, 1994; Tangney, 1991). In contrast with shame, guilt is claimed to emerge in cases when the individual feels responsibility (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995; Izard, 1978; Lindsay-Hartz, DeRiviera, & Mascolo, 1995; Smith & Lazarus, 1993) and to be associated with breaking rules.

A wide range of norms are involved in the formation of guilt, such as religious, cultural or personal values (Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995). The individual's negative self-assessment plays a role in the formation of guilt and, unlike shame, it focuses on the insufficiency of the self rather than the wrong behavior committed (Barrett, 1995; Baumeister et al., 1995; Gilbert, Pehl, & Allan, 1994; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995; Tangney, 1995).

A brief review of relevant literature shows that the relationship of shame and guilt to psychopathology and psychological adjustment has often been investigated, and researchers have reported different opinions and findings. Some researchers argue that shame is associated with non-adaptive behavior patterns but that guilt is associated with adaptive reactions (Baumeister et al., 1995; Tangney, 1995; Tangney, Burgraff, & Wagner, 1995), while some others suggest that neither feeling is related to adaptation but is associated with psychological symptoms and problems in interpersonal relationships (Harder, 1995; Jones, Kugler, & Adams, 1995; O'Connor, Berry, & Weiss, 1999). Some more-recent studies, on the other hand, show that shame is associated with a lower level of self-respect and a high level of stress and psychiatric symptomatology, while guilt is not associated with psychopathology (Woien, Ernst, Patock-Peckham, & Nagoshi, 2003).

In an effort to come up with the differences, researchers have also examined the relationship between these two feelings and personality traits. Working on the individual differences in personality structure, researchers established their study on the Big Five Model, which tries to explain personality traits based on five main dimensions, for the last 20 years. These five factors are called Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Research has shown that these five main personality factors display a lifelong consistency (Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000), can be generalized for a number of different cultures (McCrae & Costa, 1997) and can predict common psychological structures such as academic achievement (Robins, John, & Caspi, 1998), guilt (John, Caspi, Robins, Moffitt, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1994), personality disorders (Costa & Widiger, 1994), adaptation (Graziano & Ward, 1992), self-respect (Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001) and hopelessness–future anxiety (Göktan & Akbağ, 2010).

Reviewing the related literature, we noticed that the relationships between the Big Five Model's personality traits and feelings of shame and guilt were investigated. Some studies (Einstein & Lanning, 1998; Harder & Greenwald, 1999) reported that there are strong relationships between the feelings of shame and guilt and agreeableness, extraversion and neuroticism. Moreover, findings of some studies indicated that there are sometimes positive and sometimes negative relationships between the aforementioned personality structures and these feelings (Einstein & Lanning, 1998; Harder & Greenwald, 1999), while some other studies come up with weak relationships (Tong, Bishop, Enkelmann, Why, Diong, Ang, & Khader, 2006).

At this point, Tangney & Dearing (2002) claimed that shame and guilt are affected

by the socialization process and parenting styles. Some theorists (Lewis, 1971; Lewis, Alessandri & Sullivan, 1992; Nathanson, 1992; Schore, 1998) suggest that shame is promoted in early childhood as a disruption in an individual's sense of connectedness; at the same time, such distresses also produce the sense of incompetence, which shifts attention to the self and helps to gradually fix self-perception. Consequently, it implicates that shame is possibly related to some negative personality traits about the incompetent or awful self. On the base of the inference, it is considered that the nature and function of these feelings should also be examined in a socio-cultural context (Jung, 2002).

Taking into account the possible effect of the culture on shame and guilt, it can be considered that the relationships between these emotions and one's personality could result in a varying profile from culture to culture. In an individualistic culture, the emphasis is on the independence of the individual and priority of personal goals over the goals of the group or community. However, in a collectivist culture, interdependence between members of the group and the priority of group goals over individual goals is stressed (Triandis, 1994).

Turkish culture is considered a collectivistic society (Hofstede, 1991). The core of collectivism is the connection of individuals to groups in mutual obligations (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Communication is indirect, and to maintain the harmony of the group, open conflicts are avoided. The relationship has a moral base, and this always takes priority over task fulfillment. In a mutually dependent construct, children are raised so that they will be careful not to engage in bad or negative behaviors (Sayar, 2003). Therefore, negative social emotions such as shame and guilt would be evoked in children who did not conform. However, in the socialization process, men and women are exposed to different expectations, even if in the same culture. This leads to gender differences in experiencing emotions such as shame and guilt (Benetti-McQuoid & Bursik, 2005; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Starting from this point, it can be assumed that the relationships between the Big Five Model's personality traits and the emotions of shame and guilt exhibit different profiles within the Turkish culture. This assumption is the rationale of the present study. The main purpose of the study, therefore, is to investigate the predictive power of the Big Five Model's personality traits on shame and guilt for men and women, separately.

Method

Research Design

This study was designed according to the Relational Survey Model to determine the predictive power of the Big Five Model's personality traits on shame and guilt for men and women.

Sample

The study is based on a convenient sample method of a total of 360 students, 183 of which were women (50.80%) and 177 of which were men (49.20%). The participants' age ranged between 17–30 years (M=21.35, SD= 1.64).

These students have been attending several faculties and departments of a city

university located in the western part of Turkey. The participants were attending Atatürk Education Faculty (42.8%), Technical Education Faculty (18.6%), Faculty of Dentistry (8.1%), and Science and Art Faculty (30.6%). In terms of departments, distributions of the participants are as follows: Computer Education (n=26), Biology (n=32), Dentistry (n=29), Electric Education (n=21), Physical Education (n=32), Chemistry (n=45), Printer Education (n=19), Mathematics (n=17), Metal Education (n=27), Music Education (n=33), Psychological Counseling and Guidance (n=32), Sociology (n=33), and Turkish Language and Literature (n=14).

Research Instruments

Shame-Guilt Scale: The scale was developed by Şahin and Şahin (1992) with 24 items based on a 5-point Likert type and it has two dimensions called shame and guilt. In the criteria-validity analyses of the scale, the shame sub-scale was related to the Sociotropy Scale and the Submissive Behavior Scale. On the other hand, the guilt sub-scale was also associated with the Beck Depression Inventory, the Sociotropy Scale and the Submissive Behavior Scale. In the reliability analyses, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .80 for the shame sub-scale and .81 for the guilt sub-scale (Savaşır & Şahin, 1997).

The internal consistency coefficients were calculated for the sample of this study, and the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .79 for the shame sub-scale and .77 for the guilt sub-scale.

Five-Factor Personality Inventory (NEO FFI): The short form (NEO FFI) of the Five-Factor Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) was adapted to Turkish culture by Gülgöz (2002). Developed to test the Big Five Model, which is based on factor/trait theory, the scale has presented important evidence regarding the universal validity of the model in studies conducted in different cultures (McCrae, 2002). Gülgöz (2002) reports that, like in many cultures, the Turkish form displayed a factor structure matching the original form. The five main personality traits considered within the scope of NEO FFI are Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Used often in assessing the normal dimensions of personality rather than pathology, NEO FFI consists of 60 items prepared in a five-point Likert type. A high point received for each personality trait indicates that the individual possesses that trait at a high level. The internal consistency coefficients of the scale obtained in studies carried out by different researchers were found to be acceptable for the Turkish form. Sunar (1996, cited in Kurt, 2001) found that the internal consistency coefficients received scores varying between .65 and .80 for the five factors, whereas another study (Ekşi, 2004) found that the Cronbach alpha coefficients varied between .55 and .83. In the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged between .58 and .73 for five personality factors.

Procedure and Data Analysis

The study was based on voluntary participation and did not ask for any identity

information. The participants were informed both orally and in writing about the aim of the study and what to consider during the application. The application of the scale was conducted in classrooms and lasted about 45-50 minutes. The data forms which were thought to have incomplete or improper responses were excluded from the analyses. As preliminary analyses, the relationships between study variables were tested with the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation technique. In accordance with the primary objective of this study, two separate regression analyses were carried out to determine the predictive power of "Big Five Model Personality Traits" for shame and guilt in men and women separately.

Findings and Results

A correlation analysis that included the Shame-Guilt Scale and Five Factor Personality Inventory scores was conducted for each gender, and the findings are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Correlations among Study Variables by Gender

	Total Sample	Women	Men
Shame			
Neuroticism	.42***	.39***	.41***
Extraversion	-.13*	-.20**	-.11
Openness to experience	-.20***	-.23**	-.18*
Agreeableness	.10	.14	.10
Conscientiousness	.16**	.19*	.16*
Guilt			
Neuroticism	.06	.10	.01
Extraversion	.01	-.06	.06
Openness to experience	.01	-.05	.07
Agreeableness	.34***	.34***	.36***
Conscientiousness	.20***	.15*	.26***

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

A positive and significant relationship was found between shame and neuroticism (r= .42) and conscientiousness scores (r=.16), while a negative and significant relationship was found between shame and extraversion (r=-.13) and openness to experience (r=-.20) for the total sample. The correlations were similar except for the extraversion dimension for women and men. For women, there was a

significant relationship between shame and extraversion (r=-.13) negatively, whereas there was not for men. Guilt correlated with agreeableness (rtotal=.34, rwomen=.34, rmen=.36,) and conscientiousness (rtotal=.20, rwomen=.15, rmen=.26) positively for the total sample and for both genders.

After a preliminary correlation analysis, two separate regression analyses were performed to examine the effects of the Big Five Model Personality Traits on shame and guilt. The results related to shame are given in Table 2.

Table 2
Regression Analysis Predicting Shame Using Measures of Five-Factor Personality Traits

	B	SE	β	t	R	R²	F
Women					.496	.246	11.556***
Neuroticism	.32	.059	.371	5.380***			
Extraversion	-	.056	-	-.322			
Openness	-	.062	-	-3.314**			
Agreeableness	.11	.049	.148	2.253*			
Conscientiousness	.12	.058	.138	2.101*			
Men					.462	.214	9.29***
Neuroticism	.36	.064	.387	5.656***			
Extraversion	-	.059	-	-.336			
Openness	-	.066	-	-2.265*			
Agreeableness	.05	.060	.062	.897			
Conscientiousness	.13	.069	.127	1.821			

* p< .05, ** p< .01, ***p<.001

Collectively, the Big Five Model Personality Traits accounted for approximately 25% of the variance in women's shame scores and 21% of the variance in men's shame scores. β scores indicated that neuroticism made a significant contribution, having the largest effect for both women (β=.37) and men (β=.38). Openness to experience also had a predictive power on shame for each gender, negatively (βwomen=-.22, βmen=-.16). However, shame was predicted by agreeableness (β=.15) and conscientiousness (β=.14) for only women.

In terms of guilt, the predictive power of Big Five Model Personality Traits is also examined. The results of regression analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Regression Analysis Predicting Guilt Using Measures of Five-Factor Personality Traits

Gender		B	SE	β	t	R	R$_2$	F
Women						.386	.149	6.199***
	Neuroticism	.067	.046	.107	1.462			
	Extraversion	.009	.044	.016	.213			
	Openness	-.041	.048	-.061	-.854			
	Agreeableness	.189	.039	.341	4.899***			
	Conscientiousness	.082	.045	.127	1.823			
Men						.416	.173	7.144***
	Neuroticism	-.009	.050	-.013	-.189			
	Extraversion	.045	.046	.071	.992			
	Openness	.025	.052	.034	.483			
	Agreeableness	.208	.046	.321	4.494***			
	Conscientiousness	.147	.054	.195	2.731**			

* p< .05, ** p< .01, ***p<.001

As the results revealed, The Big Five Model Personality Traits accounted for approximately 39% of the variance in women's guilt scores and 42% of the variance in men's guilt scores. It was seen that agreeableness had the strongest effect on guilt for both groups (βwomen=.34, βmen=.32). The second predictor that contributed to the model was significantly conscientiousness (β=.20) for only men's guilt scores.

Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

The main purpose of this study is to define the relationships between moral emotions such as shame-guilt and personality traits. Although the relationship between these feelings and the personality traits based on the Big Five Model has already been investigated in several cultures (Einstein & Lanning, 1998; Harder & Greenwald, 1999; Tong et al., 2006), the present study was replicated to define the relationships in a Turkish sample. In this study, the findings are presented and discussed under separate headings in terms of shame and guilt.

Shame and personality traits

According to result of the study, neuroticism has predictive power on shame for both genders. In other words, the more neuroticism scores increase, the more shame increases. Literature reveals that shame, which serves as a non-adaptive function, is associated with skepticism, temper, aggression, reactions leveled at oneself, and anger (Tangney, 1991; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992). On the other

hand, it is claimed that neuroticism is related to a negative affective domain such as fear, sorrow, shame and anger (Costa & McCrae, 1991). Neuroticism is also evaluated as a negative personality trait. Therefore, shame-prone individuals may tend to be more neurotic. Studies done in both Western and Eastern cultures have gained similar findings (Einstein & Lanning, 1998; Harder & Greenwald, 1999; Penley & Tomaka, 2002; Zhong, Li, & Qian, 2002). Based on all these previous studies, it may be considered that the relationship between neuroticism and shame is generally not differentiated from one culture to another.

On the other hand, shame was predicted by one's openness to engage in experiences, for both genders. In other words, the tendency to be open to experiences decreases while the feeling of shame increases. Openness to experience is characterized by intellectual activities, analytical and flexible thinking, curiosity, and nontraditional tendencies. Individuals receiving low scores in this subscale are regarded as traditional, inflexible ordinary people with a tendency to obey the process and rules (McCrae, 1996; McCrae & Costa 1997; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Furthermore, Lewis (1987) also argued that shame is associated with the development of internalized reactions, and this feeling emerges in environments that explicitly create acute emotional reactions which evoke humiliation and failure. Therefore, experiencing this feeling intensely may lead to an increase in an inflexible way of thinking and consequently closed-mindedness to a new experience.

Another finding of the study revealed that shame was predicted by conscientiousness for only women. While shame increases, conscientiousness also increases in women participants. Conscientiousness as a personality trait is defined by features such as social harmony, control of emotions, being oriented to success, being organized, self-discipline, addiction, attentiveness and cautiousness (McCrae, 1996; McCrae & Costa 1997), self-limitation and order (Smith, Hanges, & Dickson, 2001). However, findings have been less consistent across the different studies. For example, Abe (2004) found that shame was negatively correlated with conscientiousness. On the other hand, in the study of Penley & Tomaka (2002), no significant relationship was found. Inconsistency among the studies may be due to the properties of the studies' sample.

This result can be discussed in terms of culture. In Turkish culture, assessments of others are more important than an individual's own assessment, and it naturally reflects children's attitudes and behavioral patterns. In this respect, it seems that a redefinition of conscientiousness for the Turkish culture is necessary. Although a definition of conscientiousness involves self-discipline, self-limitation and attentiveness, overemphasis of these features may be psychologically overbearing. Therefore, it may be considered that conscientious individuals may not give any permission to themselves for failure or transgression, since their parents do not accept any failure. Thus, this situation might lead to an increase of shame. Moreover, our findings can be explained by child-rearing styles with regard to the Turkish culture. While rearing a boy child, parents emphasize power, as the boy is expected

to be powerful as a man. On the other hand, girls are more protected and are treated differently. It seems that the different parental attitudes work obscurely to develop individuality and autonomy (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Thus, women having higher conscientiousness may result in shame-proneness more than men.

It was found that shame is predicted by agreeableness in women, unexpectedly. The study's results revealed that agreeableness has a positive relationship with shame. Agreeableness is a personality dimension that includes mostly interpersonal behaviors (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996). Individuals receiving high scores in this subscale are regarded as polite, helpful, considerate, collaborative, friendly and forgiving people (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997; McCrae, 1992). Our findings are inconsistent with studies (Abe, 2004; Einstein &Lanning, 1998) based on Western culture. Generally speaking, Western culture is an individualistic society, whereas Turkish culture can be seen as a collectivist culture. In a collectivist context, where the self is developed as a relational one, shame originates from the internalization of cultural moral standards, and therefore, shame mainly operates as the social-control mechanism in the case of transgression (Bedford & Hwang, 2003). Moreover, it is emphasized that in the socialization process, practices of traditional gender roles yield the differences between men and women with regard to self-construal. In term of the relationship between gender and self-construal, it is reported that men are more autonomous while women are more related-self construal (Cross & Madson, 1997). From this point of view, related-self construal may result in agreeableness for women therefore, women have more tendencies to experience shame. However, in order to make clear comments, we need to clarify how agreeableness is perceived (i.e., submissiveness or social pressure on women) in Turkish culture. For further studies, this finding should be investigated by different research designs such as the qualitative method based on a focus group or individual interviews.

Guilt and personality traits

In terms of guilt, this study determined that agreeableness predicted guilt for both genders. According to this finding, guilt was related to agreeableness, positively. Our findings are supported by previous studies (Abe, 2004; Einstein & Lanning, 1998). Guilt is considered a motivator to stimulate people and force them to perform actions that are aimed at reconstructing the existing situation. Some studies report that as a result of this feeling, people generally exhibit behaviors such as apologizing and trying to making up for something (Barrett, 1995; Baumeister et al., 1995; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995; Tangney, 1995) and giving empathic reactions more often (Hoffmann, 1998). It could therefore be suggested that agreeableness leads the individual to understand others and evaluate events from their point of view. So, as expected, agreeable people are more likely to be guilt-prone.

The results can be also discussed by taking gender into account. Guilt originates from an individual's own internal processes (private emotions), but shame originates from social interactions (public emotions) (Tangney, 2002; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). Moreover, a person who feels guilt thinks that he/she did something wrong, but the deed is alien to what he/she really is (Taylor, 1985). Thus, guilt is related to inner feelings, and gender does not matter.

The other remarkable result of the study is that guilt is predicted by conscientiousness only in men. While guilt increases, conscientiousness also increases in male participants. In literature, studies showing different results are present. For example, one of the earliest studies conducted by Lewis (1971) asserted that women are more prone to shame and men are more prone to guilt; in a later study, Tangney & Dearing (2002) indicated that women of all ages are more prone to guilt compared to men. In some other studies (Abe, 2004; Penley & Tomaka, 2002), no significant relationship was found when the study was conducted in different cultures. However, in our study, results revealed that this personality trait impacts shame and guilt differently with regard to gender in the Turkish culture. Whereas shame shows the most prominent difference between genders with women, guilt is most evident among men. Based on all these findings, it can be concluded that gender differences related to conscientiousness in guilt should be deeply investigated within culture and cross-cultural studies. Besides, as emphasized before, a redefinition of conscientiousness is suggested. What is the meaning of conscientiousness for Turkish society and other societies? Is it perceived as responsibility or over-responsibility? Is it internalized or related to introjections of social sanctions and expectations? These questions should be brought into the light. In this circumstance, the effect of conscientiousness on experiences of guilt can be explored and discussed both clearly and easily.

In conclusion, personality traits play a key role on the formation of individuals' shame and guilt. Besides, as emphasized by Kağıtçıbaşı (2010), the findings of the study are clear evidences that cultural context also has an impact on the development of these feelings as well as personality traits based on biological origins. Although both shame and guilt are usually defined as negative feelings, it is expected that these feelings function in favor of adaptation so that moral and social integrity are ensured in the personality development of the individual. Psychological counseling services for individuals or groups could be designed to have people acquire the skills required to recognize personality traits as well as shame and guilt. Therefore, people could express these feelings in a healthy way and deal with the difficulties caused by these feelings, and then these services could be extended gradually. These projects could be enriched and diversified so as to cover the whole educational system by taking individuals' developmental properties into consideration. Considering the impact of parents on a child's personality development, another recommendation is that similar programs aimed at raising parents' awareness could be designed. Finally, the cultural meanings and construction of both shame and guilt and personality traits should be clearly defined by conducting quantitative research besides qualitative research for further studies.

Limitations

There are some limitations of this study. First of all, the study was conducted with Turkish respondents living in a metropolis. It is essential that additional studies be carried out with participants of similar age groups living in other parts of the

country so that the findings of this study can be generalized. On the other hand, conducting intercultural comparisons within the same research pattern could provide more information about the subject so that cultural differences can be highlighted.

References

Abe, J. A. (2004). Shame, guilt, and personality judgment. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 85–104.

Akbağ, M., & Erden-İmamoğlu, S. (2010). Cinsiyet ve bağlanma stillerinin utanç, suçluluk ve yalnızlık duygularını yordama gücünün araştırılması. [The prediction of gender and attachment styles on shame, guilt, and loneliness]. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 10* (2), 651-682.

Barrett, K. C. (1995). A functionalist approach to shame and guilt. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 25-63). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1995). Interpersonal aspects of guilt: Evidence from narrative studies. In J. P. Tangney, & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotion: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 255–273). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Bedford, O., & Hwang, K. (2003). Guilt and shame in Chinese culture: A cross-cultural framework from the perspective of morality and identity. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 33,* 127-144.

Benetti-McQuoid, J., & Bursik, K. (*2005).* Individual differences in experiences of and responses to guilt and shame: Examining the lenses of gender and gender role. *Sex Roles, 53* (1-2), *133-142.*

Bybee, J., & Quiles, Z. N. (1998). Guilt and mental health. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 269–291). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae. R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual.* Odessa. FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., & Widiger, T. A. (1994). *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construal theory and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122*, 5-37.

Ekşi, H. (2004). Kişilik ve başaçıkma: Başaçıkma tarzlarının durumsal ve eğilimsel boyutları üzerine çok yönlü bir araştırma. [Personality and coping: A multidimensional research on situational and dispositional coping]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri/ Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 4 (1), 94-98.

Einstein, D., & Lanning, K. (1998). Shame, guilt, ego development, and the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 555–582.

Fossum, M. A., & Mason, M. J. (1986). *Facing shame: Families in recovery.* New York, NY: Norton.

Gilbert, P., Pehl, J., & Allan, S. (1994). The phenomenology of shame and guilt: An empirical investigation. *British Journal of Medical Psychology, 67,* 23-36.

Göktan, B., & Akbağ, M. (2010). An investigation on Turkish military school students: Are there associations among big five personality factors, perceived family environment and hopelessness?, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2* (2), 5458-5462.

Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In   R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795-824). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case for agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 820-835.

Graziano, W. G., & Ward, D. (1992). Probing the Big Five in adolescence: Personality and adjustment during a developmental transition. *Journal of Personality, 60***, 425–429.

Gülgöz, S. (2002). Five-factor model and NEO-PPI in Turkey. In R.R. McCrae, & Allik, J. (Eds.). *The five factor model of personality across cultures* (pp. 175-195). New York, NY: Kluwer Academia /Plenum Publishers.

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.), *The self-conscious emotions* (pp. 368–392). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Harder, D. W., & Greenwald, D. F. (1999). Further validation of the shame and guilt scales of the Harder Personal Feelings Questionnaires-2. *Psychological Reports*, *85,* 271–281.

Hoffmann, M. L. (1998). Varieties of empathy-based guilt. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 91-112). Boston, MA: Academic Press.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind.* London: McGraw-Hill.

Izard, C. E. (1978). Guilt, conscience and morality. *Human emotions* (pp. 421-452). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Johnson, J. A., & Ostendorf. F. (1993). Clarification of the Five-factor-model with the abridged big Five dimensional circumflex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 65*, 563–576.

Jones, W. H., Kugler, K., & Adams, P. (1995). You always hurt the one you love: Guilt and transgressions against relationship partners. In J. P. Tangney, & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 274–300). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

John, O. P., Caspi, A., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1994). The ''little five'': Exploring the nomological network of the five-factor model of personality in adolescent boys. *Child Development, 65***,** 160–178.

Jung, H. (2002). *Shame as a mediator between parenting and psychological adjustment for Causian and Korean students: A structural equation modeling approach* (Unpublished dissertation), Biola University, USA.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). *Benlik, aile ve insan gelişimi: Kültürel psikoloji. [Family, self, and human: Development across cultures].* İstanbul: Koç University Publishing.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: International Review, 54,* 317-337.

Kurt, E. (2001). *Effects of religiosity, personality traits and social responsibility attitudes on nonspontaneous helping behavior in a natural disaster (*Unpublished master thesis). Bosporus University, Istanbul, Turkey.

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

Lewis, H. B. (1987). Introduction: Shame – The "sleeper" in psychopathology. In H. B. Lewis (Ed.), *The role of shame in symptom formation* (pp. 1-28). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. M., & Sullivan, M. W. (1992). Differences in shame and pride as a function of children's gender and task difficulty. *Child Development*, *63*, 630-638.

Lindsay-Hartz, J., De Riviera, J., & Mascolo, M. F. (1995). Differentiating guilt and shame and their effects on motivation. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp.174-300). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McCrae, R. R. (1996). Social consequences of experiential openness. *Psychological Bulletin, 120,* 323-337.

McCrae, R. R. (2002). NEO-PPI data from 36 cultures: Further intercultural comparisons. In R.R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), *The five factor model of personality across cultures* (pp. 105-125). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52***,** 509–516.

Nathanson, D. L. (1992). *Shame and pride: affect, sex, and the birth of the self* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Norton.

Niedenthal, P. M., 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.

O'Connor, L. E., Berry, J. W., & Weiss, J. (1999). Interpersonal guilt, shame, and psychological problems. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 18*, 181–203.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H.M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128* (1), 3-72.

Penley, J.A., & Tomaka, J. (2002). Associations among the Big Five, emotional responses, and coping with acute stress. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32,* 1215-1228.

Roberts, B. W., & DelVecchio, W. F. (2000). The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: A quantitative review of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 126,* 3–25.

Robins, R. W., John, O. P., & Caspi, A. (1998). The typological approach to studying personality development. In R. B. Cairns, L. Bergman, & J. Kagan (Eds.), *Method and models for studying the individual* (pp. 135–160). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robins, R. W., Hendin, H. M., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: Construct validation of a single item measure and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 151–161.

Savaşır. I., & Şahin. N. H. (1997). *Bilişsel-davranışçı terapilerde değerlendirme: Sık kullanılan ölçekler. [The evaluation of cognitive-behavioral therapy: The scales used frequently]*. Ankara: TPD Yayınları.

Sayar, K. (2003). Kültürel bakış açısından benlik ve kişilik. [Self and personality from cultural view]. *Yeni Symposium, 41*(2), 78-85.

Smith, B. D., Hanges, J., & Dickson, M.W. (2001). Personnel selection and Five-Factor Model: Reexamining the effects of applicant's frame of reference. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86* (2)*,* 304-315.

Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Appraisal components, core relational themes, and the emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 7*, 233-269.

Schore, A. N. (1998). Early shame experiences and infant brain development. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 57-77). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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. (1995). 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, NY: Guilford Press.

Tangney, J. P., Burgraff, S. A., & Wagner, P. E. (1995). Shame-proneness, guilt-proneness, and psychological symptoms. In J. P. Tangney, & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), T*he self-conscious emotions* (pp.343–367). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

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

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, 6,* 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.

Taylor, G. (1985). *Pride, shame and guilt.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Recherches récentes sur l'individualisme et le collectivisme [Recent research on individualism and collectivism]. *Les Cahiers Internationaux de Psychologie Sociale*, *23*, 14-27.

Tong, E. M., Bishop, G. D., Enkelmann, H. C., Why, Y. P., Diong, S. M., Ang, J., & Khader, M. (2006). The role of the Big Five in appraisals. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41,* 513–523.

Woien, S. L., Ernst, H. A. H., Patock-Peckham, C., & Nagoshi, C. T. (2003). Validation of the TOSCA to measure shame and guilt. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35,* 313-326.

Zhong, J., Li, B., & Qian, M. (2002). Esteem in the personality, shame and mental health model: Its direct and moderating effects (in Chinese). *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 10,* 241–245.

Kişilik Özellikleri Utanç ve Suçluluk Duygusunu Nasıl Etkiler?:

Türk Kültürü Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme

Özet

Problem Durumu

Utanç ve suçluluk duygusu; uzun yıllar psikolojinin klinik, sosyal ve gelişim gibi farklı alt disiplinlerinde çalışan psikologların ilgi ve araştırma alanını oluşturmuştur. Bu duyguların kaynağını, aile ve diğer kilit ilişkiler içindeki erken dönem kişilerarası deneyimlerin oluşturduğunu açıklayan kuramsal ve ampirik bir çok çalışma mevcuttur (Akbağ ve Erden-İmamoğlu, 2010; Baumrind, 1979; Bradshaw, 1988; Hoffman, 1998; Tangney ve Dearing, 2002). Tangney ve Dearing (2002), bu duyguların benliğin kendi kendini değerlendirmesini içerdiğine ve moral (ahlaki) davranışların gelişmesinde anahtar rol oynadıklarına vurgu yapmaktadır.

Suçluluk ve utanç duyguları karmaşık, olumsuz ve benliği hedef alan acı verici duygulanımlar olarak nitelendirilmekle birlikte; bu iki duygu arasında belirgin farklılıkları da sıralamak mümkündür. Suçluluk duygusunun itiraf, özür dileme, empatik tepkiler verebilme gibi birey için onarıcı işlevlere hizmet ettiği (Bybee ve Quiles, 1998; Niedenthal, Tangney ve Gavanski, 1994, Tangney, 1991); utanç duygusunun, uyum sağlayıcı olmayan fonksiyonları kapsadığı; bilimsel olarak psikolojik uyumsuzluk, şüphecilik, kızgınlık, sinirlilik, kendine yönelik tepkiler ve öfke ile ilişkili olduğu ortaya konmuştur (Tangney, 1991; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher ve Gramzow, 1992). Utanç duygusu, içselleştirilmiş tepkilerin gelişmesi ile ilgili görülmüş ve açık bir şekilde aşağılama ve başarısızlık hissettiren akut duygusal tepkileri yaratan ortamlarda oluştuğu savunulmuştur (Lewis, 1987). Suçluluk duygusunun ise tam tersine sadece kişinin sorumluluk hissettiği durumlarda ortaya çıktığı vurgulanmaktadır (Baumeister, Stillwell ve Heatherton, 1995; Frijda, 1986; Izard, 1978; Lindsay-Hartz, DeRiviera ve Mascolo,1995; Smith ve Lazarus, 1993). Ayrıca suçluluk duygusunun yapılanmasında, kişinin kendine ait negatif benlik değerlendirmesi söz konusu olup; utanç duygusundan farklı olarak yapılan yanlış hareketten ziyade benliğin yetersizliğine odaklanılır (Barrett, 1995; Baumeister ve ark. 1995; Frijda, 1986; Gilbert, Pehl ve Allan, 1994; Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Lindsay-Hartz ve ark., 1995; Tangney, 1995; Wicker ve ark. 1983).

Bu iki duygu durumu arasındaki farklılıklar incelenirken, bu duyguların kişilik

özellikleri ile ilişkisi de araştırılmıştır. Kişilik özelliklerini beş temel boyut üzerinden açıklamaya çalışan Beş Faktör Modeli'ne göre; kişilik faktörleri Nörotisizm / Duygusal Dengesizlik (Neuroticism), Dışadönüklük (Extraversion), Yaşantıya Açıklık (Open to Experience), Geçimlilik (Agreeableness) ve Sorumluluk (Concientiousness) olarak adlandırılmıştır (McCrae ve Costa, 1997). Yapılan araştırmalar, bu beş temel kişilik faktörünün yaşam boyu tutarlı olduğunu (Roberts ve DelVecchio, 2000), birçok farklı kültüre genellenebildiğini (McCrae ve Costa, 1997) göstermektedir.

Konu ile ilgili yapılan çalışmalarda utanç ve suçluluk duygusu, bu kişilik özelliklerinden uyumluluk, dışadönüklük ve nörotisizm ile ilişkili bulunmuştur (Einstein & Lanning, 1998; Harder ve Greenwald, 1999). Ancak aynı kişilik yapısının bu duygularla ilişkisi bazen olumlu bazen olumsuz yönde gözlenirken (Einstein ve Lanning, 1998; Harder ve Greenwald, 1999); bazı araştırmalarda da zayıf ilişkilere rastlanmaktadır (Tong, Bishop, Enkelmann, Why, Diong, Ang, ve Khader, 2006). Utanç ve suçluluk duygusu, sosyalleşme sürecinden ve ebeveynlik stillerinden etkilendiğinden (Tangney ve Dearing, 2002), literatürde bu duyguların doğasının ve fonksiyonunun sosyo-kültürel bağlamda da incelenmesi önerilmektedir (Jung, 2002).

Araştırmanın Amacı

Utanç ve suçluluk duygusu ile Beş Faktör kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkilerin farklı kültürlerde farklı örüntüler sergileyebileceği düşünülerek söz konusu ilişkinin Türk kültürü üzerinde yeniden irdelenmesinin önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu noktadan hareketle, araştırma Beş Faktör Modeli'ne dayalı kişilik özelliklerinin, utanç ve suçluluk duygusu üzerindeki yordayıcı gücünü sınamak üzere yapılandırılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi

İlişkisel tarama modelinde hazırlanan araştırmanın örneklemini İstanbul'daki bir devlet üniversitenin farklı fakülte ve bölümlerinde öğrenimine devam eden ve araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılan 360 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Katılımcıların 183'ü kız (%50.80), 177'si erkek (%49.20)'tir. Grubun yaş aralığı 17–30 (x=21.35, ss=1.64) arasında değişmektedir. Veri toplama aracı olarak Suçluluk-Utanç Ölçeği, Beş Faktör Kişilik Envanteri (NEO FFI) ve Kişisel Bilgi Formu kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları

Temel değişkenler arası ilişkiler incelediğinde, utanç duygusu puanları arttıkça nörotisizm ve sorumluluk puanlarının arttığı; buna karşın dışadönüklük ve yaşantıya açıklık puanlarının azaldığı tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca suçluluk duygusu puanları arttıkça, geçimlilik ve sorumluluk puanlarında da artış gözlenmiştir.

Korelasyon analizlerindeki anlamlı ilişkilerden yola çıkarak, Beş Faktör kişilik özelliklerinin cinsiyet bağlamında utanç ve suçluluk duygusunu yordayıcılığını belirlemek üzere her bir kişilik özelliği için regresyon analizleri hesaplanmıştır. Bulgular, nörotisizm ve yaşantıya açıklık kişilik özelliklerinin her iki cinsiyet için, geçimlilik ve sorumluluk özelliklerinin ise sadece kızlar için utanç duygusunu yordayıcı güce sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Suçluluk duygusu açısından geçimlilik kişilik özelliğinin her iki cinsiyet için pozitif yönde bir yordama gücüne

sahip olduğu; buna karşın sorumluluk özelliğinin sadece erkeklerde suçluluğu pozitif yönde yordadığı görülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri

Sonuç olarak, elde edilen bulgular bireyin kişilik özelliklerinin erken dönemlerde şekillenen duygusal yaşantılar üzerinde belirleyici etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Her iki duygu genellikle olumsuz olarak nitelendirilse de, bireyin kişilik gelişimi sürecinde ahlaki ve sosyal açıdan bütünlüğün sağlanması adına bu duyguların uyuma dönük olarak işlemesi de beklenmektedir.

Araştırmada bahsedilen kişilik özelliklerinin, suçluluk ve utanç oluşumundaki yordayıcılığının cinsiyete göre farklılaştığı görülmektedir. Kağıtçıbaşı (2010) duyguların biyolojik kökenleri olmakla birlikte sosyal bir ortamda ifade edilip o ortamdan etkilendiğini vurgulamaktadır. Sosyalleşme süreci içerisinde öğrenmeye dayalı olarak şekillenen bu duygular, aile ortamında ve yakın sosyal çevrede cinsiyet rollerine uygun olarak pekiştirilmektedir (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Dolayısıyla elde edilen bu bulgu, kültürel bağlamda yaşanan duygusal-sosyal deneyimlerin bir yansıması olarak değerlendirilebilir. Buradan yola çıkarak; bireylerin öğrenilmiş sosyal duygular olan utanç ve suçluluk duygusunun farkına varma, bu duyguları sağlıklı bir şekilde yaşayabilme ve bu duyguların yarattığı olumsuzluklarla başa çıkabilme becerileri kazandırılmasına yönelik bireysel ve grupla psikolojik danışmanlık hizmetleri hazırlanarak bu hizmetler yaygınlaştırılabilir. Bu çalışmalar okul öncesi dönemden başlayarak, yükseköğretimi de kapsayacak şekilde, bireylerin gelişimsel özellikleri dikkate alınmak suretiyle çeşitlendirilebilir. Öte yandan anne-babanın çocuğun kişilik gelişimi üzerindeki etkisi de dikkate alınarak, benzer programlarla ebeveynlerin bilinçlendirilmesi bu araştırma bulgularından yola çıkarak getirilebilecek bir diğer öneri olabilir. Ayrıca, bundan sonra yapılacak araştırmalarda suçluluk ve utanç duygusu ile kişilik özelliklerinin kültürel anlamları ve yorumlanışları daha derinlemesine nitel araştırmalarla incelenerek konuya açıklık getirilebilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Utanç, suçluluk, Beş Faktör kişilik özellikleri, kişilik gelişimi, Türk kültürü.