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ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF GUILT IN A MULTI-ETHNIC CULTURALLY DIVERSE POPULATION

by

Avishai Zacharia

Master of Arts in Psychology,

Clinical Psychology

The purposes of this study were (1) to examine the relationships between attachment styles, personality constructs, and religiosity to guilt-proneness in order to recognize factors that may influence the initiation and resolution of guilt; (2) to examine the relationships between coping styles and guilt-proneness in order to understand the transition from the experience of guilt to its resolution, (3) to examine the relationship between subjective well-being and guilt-proneness, in an attempt to clarify the effect of guilt-proneness on life satisfaction; and lastly (4) to examine group differences in mean scores of guilt-proneness in a multi-ethnic and culturally diverse population, as well as the aforementioned relationships within each group. Data was collected from an online, self-report, survey from seven-hundred and forty university students from a comprehensive university in southern California. A series of one-way ANCOVAs were used to test group differences between gender, ethnic groups, religious affiliations, and native language speakers in relation to guilt-proneness. Significant group differences were found between female and male participants, as well as Christian and individuals without a religious affiliation. First-order correlations (controlling for shame-proneness)
were generated for groups that differed significantly from one another. Results indicated that (1) guilt-proneness was positively correlated with attachment security for all groups, (2) guilt-proneness was positively correlated with extraversion (except within the male group and the non-affiliated group) agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, and negatively correlated with neuroticism (except within the non-affiliated group); (3) guilt-proneness was found to be positively correlated with task-oriented and social-diversion coping styles for all groups (except for social diversion within the non-affiliated group), (4) Intrinsic religiosity was found to be positively correlated with guilt-proneness among female participants and Christian participants; lastly, (5) guilt-proneness was found to be positively correlated with subjective well-being for all groups. Research and clinical implications are discussed.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The emotion guilt has received little empirical research until recently, although many theoretical perspectives have existed for many years. Since its introduction into the field of psychology by way of psychoanalytic theory in the early nineteen hundreds, the notion of guilt was fairly negative. In addition, because the nature in which the emotion was discussed was based mainly on theoretical perspectives (e.g., Freud, Hoffman, Higgins), little was known of the origin and functional basis of the emotion. As such, guilt received varied interpretations that many times did a disservice to the study of guilt, and most importantly, to the implications that carried into the clinical environment. Conversely, recent publications have shown guilt to bear many positive correlates.

Although several strides have been made to the reconceptualization of guilt as a potentially prosocial and functional emotion (e.g., Tangney & Dearing, 2002), a paucity of multicultural studies have taken place to investigate the relationship among coping styles, attachment styles, personality constructs, religiosity, and subjective well-being to guilt-proneness. These variables were chosen in an attempt to understand the factors that may influence the initiation, experience, and resolution of guilt.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to expand the research into guilt as a possible adaptive variable. Accordingly, the present study will examine variables that influence the initiation, experience, and resolution of guilt, as well as the relationship between guilt and subjective well-being. Lastly, this study will examine group differences in ratings of
guilt, and the relationships between the following variables and guilt within each group:

1. The relationships between attachment styles, personality constructs, and religiosity to guilt will be examined to understand leading factors that may influence the initiation and resolution of guilt.

2. The relationships between coping styles and guilt will be examined to understand the transition between the experience and resolution of guilt.

3. The relationship between subjective well-being and guilt will be examined to understand the adaptive or maladaptive quality of guilt.

The results of this study may potentially benefit therapists by providing a better understanding of the components that make up guilt, the emotion’s relationships to variables that affect the therapeutic process, and the differences in the experience of guilt across different populations. Also, the examination of the aforementioned relationships in a multi-ethnic and culturally diverse sample could benefit future research into the study of guilt by addressing underrepresented populations in current literature.

**Definitions**

1. Guilt-proneness, as measured by the *Test of Self-Conscious Affect 3* (TOSCA3; Tangney, Dearing, Wagner, & Gramzow, 2000), is defined as an enduring “tendency to feel bad about a specific behavior” (Dearing, Stuewing, & Tangney, 2005, p. 1)

2. Shame-proneness, as measured by the *Test of Self-Conscious Affect 3* (TOSCA3; Tangney et al., 2000), is defined as the tendency to negatively evaluate the global self as a result of a wrongdoing (Dearing et al., 2005), rather than a particular behavior (e.g., guilt-proneness).
3. Shame-free guilt-proneness is the private effect of the guilt-proneness scale after the effect of the shame-proneness scale is controlled for. This is done to partial out the shared variance between guilt and shame in examining relationship with other constructs (Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

4. Guilt-free shame-proneness is the private effect of the shame-proneness scale after the effect of the guilt-proneness scale is controlled for. This is done to partial out the shared variance between guilt and shame in examining relationship with other constructs (Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

5. Self-conscious emotions refer to emotions (e.g., shame, guilt, pride, and embarrassment) that are emotion-oriented toward the self and require the development of a concept of self and a set of standards that one can use for comparison (Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

6. Culture is “a multidimensional concept that encompasses the collective reality of a group of people” (Lee & Richardson, 1997, p.11). As such, in the context of this study, culture will not be defined as race or ethnicity, but rather as the group an individual belongs to.

7. Negative reinforcement refers to the removal of an aversive stimulus which in turn, increases or maintains the frequency of the behavior which immediately preceded it.

8. Secure attachment is an attachment style represented by an individual who trusts that his/her needs will be met effectively and consistently by an attachment figure (Mikulenc & Shaver, 2007).

9. Insecure attachment styles are represented by an individual’s lack of trust that his/her needs will be met effectively (i.e., attachment avoidance) or consistently
(i.e., attachment anxiety) by an attachment figure (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

10. Intrinsic religiosity is a dimension of religiosity that examines the degree to which an individual is committed and motivated to embrace a religious creed for the sake of religion alone, and not for other means (such as, financial success or comfort; Koenig & Bussing, 2010).

11. Organized religiosity represents a dimension of religiosity which entails public religious activities, such as church attendance or bible study group (Koenig & Bussing, 2010).

12. Non-organized religiosity involves religious activities that are practiced in private, such as private prayer or private bible reading (Koenig & Bussing, 2010).

13. Extraversion is a personality construct composed of the following personality facets (and trait adjectives which describe them): gregariousness (sociable), assertiveness (forceful), activity (energetic), excitement-seeking (adventurous), positive emotions (enthusiastic), and warmth (outgoing) (John & Srivastava, 1999; Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999).

14. Agreeableness is a personality construct composed of the following personality facets (and trait adjectives which describe them): trust (forgiving), straightforwardness (not demanding), altruism (warm), compliance (not stubborn), modesty (not show-off), and tender-mindedness (sympathetic) (John & Srivastava, 1999).

15. Contentiousness is a personality construct composed of the following personality facets (and trait adjectives which describe them): competence (efficient), order (organized), dutifulness (not careless), achievement striving (thorough), self-
discipline (not lazy), and deliberation (not impulsive) (John & Srivastava, 1999).

16. Neuroticism is a personality construct composed of the following personality facets (and trait adjectives which describe them): anxiety (tense), angry hostility (irritable), depression (not contented), self-consciousness (shy), impulsiveness (moody), and vulnerability (not self-confident) (John & Srivastava, 1999).

17. Openness is a personality construct composed of the following personality facets (and trait adjectives which describe them): ideas (curious), fantasy (imaginative), aesthetics (artistic), actions (wide interests), feelings (excitable), and values (unconventional) (John & Srivastava, 1999).

18. Subjective well-being is defined as an individual’s rating of his/hers own satisfaction with life.

Research Hypotheses

As a result of the information in the literature review in Chapter II, the following research hypotheses were developed.

1. Female participants will show a significantly higher guilt-proneness mean score than male participants.

2. Participants with a Christian affiliation will display a significantly higher mean score of guilt-proneness than participants without a religious affiliation.

3. Participants whose native language is English will demonstrate significant different mean scores of guilt-proneness than participants whose native language is Spanish.

4. Guilt-proneness will be positively and significantly correlated with shame-proneness for all groups.

5. Guilt-proneness will be positively and significantly correlated with secure attachment.
to mother, father, partner, and close friend attachment targets for all groups.

6. Guilt-proneness will be positively and significantly correlated with the personality constructs agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, and significantly and negatively correlated with neuroticism.

7. Guilt-proneness will be significantly and positively correlated with task-oriented coping.

8. Guilt-proneness will be significantly and positively correlated with intrinsic religiosity, organized religiosity, and non-organized religiosity among Christian participants.

9. Guilt proneness will be significantly and positively correlated with ratings of subjective well-being.

**Assumptions**

This research is based on the following assumptions:

- Participants were not pressured to complete the questionnaires associated with this study.
- All participants were knowledgeable about the intention of the study and their rights as student participants.
- The participants had college level reading and writing skills in the English language which allowed them to fully understand the items and instructions on the questionnaires associated with this study.
- The questionnaires employed in this study were answered completely, honestly, and attentively by the participants.
- The data analyses involved no errors.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Guilt

The emotion guilt has been presented, defined, and studied in various ways in the psychological literature. To paint a clear picture of guilt in current research it is necessary to consider its evolution within the field of psychology. One of the most impactful early connotation in which guilt was presented was within the psychoanalytic view. According to O'Connor, Berry, Weiss, Bush, and Sampson (1997), early psychoanalytic theorists viewed guilt as both a cause and a result of psychological and emotional distress. More specifically, guilt was the result of unconscious wishes to hurt others that were driven by feelings of hate and jealousy (O'Connor et al., 1997). An example of this can be seen in Freud’s early conceptualization of the Oedipal conflict in which feelings of guilt stemmed from the ego in an attempt to correct the damage left by hostile emotions (O'Connor et al., 1997). Melanie Klein, an influential psychoanalytic theorist in the early-to-mid 1900s, further explained that guilt resulted from aggressive wishes toward an object (defined as an internal, external, or part of a person who is the focus of said wishes; Gabbard, Litowitz, & Williams, 2012). Then in turn, this feeling of guilt may be attenuated or resolved by efforts intended to repair or compensate for the consequences of those hostile wishes (Gabbard et al., 2012).

The development of attachment theory, progressions in evolutionary psychology, and other advancements at that time, motivated much research to focus on the interpersonal qualities of guilt and shame. Lewis’s (1971) work reintroduced guilt as an external negative evaluation that in its nature means ‘debt’ (from the Teutonic root
Schuld), and shame as a negative attribution internalized toward the global self. The externalized nature of guilt toward a particular behavior or event gives room for adjustment or correction while shame does not (Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1992). This contrast is one of the most consistent distinctions between the two emotions and has been supported in much research (e.g., Higgins, 1987; Tangney, et al., 1992; Tangney, Burggraf, & Wagner, 1995; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Treeby & Bruno, 2012).

The evolution of guilt from the early psychoanalytic perspective was influenced by theorists such as Hoffman (1981) who proposed that guilt is related to altruism and empathy. Hoffman argued that, from an evolutionary standpoint, prosocial behaviors benefit group functioning and therefore can be considered a survival strategy that adheres to the construct of group selection (i.e., the view that qualities that benefit a group’s survival will be promoted by natural selection). This assumption was based partially on archeological findings that primitive mammals that functioned within groups produced more offspring than those who were not living in groups. Other researchers extended this notion and proposed that the evolutionary function of guilt can be for the enhancement of social attractiveness (Gilbert, 1997; Jensen-Campbell, Graziano, & West, 1995), for the sake of reproduction, or as a preventative measure for group rejection (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Jensen-Campbell et al. (1995) showed in their research that women characterized prosocial men as more physically and sexually attractive than dominant men. Additionally the results of their study indicated that level of dominance (high or low) bears no interactions with attractiveness. These finding are in direct support of Hoffman’s perspective and are in opposition of the early Darwinist notion that natural selection favors “egotistic, self-preserving behaviors” (Hoffman, 1981, p. 1).
Another noted stride in the reconceptualization of guilt, called discrepancy theory, was developed by Higgins (1987). Higgins defined guilt as separate from shame and due to different discrepancies between a domain of self (i.e., actual, ideal, and aught) and one standpoint of the self (i.e., own, significant-other). In the self-discrepancy model different dyads of discrepancies yielded different types of negative outcomes. A discrepancy between the actual and ideal self (as represented by personal or a significant other’s hopes and desires) leads to disappointment and sadness (i.e., the experience of shame), while a discrepancy between actual and aught self produces fear and restlessness (i.e., the experience of guilt; Higgins, 1987). Higgins explained that the discrepancy that resulted in the feeling of guilt and restlessness was motivated by “feelings of moral worthlessness or weakness” (p. 5). Tangney, Niedenthal, Covert, and Barlow (1998) attempted to replicate Higgins’ study, and found little support for the discrepancy model. Their research found significantly higher scores of shame in all types of self-discrepancies when compared to guilt, and provided support for the definitions of guilt and shame introduced by Lewis (1971).

In Tangney’s view (a prominent voice in the field), guilt, unlike shame, is a very adaptive feeling that protects attachments and promotes prosocial behaviors that are fundamental to a healthy life (Tangney et al., 1992; Tangney et al., 1995). In other words, shame leads an individual to experience the self as flawed, while guilt externalizes the evaluation to a problematic behavior, which leaves room to resolve a given situation or correct an act (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007).

Work by Lagattuta and Thompson (2007) intended to clarify the developmental requirements for the experience of conscious emotions, explained that three abilities are
needed for the emergence of guilt: (1) self-awareness, (2) the recognition of external standards that one can use as a point of comparison, (3) and the ability to implement a given standard and evaluate one’s success in doing so. Tangney and Dearing (2002) added that guilt requires an additional ability; the capacity to clearly distinguish between the self and a behavior. This ability allows the individual to externalize the wrongdoing and experience guilt instead of shame. As a result, guilt is fundamentally dependent on personal experience, and so it is without surprise that the experience of guilt is different across cultures (Tracy & Robins, 2007). It is important to note that all of the theoretical perspectives regarding guilt presented earlier stand in agreement that personal experiences and cultural factors influence the experience of guilt.

Although there are ontological disagreements between the different theories in regards to the manifestation, expression, and meaning of guilt, there are two consistent similarities. First, guilt has the propensity to create a sense of unease or restlessness that motivates reparative behavior(s) by means of negative reinforcement. Second, the environment in which we live, and the subsidiary cultures we belong to, create variance in the reinforcing contingencies of guilt.

Thus, guilt-proneness will be treated as a process in the current thesis that can be separated into three identifiable elements: (1) a setting event that yielded an individual’s behavior as interpersonally offensive and undesirable, as prescribed by social norms; (2) a negative physiological arousal; and (3) a reparative task-oriented act that may or may not alleviate said arousal (also subject to social norms).

In view of this, much research has been done in the past two decades to clarify the isolated effects of guilt on different facets of mental health. In doing so, guilt was
conceptualized as a measurable, reliable, and stable personality characteristic called guilt-proneness, as measured by the Test of Self-Conscious Affect 3 (TOSCA3; Tangney et al., 2000). Guilt-proneness is defined as an enduring “tendency to feel bad about a specific behavior” (Dearing et al., 2005, p.1). It is important to note that the conceptualization of guilt into guilt-proneness is not the only one found in current literature. Other types of interpersonal guilt that are prominent in psychological research are: (1) self-hate guilt, which involves self-punishment with negative thought, feelings, and behaviors; (2) omnipotent guilt, which is an excessive form of guilt in which one feels responsible for the happiness of others; (3) separation guilt, which results from fear of harming others by pursuing one’s goals which are conducive to separation; and (4) survivor guilt, that arises from the belief that one is experiencing good at the expense of others (O'Connor et al., 1997). A study done by O’Connor et al. (1997) stated that guilt proneness (as measured by the TOSCA3) was related to survivor guilt ($r = .25, p < .01$), omnipotent guilt ($r = .35, p < .001$), and self-hate guilt ($r = .18, p < .05$). O'Connor et al. (1997) also found a positive correlation between survivor guilt ($r = .30, p < .05$) and depression and self-hate guilt ($r = .42, p < .001$) and depression (as measured by the Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire 45; O'Connor et al., 1997) in a residential drug treatment sample. Accordingly, guilt also has the propensity to be maladaptive when it becomes irrational and excessive (O’Connor, Berry, & Weiss, 1999). Albertsen, O'Connor, and Berry (2006) suggested that maladaptive interpersonal guilt has been correlated with a range of psychopathologies (e.g., psychoticism, addiction, and somatization).

The point at which guilt becomes excessive and irrational is depicted well in the words of Ferguson and Crowley (1997): “[it is when] guilt or shame are chronically used
(or not used) to organize and interpret experience that they can become affective styles which may, with time, lead to different forms of psychopathology” (p. 2). Simply put, when an individual makes a negative attribution consistently toward the self (i.e., shame) or consistently toward a behavior(s) (i.e., guilt) as a preference rather than an appropriate response, the experience of shame or guilt becomes maladaptive.

The composition of the TOSCA3 can be said to capture the adaptive spectrum of guilt because of the prosocial and non-pathological correlates that are consistently found in the literature (e.g., Waite & Lehrer, 2003). Concordantly, in a study done by Treeby and Bruno (2012) where alcohol abuse was postulated to be a defense mechanism among depressives, guilt-proneness was shown to be a significant protective factor. Specifically, a negative correlation was found between shame-free guilt-proneness and drinking as a means to cope with depression, while shame-proneness proved to be a risk factor. In a study done by Fergus, Valentiner, McGrath, and Jencius (2010), guilt-proneness was further buttressed as significantly and negatively correlated with depression.

In addition, Flynn and Schaumberg (2012) showed in their research that guilt-proneness was positively correlated with effective organizational commitment. They theorized that guilt prone individuals have a natural tendency to work harder, and in doing so create an affinity toward their place of employment. Furthermore, guilt-proneness has been shown to be indicative of leadership potential (Schaumberg & Flynn, 2012). These results may be partly explained by the work of Zemack-Rugar, Bettman, and Fitzsimons (2007) who demonstrated that guilt prone individuals showed significantly higher self-control when offered an immediate reward versus a long-term benefit.
In support of the idea that guilt is a prosocial emotion, Covert, Tangney, Maddux, and Heleno (2003) showed in their work that guilt prone individuals have greater desire to provide apologies, commit to improvements, and suggest effective reconciliations when faced with a personal conflict. In accordance with this idea, guilt-prone individuals are generally more supportive in interpersonal relationships, offering comfort and aid to close individuals in need (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994).

To summarize, the process of guilt entails three identifiable separable events. In accordance, the current thesis will aim to recognize the variables that contribute to the initiation and resolution of guilt (attachment styles, personality constructs, and religiosity), the transition from the negative arousal of guilt to its resolution (coping styles), and the adaptive or maladaptive nature of the emotion (subjective well-being).

**Guilt-Proneness and Attachment**

The conceptual framework initiated by attachment theory is one of the most intensively researched topics in current psychological literature (Mikulenc & Shaver, 2007), yet investigative work between guilt-proneness and attachment styles is fairly scarce (Lagattuta & Thompson, 2007). Nevertheless, the hypothesis of a relationship between the two constructs is repetitive in the literature (e.g., Gilbert 2007; Tangney, 1995).

The concept of attachment was introduced in the writings of John Bowlby and the empirical research done by Mary Ainsworth in the mid 1900s. From their work, three types of attachment styles between children and caregivers, that have shown high reliability and validity and endured the test of time, were formed (i.e., secure, anxious, and avoidant attachments (Mikulenc & Shaver, 2007). In secure attachment the
individual trusts that his or her needs will be met effectively and consistently, whereas the absence of trust (i.e., attachment insecurity) can result in two types of attachment qualities (i.e., attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Thus, avoidant attachment can be seen as the deactivation in the affective response resulting from the failure of a caregiver to provide consistent, responsive care (Siegel, 2012). Anxious attachment involves the opposite side of the spectrum, in which hyperactivation of affect takes place due to inconsistent responsiveness (Siegel, 2012). Early caregiver-child interactions, as described by Siegel, serve an important role in the development and maintenance of affect regulation, as the quality of these early experiences influence the way in which future interpersonal relations form.

In regards to the relationship between guilt-proneness and attachment, a search on PsychINFO (using the terms “guilt” and “attachment” on 02/14/14) yielded six peer-reviewed articles, of which only two (Erzar, Torkar, & Erzar, 2010; Lopez et al., 1997) tested the correlation between guilt proneness (as measured by the TOSCA3) and attachment security. In addition, there are not published studies that look specifically at relationship-specific correlates that pertain to different attachment targets, even though research suggests that attachment style is not necessarily trait-like but dependent on the attachment target (Fraley, Heffernan, Vicary, & Brumbaugh, 2011). Nevertheless, the aforementioned two articles and a study done by Mikulincer, Shaver, and Slav (2006), on the relationship between attachment style and tendency to forgive transgressors, agree that guilt is positively related to attachment security.

According to Bowlby, individuals throughout their lives engage in attachment behaviors, which are actions aimed at maintaining proximity to attachment targets.
(especially during times of stress or need; Mikulencer & Shaver, 2007). As discussed earlier, guilt, at its foundation, is an interpersonally evoked emotion intended to amend interpersonal harms. Thus, it is hypothesize in this thesis that individuals who maintain secure attachment to an attachment target (mother, father, partner, and close-friend) will be more inclined to feelings of guilt because the emotion has been found to be conducive to the maintenance of interpersonal relationships.

**Guilt-Proneness and Personality**

To understand factors that may influence the initiation and resolution of guilt, and to clarify the relationship between guilt-proneness and cultural affiliations, a measure of personality was introduced into the study. It is important to consider that a relationship exists between attachment history and personality development, as early life interpersonal experiences have been shown to influence the development of personality from neurological, biological, and psychosocial perspectives (Siegel, 2012).

Personality can be categorized into five constructs: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience (e.g., *Big Five Inventory*; BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). These personality types stem from linguistic analyses of popular ways in which people describe themselves and others. Extraversion is related to desirable characteristics such as sociability, assertiveness, and adventurousness (Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999). Agreeableness is related to humility, warmth, and generosity (Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999). Conscientiousness relates to reliability, decisiveness, and industriousness (Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999). Neuroticism is related to negative traits such as insecurity, irritability, and emotionality (Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999). Lastly, openness to experience is related to intellect and creativity (Saucier &
In an experiment conducted by Schaumberg and Flynn (2012) the BFI and the TOSCA3 were contrasted to establish a correlation between guilt-proneness and leadership potential. Of interest to this work, guilt-proneness was found to be significantly and positively correlated with agreeableness ($r = .43, p < .01$) but not to the remaining personality dimensions. It is important to note that the authors reexamined the correlations between the personality constructs and guilt-proneness with a different sample, in the same experiment, and found a significant and negative correlation between guilt-proneness and agreeableness ($r = -.11, p < .01$). To add to the discrepancy in results, in another study (using the Five Factor Markers; FFM; Goldberg, 1992) agreeableness was positively correlated with guilt-proneness ($r = .24, p < .05$; Abe, 2004). The variation in strength and direction of the relationship between guilt-proneness and agreeableness may be due to the personality measured employed (i.e., scenario-based versus checklist; Abe, 2004) or to the population studied. For example, in Schaumberg’s and Flynn’s (2012) study, the sample that displayed a positive relationship between guilt-proneness and agreeableness was composed of general university students and staff (45% female participants, $M$ age = 21.26). However, the sample that displayed a negative relationship was composed of first year MBA students (35% female participants, $M$ age = 26.89). In regards to extraversion, other than the studies conducted by Schaumberg and Flynn (2012) that found no correlation between guilt-proneness and extraversion, no other study was found that contrasted the TOSCA3 with a five-factor personality measure.

On the other hand, the relationship between guilt-proneness and conscientiousness has been well supported. In meta-analysis attempting to clarify the relationship between
guilt and conscientiousness, the authors found a positive correlation ($r = .21, p < .05$) across twenty-five samples (Fayard, Roberts, Robins, & Watson, 2012). The authors explained the relationship by stating that individuals high on conscientiousness are predisposed to be guilt-prone because they understand the possible emotional impact their actions may have.

Due to the paucity of peer reviewed articles contrasting the TOSCA3 to five-factor personality measures, the review was expanded to include results from the *Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale* (GASP; Cohen, Wolf, Panter, & Insko, 2011). The GASP, in contrast to the TOSCA3, separates guilt-proneness into two subscales: negative behavior evaluation and repair action tendencies. Cohen et al. (2011) found that the negative behavior evaluation of guilt (in a first order correlation controlling for the negative self-evaluation of shame) was positively correlated with agreeableness ($r = .25, p < .05$) and conscientiousness ($r = .20, p < .05$). However, the repair subscale of guilt (in a first order correlation controlling for the withdrawal subscale of shame) was positively correlated with agreeableness ($r = .26, p < .05$), conscientiousness ($r = .19, p < .05$), and openness ($r = .16, p < .05$).

Seeing that the population studied may affect the relationships between guilt-proneness and personality constructs, as seen with the relationship of guilt-proneness and agreeableness, it is of particular interest to assess the personality construct correlates of guilt-proneness in a culturally-diverse sample. It is hypothesized in this study that guilt-proneness will be positively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness across all cultures. In addition, a negative relationship is expected between guilt-proneness and neuroticism, since emotional stability can be seen as a property of
guilt-proneness (e.g., Fergus, Valentiner, McGrath, and Jencius, 2010; Waite & Lehrer, 2003), as measured by the TOSCA3.

**Guilt-Proneness and Coping**

A fundamental defining characteristic of guilt, as discussed earlier, is the negative reinforcing quality that promotes externalized, reparative, goal directed behaviors that are intended to cope with the negative arousal set by the emotion of guilt. Similarly, coping is generally defined as a purposeful reaction to an external negative experience (Endler & Parker, 1990; Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). More precisely, coping can be seen as a mediating variable between an antecedent stress-promoting event and a perceived negative consequence (Endler & Parker, 1990).

There are many coping styles found in the psychological literature (e.g., religious coping, collective coping, and dyadic coping). However, most coping styles can be categorized into three general constructs: task-oriented coping, emotion-oriented coping, and avoidance-oriented coping (as assessed by the widely used *Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations, second edition*; CISS; Endler & Parker, 1999). Task-oriented coping is a problem-focused approach that entails planning and attempting to solve a given stress-provoking problem, which may involve planning one’s time better or determining a course of action that is actively intended to address the problem (Endler & Parker, 1990, 1999). In emotion-oriented coping, the focus of change is directed toward the self with the aim of reducing the stress induced by the problem (Endler & Parker, 1990, 1999). This approach includes daydreaming reactions and/or becoming upset or angry, which may counterproductively result in additional stress. Avoidance-oriented coping involves both task-oriented and person-oriented strategies with the sole aim of avoiding dealing
with the problem in order to reduce negative arousal (Endler & Parker, 1990). Avoidance coping style can be divided into two types: (1) social diversion, in which the individual attempts to interact with others in order to avoid the problem, and (2) distraction which is a task-oriented approach intended to actively preoccupy oneself with irrelevant activities (Endler & Parker, 1990; 1999).

Current research has shown much support for the notion that task-oriented coping is more effective than avoidance or emotion-oriented coping strategies when dealing with stressful situations. For example, Christensen and Kessing (2005) found that low frequencies of task-focused coping are correlated with higher risk of depression and drug use. In relation to guilt, a six month long study tracking dieting behaviors of obese individuals found that guilt (assessed by the Weight- and Body-Related Shame and Guilt Scale; Conradt et al., 2007) was significantly and positively correlated with goal oriented strategies and dietary restraint (Conradt et al., 2008). It is noteworthy that a search of PsychINFO (02/14/14) using the terms “coping” and “guilt-proneness” resulted in only six peer-reviewed articles; none of which employed the CISS or a comparable measure that assessed for the three general domains of coping.

As a result, the relationships between coping styles and guilt-proneness will be examined because the processes of guilt and coping are fairly similar. Viewing these relationships will allow us to (1) inspect the transition from the experience of guilt to its resolution, as well as to (2) provide support to the current definition of guilt, as a negative physiological arousal that can be ameliorated by a task-oriented act. Accordingly, guilt-proneness is hypothesized in this thesis to be positively correlated with task-oriented coping.
Guilt-Proneness and Religiosity

One of the most revisited topics in which guilt is discussed in the folk literature is within the realm of religious practice. It is very intriguing that empirical research depicting the relationship between religion and guilt-proneness is fairly scarce. A search of PsychINFO (2/22/14) employing the search terms “guilt proneness” and “religion” yielded only three peer reviewed articles, of which none incorporated the predominantly used TOSCA3.

Religion is generally divided into three areas: organizational religiosity activity (i.e., the use of religious services such as prayer groups), non-organizational religiosity activity (i.e., activities performed in private such as praying), and intrinsic religiosity (i.e., an individual’s degree of commitment and motivation to a higher power; Koenig & Büssing, 2010). Extrinsic religiosity can be defined as the purposeful use of religion for social status, comfort, or even financial success, and as the overt opposite of intrinsic religiosity (Koenig & Büssing, 2010). These religiosity dimensions are common constructs in the literature and are part of widely used measures such as the Duke Religious Index (DUREL; Koenig, Parkerson, & Meador, 1997).

Because of the lack of research studying the effect of religiosity on guilt-proneness, the search was extended to include other guilt measures (i.e., The Beall Shame Guilt Test; SGT; Smith, 1972). This search found a study done by Richards (1991) who examined the relationship between religious devoutness and emotional adjustment. The sample was composed mainly of Christian affiliates (94%) and only 5% of participants claimed to have no religious preference (1.9% of participants identified as atheists). Guilt proneness (as measured by a short form version of SGT; SGT-RW; Richards & Williams,
1989) was positively correlated with intrinsic religiosity ($r = .30, p < .001$; measured by the *Religious Orientation Scale*; ROS; Donahue, 1985).

Accordingly, religiosity will be examined because the dimensions that make up the construct are postulated to influence the initiation and resolution of guilt. This is so because the dimensions of religiosity are closely related to the implementation and enforcement of group norms, which are, as described previously, a determining factor to the experience of guilt. Thus, it is hypothesized in this thesis that guilt-proneness will be positively correlated with intrinsic religiosity, organized religiosity, and non-organized religiosity among Christian participants.

**Religious Affiliation and Guilt-Proneness**

Another spectrum of religiosity that is of interest in the literature is religious affiliation. Albertsen et al. (2006) found significant differences between religious affiliations in maladaptive interpersonal guilt. The authors collapsed survivor guilt, separation guilt, and omnipotent guilt into one variable called “interpersonal guilt” because they hypothesized these three subscales were directly related to the concern of harming another person (as measured by the *Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire*; IGQ; O’Connor et al., 1997). The results indicated that Christian affiliates displayed higher scores on the interpersonal guilt composite than those without a religious affiliation.

Since no studies were found to have representative distributions of Christian and non-affiliated participants in the study of guilt-proneness (as measured by the TOSCA3), this thesis will aim to (1) examine group differences in the experience of guilt-proneness, and (2) examine the relationships between personality, attachment, religiosity, coping, and subjective well-being to guilt-proneness within each group. Based on the findings of
Albertsen et al. (2006), it is hypothesized in this thesis that guilt-proneness mean scores will be significantly higher among Christian participants when compared to the non-affiliated participants.

**Guilt-Proneness and Subjective Well-Being**

Another variable that has provoked great interest in the psychological, sociological, and economic literature, yet has not been well studied in relation to guilt-proneness, is subjective well-being. Subjective well-being is often defined as global satisfaction with one’s own life (e.g., Van Praag & Frijters, 1999). In 1965, Cantril created a measure (a self-anchoring ladder rating of life) that attempted to capture an individual’s current subjective well-being. Since then, much research has focused on distinguishing different qualities that influence rating on this (and similar) scales.

Consequently, it is remarkable that the relationship between guilt-proneness and a reliable and valid measure of subjective well-being has not been established in the psychological literature. Similar in magnitude to previous searchers, a PsychINFO search (on 02/26/14) using the terms “guilt” and “subjective well-being” yielded nine peer reviewed articles, none of which have used the TOSCA3, or the GASP. However, the notion of guilt as a negative predictor of subjective well-being can be seen in the work of Knafo and Assor (2007). Guilt was assumed to be a predictor of diminished subjective well-being because it may represent a type of adherence to parental values, among youths, that is the product of external or internal pressures intended to maintain a level of self-worth. Results indicated that guilt was negatively correlated with ratings of life-satisfaction. Important to note is that guilt was assessed by self-report rating of the experience of the emotion using a 4-point scale, rather than a scenario based
Based on the information presented above regarding the correlates of guilt-proneness, it is hypothesized that guilt, as measured by the TOSCA3, will be positively correlated with life satisfaction when the experience of shame-proneness is controlled. The current study will attempt to investigate the relationship between guilt-proneness and subjective well-being across different cultures because this variable can be used to assess the adaptive or maladaptive character of guilt.

**Guilt-Proneness and Ethnicity**

As previously discussed, self-conscious emotions are inevitably affected by personal experiences, which are, to a great extent, influenced by the group one belongs to (Lagattuta & Thompson, 2007). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that members of different ethnic groups may experience guilt differently, and therefore yield different guilt-proneness scores in fixed scenario based questionnaire (e.g., TOSCA3).

Although ethnic membership is assumed to produce significantly different outcomes in the experience of guilt (Tracy & Robins, 2007), recent work by Orth, Robins, and Soto (2010) in an ethnically diverse sample (i.e., Caucasian, Asian, and Black) found that guilt-proneness does not differ significantly across different ethnic groups. It is important to note that there was great disparity between the ethnic group sizes, where 74% were Caucasian and 6% were Black (or of African ancestry).

Furthermore, Fessler (2004) found that among Bengkulu natives the concept of guilt is for the most part non-existent. When researchers tried to explain the experience of guilt to participants, the Bengkulu natives expressed a sense of uncertainty about the subject matter. These findings suggest that the experience of guilt should not be viewed
as similar across cultures. This research may indicate that guilt may not be an evolutionary outcome but rather a cultural construct that is composed of more global human experiences (Fessler, 2007).

Thus, the present study will test for group differences in the experience of guilt-proneness between Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian, African-American, Armenian/Middle Eastern, and mixed-ethnic/other participants. It is hypothesized in this thesis that people of different ethnicities will differ significantly from one another in mean scores of guilt-proneness, because they may be affected differently by group norms.

**Guilt-Proneness and Gender**

The difference in guilt-proneness between male and female participants has been well established and supported in previous empirical research and theory (see meta-analysis by Else-Quest, Higgins, Allison, & Morton, 2012). Female individuals are generally considered to be more susceptible to feelings of shame and guilt than male participants (Else-Quest et al., 2012). Kim, Thibodeau, and Jorgensen (2011) explained this relationship by stating that women are more likely to define their identity in relation to social roles as they are more invested in interpersonal relationships.

In a meta-analysis done by Else-Quest et al. (2012) reviewing gender differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions, the authors concluded that gender differences in the experience of guilt may be due to inherent, trait-like, small differences between the sexes at a young age, that have been amplified through the course of their lives by gender role socializations and stereotypes. They based this notion on the idea that girls are encouraged to fully express their emotions while boys are encouraged to control their emotions.
In conclusion, both explanations rely on the interaction of the individual with the environment, which is in direct agreement with the interpretation of guilt as a socially evoked emotion. Consequently, this study will examine whether there are differences between men and women on guilt-proneness and also whether the relationships between the independent variables and guilt-proneness are similar for women and men.

**Guilt-Proneness and Native Language**

Another variable that stemmed from Fessler’s (2004) work is the effect of language on the experience of guilt. Contradictory to the idea that native language will result in a different experience of guilt, Schaumberg and Flynn (2012) found no significant correlation between native language (English and non-English native speakers were contrasted dichotomously) and guilt-proneness. Other than this study, no research was found contrasting native-language and proneness to feelings of guilt employing the TOSCA3.

Accordingly, this study will examine for group differences between English and Spanish native speakers in the experience of guilt-proneness. It is hypothesized in this thesis that English and Spanish language speakers will differ significantly in guilt-proneness mean scores from one another.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Procedures

Seven-hundred and forty students at a comprehensive university in southern California participated in this study. Data was collected using an online (Qualtrics.com), self-report, survey during the fall 2013 semester. The research participants were recruited using convenience sampling from two, lower-division undergraduate, psychology courses, which were not limited to students who major in psychology. Student participants who met the age minimum of 18 years participated in order to receive class credits. Consent was attained from all participants.

No time limit was given to complete the survey, though participants were encouraged to complete the survey in one sitting. The majority of participants completed the survey within 40 minutes. Data were entered, coded, verified, and analyzed by trained researchers using IBM SPSS Statistics Editor version 20 for Windows and MAC.

Sample

The composition of the sample varied according to age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, native language, and religious affiliation. Ages of participants’ ranged from 18-39 ($M = 19.31, SD = 2.3$). Their classification levels follow: 55.5% freshman, 23.5% sophomores, 14.9% juniors, 5.5% seniors, and .5% graduate students. Genders were nearly equal with 50.7% female participants and 49.3% male participants. All categorical variables were self-identified by open-ended questions, other than gender and educational level.

The study consisted of the following ethnic group affiliations: Hispanic (49.2%),
Caucasian (15.8%), Asian (12.2%), Mixed-ethnic/other (10.5%), Armenian/Middle Eastern (7.3%), African-American/Black (5.0%). The majority of participants’ identified their first language as English (64.7%), followed by Spanish (24.9%) and other (10.4%).

The participants’ spiritual/religious affiliation was as follows: Christianity (65.3%), claimed no religious affiliation (19.6%; 3.5% of the entire sample identified as Atheists), Agnostic (4.2%), non-specified/other (4.1%), Islam (2.0%), Judaism (1.8%), non-denominational religious (1.6%), and Buddhism (1.5%).

**Measurement**

The aforementioned variables: subjective well-being, guilt-proneness, coping style, attachment status, personality characteristics, and religiosity were assessed using the following measures and administered to participants in the order of presentation. Sample characteristics were measured using standard demographic items.

**Cantril's Self-Anchoring Ladder Rating of Life, Best-Worst Possible Life**

This measure is intended to assess for subjective well-being (Cantril, 1965). In the original procedure, the interviewer asks open-ended questions intended to anchor the best possible life one could ask for (10) and the worse possible life one could imagine (0). Then the interviewer asks for a rating from 0 (worse possible life) to 10 (best possible life) five years ago followed by a rating of where they expect to be 5 years from now (in an attempt to anchor the response in time). Only then does the interviewer asks the participant to rate where they are on the ladder at the present time. Due to recent research about the integrity of this measure online (see Van Acker & Theuns, 2010), the present questionnaire was modified to be more suitable to online surveying. The participants were presented with this measure at the beginning of the survey with the following
instructions: “**Before reading and answering the following question:** Please take a few moments to think about the best possible life you could hope for, and then the worst possible life you could have. Once you have envisioned the two extremes, please continue to answer the following question. Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present time?” This measure was administered once more at the end of the survey, after all the aforementioned questionnaires, to examine a possible priming effect. Cantril’s ladder had an acceptable test-retest reliability over the span of two years (.70) (Palmore & Kivett, 1977) and has been widely used throughout the years.

**Test of Self-Conscious Affect 3 (TOSCA)**

The TOSCA3 was used to assess guilt-proneness (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). The measure entails 16 different vignettes and yields 69 items with 4 to 5 questions per vignette that the responder must rate on a Likert-type scale from 1 (not likely) to 5 (very likely). In each one of the 16 scenarios, one response is dedicated to the assessment of shame-proneness and one for guilt-proneness. An example vignette follows:

**You break something at work and then hide it.**

a) You would think: “This is making me anxious. I need to either fix it or get someone else to.”

b) You would think about quitting.

c) You would think: “A lot of things aren’t made very well these days.”

d) You would think: “It was only an accident.”
In the above example, guilt-proneness corresponds with the first item and shame-proneness corresponds with the second. It is important to note that shame-proneness and guilt-proneness are both significantly and positively correlated with each other because both constructs assess negative affect and internal attributions (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). The internal consistency reliability alphas for shame-proneness (.80) and guilt-proneness (.77) were both high using the data in the current study.

**Coping Inventory of Stressful Situations (CISS)**

The CISS was employed to assess for 3 coping tactics (i.e., task-oriented, emotion oriented, and avoidance oriented) and the 2 subsidiary styles of avoidance oriented coping (i.e., distraction and social diversion; Endler & Parker, 1999). The measure includes 48 items in which the participants were asked to rate their personal level of agreement with coping actions in response to stressful situations on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). Some examples of items from the CISS are: “schedule my time better” (task-oriented coping), “blame myself for procrastinating” (emotion-oriented coping), “window shop” (distraction coping) and “talk to someone whose advice I value” (social-diversion coping). Using the data in this study, the following alphas have been found: .91 for task-oriented coping, .88 for emotion oriented coping, .78 for distraction, .78 and for social diversion.

**Relationship Structures Questionnaire (ECR RS)**

The ECR-RS is a revision of the *Experience in Close Relationships Questionnaire* (ECR; Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). The ECR-RS assesses for anxious and avoidant attachment styles (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000). Low scores on these scales are considered to indicate the presence of secure attachment (Fraley et al., 2011). This self-
The report questionnaire is intended to examine attachment for a mother, father, spouse, and close friend attachment figures by presenting the same 9 items for each attachment target. The participant is asked to rank from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) on a Likert scale the extent to which he or she agrees with each item for each of the four attachment figures. Example items follow: “It helps to turn to this person in time of need” and “I often worry that this person doesn’t really care for me.” The ECR-RS produced high alpha reliability scores for mother, father, spouse, and close friend attachment figures for both anxiety (.89, .93, .90, .92, respectively) and avoidance (.89, .89, .89, .89, respectively) using the current data.

**Big Five Inventory (BFI)**

The BFI assessed for extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience personality constructs using a self-report, 5-point Likert scale, where 1 corresponds with “strongly agree” and 5 corresponds with “strongly disagree” (John et al., 1991). The survey contains 44 items such as: “is depressed, blue” or “is inventive.” Internal consistency alphas for extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness in the current study were: .84, .75, .76, .82, and .69, respectively.

**Duke Religion Index (DUREL)**

The DUREL is a 5-item scale divided into three domains of religiosity (Koenig & Büssing, 2010). The first item assessed organized religious activity by asking, “How often do you attend church, synagogue, or other religious meetings?” The second item assessed non-organized religious activity by asking, “How often do you spend time in private religious activities, such as prayer, meditation, or Bible study?” The last three
items are intended to evaluate intrinsic religiosity by asking participants to rate the influence of their belief on different aspects of their life. The items follow: (a) “in my life, I experience the presence of the Divine [God]”; (b) “my religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life”; and (c) “I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life” (Koenig & Büsing, 2010). The DUREL has a high test-retest reliability (.91), high convergence validity (ranging from .71-.86), and high internal consistency (ranging from .78-.91) (Koenig & Büsing, 2010). The internal consistency alpha of intrinsic religiosity was found to be .88 using the current data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptive information depicting means and standard deviations for all variables can be found in Table 1. The results of all statistical operations discussed above are presented in this chapter. A bivariate correlations table (Table 11 in Appendix B) and a first-order correlations table, controlling for shame-proneness (Table 12 in Appendix B), that included the entire sample were generated to establish a benchmark for comparison purposes.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics for the variables examined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilt-proneness</td>
<td>34-80</td>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame-proneness</td>
<td>18-75</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented coping</td>
<td>20-80</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented coping</td>
<td>18-79</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social diversion coping</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction coping</td>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother attachment anxiety</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother attachment avoidance</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father attachment anxiety</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father attachment avoidance</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner attachment anxiety</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner attachment avoidance</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-friend attachment anxiety</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-friend attachment avoidance</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>1.13-5.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>1.56-5.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>1.67-5.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>1.60-4.90</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religious activity</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-organized religious activity</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well-being (1)</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well-being (2)</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-way ANCOVAs

A series of one-way ANCOVAs were used to test group differences between gender, ethnic groups, religious affiliations, and native language speakers in relation to guilt-proneness. The effect of shame-proneness was controlled because guilt-proneness and shame-proneness were found to be significantly and positively correlated ($r = .46, p < .001$; bivariate correlation).

One-way ANCOVAs Examining Gender Differences

A one-way ANCOVA was used to examine differences between genders on guilt-proneness after controlling for shame-proneness. In accordance with previous studies, and as hypothesized in this work, female participants ($M = 65.16, SD = 7.33$) reported significantly higher guilt-proneness than male participants ($M = 60.99, SD = 8.33$) while controlling for shame-proneness, $F(1,737) = 21.77, p < .001$.

One-way ANCOVA Examining Differences between Christian and non-Affiliated Participants

A one-way ANCOVA was performed to test the hypothesis that members of different religious affiliations would report significantly different results of guilt-proneness. Because of the large discrepancy between the different religious group affiliations (e.g., Christianity $n = 483$ and Buddhism at $n = 11$) the analysis only considered Christianity ($n = 483$) and those who claimed “no religious affiliation” ($n = 145$). Thus, the analysis compared if Christians ($M = 63.71, SD = 8.06$) differed significantly from individuals who claimed no religious affiliation ($M = 61.10, SD = 7.97$) in the experience of guilt-proneness, while controlling for shame proneness. Results supported the hypothesis Christian affiliates would display significantly higher mean
scores of guilt-proneness than participants without a religious affiliation $F(1,625) = 12.72, p < .001$.

**One-way ANCOVA for Native Language Speakers**

Participants ascribed to 26 different native languages in the current study. The large number of languages spoken by participants in this study exemplifies the diversity of the sample; however, the diversity yielded most groups inappropriate for comparison. For example, Portuguese, Thai, Danish, and Assyrian had one participant each, and so, similar to the previous analysis, only two categories were used: English ($n = 479$) and Spanish ($n = 184$) native speakers. The one-way ANCOVA was performed to compare English ($M = 63.29, SD = 8.07$) and Spanish ($M = 62.72, SD = 8.37$) native speakers in the experience of guilt-proneness, while controlling for shame-proneness. A one-way ANCOVA demonstrated no significant between-subjects difference, $F(1,660) = 1.37, p = .24$.

**One-way ANCOVA for Ethnic Groups**

Results of a one-way ANCOVA intended to compare the difference between ethnic groups on guilt-proneness, while controlling for shame-proneness, indicated that there was no significant difference between ethnic-affiliates. Caucasian ($n = 117, M = 62.73, SD = 8.05$), Hispanic ($n = 364, M = 63.04, SD = 8.40$), African-American ($n = 37, M = 62.11, SD = 9.69$), Mixed-ethnic/Other ($n = 78, M = 62.19, SD = 8.19$), Asian ($n = 90, M = 64.06, SD = 6.66$), and Middle-Eastern/Armenian ($n = 54, M = 64.80, SD = 7.03$) participants did not differ significantly in mean scores of guilt-proneness, $F=(5, 734) = 1.10, p = .37$.  

34
First-Order Correlations for Gender

First-order correlations (controlling for shame-proneness) were generated for groups that differed significantly from one another to depict the relationship between coping styles, personality constructs, religiosity dimensions, attachment quality of different attachment targets, and subjective well-being to guilt-proneness. In Appendix B, the correlations between each variable for each subsample are shown. Specifically, Tables 13 (female participants) and 14 (male participants) were generated for each gender, and Tables 15 (Christian participants) and 16 (non-affiliated participants) were generated for the two religious affiliation groups.

As hypothesized, shame-free guilt-proneness was associated with secure attachment. Female participants showed a negative relationship between the insecure attachment subscales (anxious and avoidant) to all attachment figures and shame-free guilt-proneness, while male participants showed similar results, albeit a non-significant relationship between partner attachment anxiety and guilt-proneness.

Table 2
Correlations between shame-free guilt-proneness and attachment styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Subscales</th>
<th>Men (n = 362)</th>
<th>Women (n = 372)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-friend anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-friend avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Next, correlations between guilt-proneness and the five personality dimensions were examined. In support of the hypothesis, shame-free guilt-proneness was found to be
positively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, and negatively correlated with neuroticism in both groups. Noteworthy is that a positive correlation between extraversion and guilt-proneness was found only among female participants but not among male participants \((p = .075)\).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Constructs</th>
<th>Men ((n = 362))</th>
<th>Women ((n = 372))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion and guilt</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness and guilt</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness and guilt</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism and guilt</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and guilt</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

The hypothesis that guilt-proneness will be positively related to task-oriented coping was supported in both groups. Results indicated that shame-free guilt-proneness was also positively correlated with social-diversion coping style.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Styles</th>
<th>Men ((n = 362))</th>
<th>Women ((n = 372))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented and guilt</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented and guilt</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction (avoidance) and guilt</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion (avoidance) and guilt</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Lastly, as hypothesized, subjective well-being was found to be positively related to shame-free guilt-proneness for both female and male participants.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Well-Being Items</th>
<th>Men ((n = 362))</th>
<th>Women ((n = 372))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of survey</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending of survey</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
First-Order Correlations for Christian and Non-Affiliated Participants

The hypothesis that secure attachment will be positively related to guilt-proneness for all attachment targets across all groups was not supported. While Christian participants did display a positive relationship between attachment security to all attachment targets and shame-free guilt-proneness, the non-affiliated group did not. Specifically, mother and father attachment avoidance scale scores were not found to be significantly correlated with shame-free guilt-proneness; however, all the remaining scales displayed a significant negative relationship within the non-affiliated group.

Table 6
Correlations between shame-free guilt-proneness and attachment styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Subscales</th>
<th>Christian (n = 480)</th>
<th>Non-Affiliated (n = 142)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-friend anxiety and guilt</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-friend avoidance and guilt</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

A more striking distinction between the two groups can be seen in the correlates of personality constructs to shame-free guilt-proneness. In the Christian group, shame-free guilt-proneness was found to be positively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness, and negatively correlated with neuroticism. However, the non-affiliated group only displayed positive correlations between agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness with shame-free guilt-proneness. As such, the hypothesis was supported only within the Christian group.

Table 7
Correlations between shame-free guilt-proneness and personality constructs
Personality Constructs  Christian \( (n = 480) \)  Non-Affiliated \( (n = 142) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Constructs</th>
<th>Christian (n = 480)</th>
<th>Non-Affiliated (n = 142)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion and guilt</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness and guilt</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness and guilt</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism and guilt</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and guilt</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05. \**p < .01.

In regards to coping strategies, both groups displayed a positive relationship between task-oriented coping and shame-free guilt-proneness in support of the hypothesis. In addition, social-diversion coping was positively correlated to shame-free guilt-proneness within the Christian group.

Table 8  
Correlations between shame-free guilt-proneness and coping styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Styles</th>
<th>Christian (n = 480)</th>
<th>Non-Affiliated (n = 142)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented and guilt</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented and guilt</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction (avoidance) and guilt</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion (avoidance) and guilt</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05. \**p < .01.

In regards to religiosity, a significant relationship between intrinsic religiosity and guilt-proneness was found among the Christian group; however, organized and non-organized religiosity dimensions were not correlated with shame-free guilt-proneness.

Table 9  
Correlations between shame-free guilt-proneness and religiosity dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity Dimensions</th>
<th>Christian (n = 480)</th>
<th>Non-Affiliated (n = 142)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic and guilt</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized and guilt</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-organized and guilt</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05. \**p < .01.

Finally, subjective well-being was found to be positively related to shame-free guilt-proneness for both the Christian and non-affiliated groups. Although there was no significant relationship between the last subjective well-being item and guilt proneness
among non-affiliated participants, noteworthy is that the significance level was .06 and so
deserving of similar interpretation as the first item in discussion.

Table 10
*Correlations between shame-free guilt-proneness and subjective well-being*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Well-Being Items</th>
<th>Christian ($n = 480$)</th>
<th>Non-Affiliated ($n = 142$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of survey</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending of survey</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The aim of this work was to expand the research into guilt as a possible adaptive variable. Accordingly, the purposes of this study were (1) to examine the relationships between attachment styles, personality constructs, and religiosity to guilt-proneness in order to recognize factors that may influence the initiation and resolution of guilt; (2) to examine the relationships between coping styles and guilt-proneness in order to understand the transition from the experience of guilt to its resolution, (3) to examine the relationship between subjective well-being and guilt-proneness, in an attempt to clarify the effect of guilt on life satisfaction; and (4) to examine group differences in mean scores of guilt-proneness in a multi-ethnic and culturally diverse population, as well as the aforementioned relationships within each group. The findings suggested that gender and religious affiliation were the only cultural groups in which a significant mean difference was found in mean scores of guilt-proneness. Furthermore, the results indicated a variance in the strength and significance of the independent variables in the relationships with guilt-proneness across the populations examined.

As presented earlier, the process of guilt can be divided into 3 components: (1) a setting event that yielded an individual’s behavior as interpersonally offensive and undesirable that is subject to social norms, (2) a negative physiological arousal, and (3) an external reparative act that is also subject to social norms, which may or may not alleviate the arousal. As such, the discussion will be oriented to first discuss the quality of the response intended to reduce the negative physiological arousal, and then to factors that influence the initiation and resolution of the guilt experience.
Guilt-Proneness and Coping Styles

In overview, coping is divided into three constructs: task oriented coping, emotion-oriented coping, and avoidance-oriented coping (Endler & Parker, 1999). Task-oriented coping is oriented toward the presenting problem, while emotion-oriented coping is directed toward the self with the aim of reducing the stress induced by the problem. Avoidance-oriented coping involves both task-oriented and emotion-oriented strategies in an attempt to avoid the problem at hand, which may come in the forms of social diversion or distraction.

As presented in Chapter II, the definitions of guilt-proneness and task-oriented coping are fairly close. Both processes involve a response to a negative antecedent event that comprises an externalized act(s) intended to influence the problem itself, and as a consequence, or through the process, relieve stress. The distinction between the definitions is that with task-oriented coping, a negative self-evaluation due to an interpersonally undesirable act is not required. Consequently, and in agreement with previous research (e.g., Conradt et al., 2007), a positive relationship between guilt-proneness and task-oriented coping is almost natural and can be observed across the entire sample.

Accordingly, a factor that may have influenced this relationship between task-oriented coping and guilt-proneness is the structure of the TOSCA3; as a scenario based questionnaire, guilt-proneness is accounted for in large as the likelihood of an individual to participate in a particular externalized act. Similarly, task-oriented coping is accounted for in the CISS as the likelihood of the individual to participate in externalized, problem-oriented acts. Thus, a relationship to task-oriented behaviors is inherent in the way in
which the measure was formed.

In regards to social diversion, the sample as a whole did depict a positive relationship with shame-free guilt-proneness (see Table 12), although the ANCOVA analysis illustrated that individuals without a religious affiliation are excluded from this finding. Needless to say, it was expected to see other forms of coping strategies in relationship to shame-free guilt-proneness, as one coping style in association to guilt cannot possibly represent the full spectrum of an individual’s coping repertoire. Thus, the more an individual is prone to feelings of guilt, the more one is inclined to seek social interaction as a mean of distraction from the negative arousal associated with breaking a social norm. This could be done to probe the impact of his/her wrong doing among those who set or enforce the social norms one has broken, or to simply avoid addressing the problem among those one feels comfortable and secure around.

Due to the exploratory nature of this research and the statistical analyses performed, further inference into the sole relationship between task-oriented coping and shame-free guilt-proneness cannot be established.

**Guilt-Proneness and Attachment**

The relationships between context dependent attachment styles and guilt-proneness were in agreement with previous works (Erzar, et al., 2010; Lopez et al., 1997) in depicting a positive relationship between secure attachment and guilt-proneness. Shame-free guilt-proneness was negatively correlated with both avoidance and anxious attachment scales across all attachment targets for female participants and Christian participants (as well as the cumulative sample); however, differences can be seen in the male and non-affiliated groups. The non-affiliated participants had no significant
correlations between mother and father attachment avoidance and shame-free guilt-proneness. In addition, male participants displayed a lack of significance between partner attachment anxiety and shame-free guilt-proneness.

Seeing that female participants and Christian participants have significantly higher mean scores of guilt-proneness (65.16 and 63.71, respectively) than male participants and non-affiliated participants (60.99 and 61.10, respectively), leads us into thinking that parental secure attachment predicts an individual’s inclination to guilt-proneness. Although this is based on a correlation analysis, this explanation may not be far from the truth. Attachment development begins before the end of the first year of life (Siegel, 2012) and has been vastly hypothesized to be fairly stable throughout adulthood (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), while guilt could potentially be achieved at the end of the second year of life (Lagattuta & Thompson, 2007) and strengthened in future development (Orth et al., 2010). Thus, the lack of early parental attachment security may yield an individual less prone to the adaptive spectrum of interpersonal guilt.

On the other hand, this relationship can be bidirectional. Since guilt-prone individuals have a great sense of commitment to the relationships they participate in (as discussed in Chapter II), they may develop secure attachments to close attachment targets by way of the reparative prosocial behaviors that facilitate trust and dependency. This is a more likely explanation as attachment styles have been shown to be affected by interpersonal experiences at later stages in life (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Siegel, 2012). As such, the group differences between gender and religious affiliations should not be seen independently as moderating or mediating variables between secure attachment and guilt-proneness.
Why then do male participants have a significantly lower mean score of guilt-proneness than women yet maintain similar attachment security to parents? An explanation of this has been presented by Else-Quest et al. (2012). They proposed that men are more likely than women to attempt and control the expression of their emotions. By doing so, male participants may limit their agreement ratings with the experience of guilt, or the resulting reparative acts that follow, on the TOSCA3. In support of this, female ($M = 50.25, SD = 9.86$) and male ($M = 45.31, SD = 9.98$) participants also demonstrated a significant difference in rating of guilt-free shame-proneness, $F(1,737) = 15.53, p < .001$.

**Guilt-proneness and Personality**

Shame-free guilt-proneness was found to be positively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness and negatively correlated with neuroticism for the total sample. However, the relationship between shame-free guilt-proneness and extraversion was not found among male participants (although bordering at $p = .075$) or non-affiliated participants. Furthermore, non-affiliated participants were the only group who did not display a significant correlation between shame-free guilt-proneness and neuroticism.

Although it is outside the spectrum of this thesis, it is particularly interesting to see such a robust correlation between shame-free guilt-proneness and extraversion for the sample as a whole since none of the research reviewed here depicted any type of correlation. Nevertheless, the relationship between guilt-proneness and extraversion seems appropriate when looking at the personality facets that accumulate to the construct called extraversion (and the trait adjectives which describe them): gregariousness.
(sociable), assertiveness (forceful), activity (energetic), excitement-seeking (adventurous), positive emotions (enthusiastic), and warmth (outgoing) (John & Srivastava, 1999; Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999). Similar in definition, and as presented in the review of literature, guilt-proneness has been associated with aspects of social desirability, leadership potential, and goal-oriented behaviors (assertiveness). Thus, a positive relationship between the two constructs is not surprising as both demonstrate similar traits.

In regards to agreeableness, although a relationship was not well established in the literature (e.g., Schaumberg & Flynn, 2012), the construct was found to be positively correlated with shame-free guilt-proneness for the entire sample. The relationship can be explained similarly to the relationship between guilt-proneness and extraversion in that they carry similar personality traits. Agreeableness is defined by the following personality facets (and trait adjectives): trust (forgiving), straightforwardness (not demanding), altruism (warm), compliance (not stubborn), modesty (not show-off), and tender-mindedness (sympathetic) (John & Srivastava, 1999). It is no surprise that the altruistic qualities associated with agreeableness (e.g., humility, warmth, and generosity; Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999) are associated with the likelihood of an individual to practice in relationship maintaining reparative behaviors, a defining characteristic of the guilt-prone individual.

The relationship between conscientiousness (a quality marked by reliability and decisiveness) and shame-free guilt-proneness was expected as it has been well established in the literature (e.g., Fayard et al., 2012). The relationship can be described with the words of Fayard et al., who explained that the conscientious individual has the propensity
to understand the interpersonal consequences of their actions and so avoids guilt-provoking situations.

Shame-free guilt-proneness and openness to experience displayed a strong positive correlation ($p < .001$) for the entire sample (regardless of gender or religious affiliation). This finding is inconsistent with the results found by Schaumberg and Flynn (2012), and in agreement with the relationship between the repair subscale of guilt and openness noted by Cohen et al. (2011). Openness is defined by the following facets: ideas (curious), fantasy (imaginative), aesthetics (artistic), actions (wide interests), feelings (excitable), and values (unconventional) (John & Srivastava, 1999). Although at first glance this relationship may seem counterintuitive, in that guilt-prone individuals would be more conventional in their values (as seen with the correlation to contentiousness), this relationship can be explained in two ways. First, and in accordance with Cohen et al. (2011) findings, the repair function of guilt may be seen as the common factor between guilt-proneness and openness. Accordingly, an individual who is high on openness and may have unconventional values, is nevertheless likely to practice in relationship maintaining behaviors, a quality that is associated with the adaptive spectrum of guilt-proneness. Secondly, the personality facet that brands openness with unconventional values should not be translated as having no values. Rather, this relationship can be an example of the degree to which guilt-inducing social norms are stable and global. In other words, an individual who is high on openness and may have unconventional values is nevertheless ruled by guilt-inducing social norms.

Lastly, neuroticism was found to be negatively related to shame-free guilt-proneness for the entire sample, with the exception of the non-affiliated group. These
results are not in agreement with the work of Schaumberg and Flynn (2012) in which a significant relationship did not take place between neuroticism and guilt-proneness. This relationship can be explained simply in that guilt-proneness is an emotion marked by emotional stability (the opposite spectrum of neuroticism), as displayed in the review of literature. A different explanation for this relationship could be extrapolated from the relationship between coping styles and neuroticism because guilt and task oriented coping are quite similar in process, as discussed previously. In a study done by McWilliams, Cox, and Murray (2003), to test the psychometric properties of the CISS among outpatients diagnosed with major depressive disorder, the authors contrasted the CISS scales with a five-factor personality questionnaire (The NEO Five-Factor Inventory; NEO-FFI; Costa & McCrae, 1992). They found that neuroticism was positively correlated with emotion-oriented coping \( (r = .66, p < .001) \) and negatively correlated with task-oriented coping \( (r = -.37, p < .001) \). Considering that neuroticism showed similar relationships to emotion-oriented \( (r = .66, p < .001) \) and task oriented coping styles \( (r = -.23, p < .001) \) in this study, it is possible that a neurotic individual has a greater predisposition to the experience of shame. This could be because the neurotic individual is more inclined to attribute the fault to the self (i.e., shame) and attempt to resolve the negative arousal with emotion-oriented coping styles. In accordance, neuroticism was found to be positively correlated with guilt-free shame-proneness \( (r = .52, p < .001) \).

Based on these relationships, it is possible that the lack of relationship between shame-free guilt-proneness and neuroticism among the non-affiliated group could be a divergent relationship between neuroticism and shame in terms of coping. Not surprisingly, and in contrast to the entire sample, non-affiliated participants displayed no
relationship between task-oriented coping and guilt-free shame-proneness ($r = -.10, p = .24$). Accordingly, the way in which non-affiliated participants high on neuroticism cope with shame and experience guilt are different from other participants. This may be due to a less defined attribution process (self versus behavior), in which the experiences of shame and guilt are more closely related. Although the analyses conducted in this thesis do not allow for further statistical inference, the correlation between shame and guilt observed within the non-affiliated group ($r = .53, p < .001$) was higher than the Christian group ($r = .45, p < .001$), female group ($r = .46, p < .001$), or male group ($r = .40, p < .001$).

These correlations indicated that guilt-proneness is a quality that is not limited only to a particular set of personality constructs; rather, it is associated with the entire spectrum of personality (as measured by a five-factor model of personality). Thus, the experience of shame-free guilt-proneness can be said to be related to all dimensions of personality.

**Guilt-Proneness and Religiosity**

In agreement with previous research (Richards, 1991) and as hypothesized in this study, intrinsic religiosity was found to be positively correlated with shame-free guilt-proneness within the Christian group. However, relationships between non-organized or organized religiosity dimensions with guilt-proneness were not found.

The lack of relationship between the variables among the non-affiliated group is fairly self-explanatory. These individuals simply do not have religious values that can be captured in the intrinsic religiosity items, and so a relationship with shame-free guilt-proneness cannot be established.
The relationship between intrinsic religiosity and shame-free guilt-proneness can be explained for Christian participants in that individuals who are committed and motivated to implement religious or spiritual values into their lives are much more likely to abide by a set of rules that protect and maintain certain qualities of interpersonal responsibility. As such, these individuals have a more explicit set of norms to follow when compared with non-religious individuals, and so are more likely to experience a negative arousal set by breaking these boundaries. Another factor that may explain this relationship is that individuals who are strongly committed to their religious beliefs may experience the negative arousal associated with guilt as more aversive. This may be true for some because the socially undesirable behavior that preceded the emotion may be punishable by the religious group one belongs to (regardless of communal practice) or the deity one believes in. Implications based on these interpretations should take into account that the relationship between guilt-proneness and intrinsic religiosity was weak and most likely due to large sample size.

Although the relationship between non-organized religiosity and guilt-proneness was not established within the Christian group, this should not be generalized to other religious affiliations. A weak and positive relationship between non-organized religiosity and shame-free guilt-proneness ($r = .08, p < .05$) was found for the entire group. This relationship suggests that private acts of religious practice, among other religious affiliations (which are too small to be examined privately), are indicative of the likelihood of an individual to perform prosocial reparative acts that are motivated by guilt.

**Guilt-Proneness and Subjective Well-Being**

The subjective well-being mean scores displayed no significant difference
between the first and second introduction in the survey. Contradictory to the results found by Knafo and Assor (2007), shame-free guilt-proneness was found to be significantly and positively correlated with subjective well-being for the entire population at the .05 level, when considering the first introduction of subjective well-being.

Although the nature of guilt is the product of negative evaluation, the relationship to subjective well-being can be seen as more influential by the resulting outcomes of the emotion. Guilt-proneness has been positively correlated with a range of desirable characteristic, as discussed in the review of literature, which many have been shown to be positively correlated with life satisfaction. Accordingly, it is not unusual to observe a positive correlation between shame-free guilt-proneness and life satisfaction. An individual who copes better with life stressors, is more socially desirable, has more desirable personality characteristics, and reports healthy attachment to close persons, should in turn report higher life satisfaction.

**Limitations and Research Implications**

This work was intended to hone the empirical understanding of guilt and was exploratory in nature. The results were successful in introducing new correlations and interpretations that were not present in the current study of guilt. Due to the nature of this thesis, several limitations were present. The research design was correlational cross-sectional and does not give any indication of causality. The questionnaire was self-report, which yields a shared method variance that may inflate the correlations between the variables present in this study. Also, the sequence of the questionnaire presentation may have primed the subject to consider mainly interpersonal stressors on the CISS as the TOSCA3 preceded it. The current research did not have a representative sample of
different religious affiliations, native languages, and ethnicities. Thus, the inspection of different possible interactions between religious affiliations, native languages, and ethnicities with guilt-proneness was prevented.

An additional limitation was that the sample was entirely comprised of college students. As such, the sample represented a fairly defined population that may differ significantly in some or all the variables considered in this study from the entire population. Furthermore, the dominant age group of the sample may yield the results of this study inappropriate for other age groups because (as discussed in Chapter II) guilt has a positive trajectory with age. Lastly, the population only included individuals who currently reside in southern California, and thus the results cannot be generalized to other regions of the country. Consequently, future research should aim to capture a representative sample.

Furthermore, research should focus on finding a reliable and valid distinction between the adaptive and maladaptive spectrum of the emotion. In quantifying and empirically distinguishing the point at which guilt becomes maladaptive, rather than stating that it occurs when the emotion becomes excessive or irrational, the current lack of attention and understanding of guilt (and its confusion with shame), not just in the general population but among mental health professionals, may be resolved. Also, future research may benefit from accounting for cultural variations within guilt measures. As it was presented in Chapter II, guilt is strongly influenced by the social norms set by the different cultures one belongs to. In accounting for these variations in the vignettes and items presented, more valid results may be attained.

It may be useful for further research to test guilt-proneness as a mediating and
moderating variable to life satisfaction as the emotion may represent a protective factor to psychopathology. In accordance, it would be of empirical value to administer the IGQ alongside a subjective well-being measure to test a potential relationship between maladaptive guilt-proneness and life satisfaction. Future research may also benefit from examining guilt as a process and not as a fixed variable, as it has been shown in this work that the experience involves several stages that are highly affected by environmental consequences and coping strategies.

**Clinical Implications**

The finding that guilt-proneness is positively related with life satisfaction supports the notion that guilt should be addressed carefully in psychological treatment as different from shame, and likely to bear positive as well as negative qualities. Furthermore, when a therapist encounters a client demonstrating guilt, the therapist may benefit from a thorough examination of the cultural influences that are associated with guilt. By assessing the extent to which the belief of interpersonal harm is conducive to the client’s social standing, within the construct of their environment, the therapist may avoid addressing guilt as a problem but rather as a tool for improvement. Secondly, it may be of value to divert attempts at emotion-oriented coping strategies toward socially desirable (as relating to the client’s environment) task-oriented acts, because they are likely to reduce the negative arousal associated with the act. Thirdly, the course of treatment dealing with guilt may employ dialectic/systemic (for review, Ivey, Bradford Ivey, Myers & Sweeney, 2004) treatment strategies as they are intended to raise the awareness of the client about their role within their particular culture. This approach may provide the client with a sense of control or acceptance about the interpersonal difficulty he or she is facing.
Nevertheless, formal/reflective (Ivy et al., 2004) strategies should aid the individual in changing irrational beliefs about the potential consequences.

Most importantly, when dealing with guilt, the course of treatment should not be determined on interpretation of guilt from the guilt measures available today. The current guilt measures do not have the capacity to distinguish between maladaptive and adaptive characteristics, regardless of the correlates established in research.

**Conclusion**

The purposes of this study were (1) to examine the relationships between attachment styles, personality constructs, and religiosity to guilt-proneness in order to recognize factors that may influence the initiation and resolution of guilt; (2) to examine the relationships between coping styles and guilt-proneness in order to understand the transition from the experience of guilt its resolution; (3) to examine the relationship between subjective well-being and guilt-proneness, in an attempt to clarify the effect of guilt-proneness on life satisfaction; and (4) to examine group differences in mean scores of guilt-proneness in a multi-ethnic and culturally diverse population, as well as the aforementioned relationships within each group. Results indicated that (1) guilt-proneness was positively correlated with attachment security for all groups, (2) guilt-proneness was positively correlated with extraversion (except within the male group and the non-affiliated group) agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, and negatively correlated with neuroticism (except within the non-affiliated group); (3) guilt-proneness was found to be positively correlated with task-oriented and social-diversion coping styles for all groups (expect for social diversion within the non-affiliated group), (4) Intrinsic religiosity was found to be positively correlated with guilt-proneness among
female participants and Christian participants; and lastly, (5) guilt-proneness was found to be positively correlated with subjective well-being for all groups.

Additionally, the point of transition from adaptive to maladaptive guilt has not been well established in psychological literature. In considering guilt as a process, it is in the view of the author that guilt can be effectively resolved and remain within the adaptive spectrum as long as a task-oriented and socially acceptable reparative act is available. This allows the individual to deal with the dissonance initiated by the process of guilt without resorting to emotion-oriented strategies that may yield the emotion maladaptive.
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MEASURES USED IN THE THESIS
AND INFORMATION PRESENTED TO PARTICIPANTS

Q49. CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS
BILL OF RIGHTS

The rights below are the rights of every person who is asked to be in a research study. As an experimental subject I have the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is trying to find out,
2. To be told what will happen to me and whether any of the procedures, drugs, or devices is different from what would be used in standard practice,
3. To be told about the frequent and/or important risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that will happen to me for research purposes,
4. To be told if I can expect any benefit from participating, and, if so, what the benefit might be,
5. To be told the other choices I have and how they may be better or worse than being in the study,
6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study,
7. To be told what sort of medical treatment (if needed) is available if any complications arise,
8. To refuse to participate at all or to change my mind about participation after the study is started. This decision will not affect my right to receive the care I would receive if I were not in the study.
9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.
10. To be free of pressure when considering whether I wish to agree to be in the study.

If I have other questions I should ask the researcher or the research assistant, or contact Research and Sponsored Projects, California State University, Northridge, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91330-8232, or phone (818) 677-2901.

Q50. California State University, Northridge
CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

The Positive and Negative Effects of Guilt on Well-Being

You are being asked to participate in "The Positive and Negative Effects of Guilt on Well-Being," a study conducted by Avishai Zacharia as part of the requirements for the M.A degree in clinical psychology at California State University, Northridge, department of psychology. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything that you do not understand before deciding if you want to participate. A researcher listed below will be available to answer your questions.

RESEARCH TEAM
Researcher:
Avishai Zacharia
Department of Psychology
(818) 605-7451
Avishai.Zacharia638@my.csun.edu
Department of Psychology
18111 Nordhoff St.
Purpose of Study
The purpose of this research study is to explore the positive and negative effect of feelings of guilt on well-being, choices, quality of relationships, and perceptions.

Subjects
Inclusion Requirements
You are eligible to participate in this study if you are at least 18 years of age or older.

Time Commitment
This study will involve approximately 40 minutes of your time.

Procedures
The following procedures will occur:
You will rate the quality of your life (approximately 1-3 minutes). After that you will complete a survey that includes the following topics: your reactions to day-to-day life situations (approximately 7-10 minutes); the way you react to various stressful, upsetting, or troubling events (approximately 10 minutes); the way in which you mentally represent important people in your life (approximately 5-7 minutes); your perspective on spirituality/religion; the way you perceive your character (approximately 3-6 minutes). Then, you will answer several demographic questions followed by rating your quality of life once more (approximately 2-4 minutes). The study will be conducted in one session.

Risks and Discomforts
This study involves no more than minimal risk. There are no known harms or discomforts associated with this study beyond those encountered in normal daily life.
The possible risks and/or discomforts associated with the procedures described in this study include: fatigue, boredom, or mild emotional discomfort.
For any concerns and accommodations, participants may contact the researchers.
If at any point you decide to discontinue the survey or skip question(s), there will be no consequences other than the following:
1. Skipping questions and providing false information will invalidate the survey and you will not receive research credits.
2. The lack of completion of the survey will result in no research credits and the deletion of any information you entered (identifiable or otherwise).
The Klotz Student Health Center is available to students and may be used as a referral: 18111 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, CA 91330-8270
Telephone (818) 677-3686
BENEFITS
Subject Benefits
You will not directly benefit from participation in this study.

Benefits to Others or Society
A contribution to the growing literature about the positive and negative effects of guilt prone feelings and behaviors, in a population not well researched (ethnically diverse college students), on well-being. Additionally, the study may assist practitioners in distinguishing between the effect of guilt on different types of coping strategies and personality traits.

ALTERNATIVES TO PARTICIPATION
The only alternative to participation in this study is not to participate.

COMPENSATION, COSTS AND REIMBURSEMENT
Compensation for Participation
You will receive research credit for an eligible course at the rate of 1 point per 15 minutes of participation. The study is estimated to take approximately 40 minutes. As such, you are expected to receive 2-3 research credits.

Costs
There is no cost to you for participation in this study.

Reimbursement
You will not be reimbursed for any out of pocket expenses, such as parking or transportation fees.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Subject Identifiable Data
All identifiable information that will be collected about you will be removed at the end of data collection.

The following identifying information will be collected when you log in to begin the survey in order to reward you with research credits: Full name, Students identification number, course name, and class number (of which the research credits are intended to satisfy). After the survey has been completed you will be assigned with a random 5-digit code that will be associated with the data collected. After you have been rewarded with research credits, the aforementioned identifying information will be deleted. As such, the identifying information will not be present on data sheets, and will be kept separately on an encrypted and coded spread-sheet noting the identifiable information and the assigned 5-digit code.

Data Storage
All research data will be stored on a laptop computer that is password protected and has encryption software.

The laptop is stored at the researcher’s (Avishai Zacharia) home. The laptop is solely owned and operated by Avishai Zacharia.

Data Access
The researcher and faculty advisor named on the first page of this form will have access to your study records. Any information derived from this research project that personally identifies you will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without your separate consent, except as specifically required by
law. Publications and/or presentations that result from this study will not include identifiable information about you.

Data Retention
The researchers intend to keep the research data indefinitely.

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS
If you have any comments, concerns, or questions regarding the conduct of this research please contact the research team listed on the first page of this form.

If you have concerns or complaints about the research study, research team, or questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Research and Sponsored Projects, 18111 Nordhoff Street, California State University, Northridge, Northridge, CA 91330-8232, or phone 818-677-2901.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION STATEMENT
You should not continue with the study unless you have read it and been given a copy of it to keep.
Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or discontinue your involvement at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. Your decision will not affect your relationship with California State University, Northridge. Your participation indicates that you have read the information in this consent form and have had a chance to ask any questions that you have about the study.

Q51. By starting the survey, you acknowledge that you have read this information and agree to participate in this research, with the understanding that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty other than not being awarded research credit.

Q54. Please enter the following information in order to award you with research credit at the end of the survey:

Q55. Full Name (First, middle initials, and last):


Q56. Student Identification Number (no spaces):


Q57. Course Name (e.g. PSY 250)


Q58. Class Number (e.g. 11223)


Q59. Continue to the next page to begin the survey

Q60. The purpose of this research study is to explore the positive and negative effect of feelings of guilt on well-being, in relation to choices, quality of relationships, and perceptions.

You will rate the quality of your life (approximately 1-3 minutes). After that you will complete a survey that includes the following topics: your reactions to day-to-day life situations (approximately 7-10 minutes); the way you react to various stressful, upsetting, or troubling events (approximately 10 minutes); the way in which you mentally represent important people in your life (approximately 5-7 minutes); your perspective on spirituality/religion; the way you perceive your character (approximately 3-6 minutes). Then, you will answer several demographic questions followed by rating your quality of life once more (approximately 2-4 minutes).

Q7. Before reading and answering the following question: Please take a few moments to think about the best possible life you could hope for, and then the worst possible life you could have. Once you have envisioned the two extremes, please continue to answer the following question.

Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel
you personally stand at the present time?

- [ ] best possible life
- [ ] 8
- [ ] 7
- [ ] 6
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 1
- [ ] worst possible life

Q10. Below are situations that people are likely to encounter in day-to-day life, followed by several common reactions to those situations.

As you read each scenario, try to imagine yourself in that situation. Then indicate how likely you would be to react in each of the ways described. We ask you to rate all responses because people may feel or react more than one way to the same situation, or they may react different ways at different times.

For example:

A. You wake up early one Saturday morning. It is cold and rainy outside.

a) You would telephone a friend to catch up on news.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) You would take the extra time to read the paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) You would feel disappointed that it’s raining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) You would wonder why you woke up so early.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the above example, I've rated ALL of the answers by checking the corresponding blank space under a number. I checked a "1" for answer (a) because I wouldn't want to wake up a friend very early on a Saturday morning -- so it's not at all likely that I would do that. I checked a "5" for answer (b) because I almost always read the paper if I have time in the morning (very likely). I checked a "3" for answer (c) because for me it's about half and half. Sometimes I would be disappointed about the rain and sometimes I wouldn't -- it would depend on what I had planned. And I checked a "4" for answer (d) because I would probably wonder why I had awakened so early.

Please do not skip any items -- rate all responses.

Q12. 1. You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o'clock, you realize you stood him up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;I'm inconsiderate.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;Well, he'll understand.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You'd think you should make it up to him as soon as possible</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: &quot;My boss distracted me just before lunch.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. 2. You break something at work and then hide it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;This is making me anxious. I need to either fix it or get someone else to.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would think about quitting.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;Well, they'll understand.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: &quot;A lot of things aren't made very well these days.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: &quot;It was only an accident.&quot;</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14. 3. You are out with friends one evening, and you're feeling especially witty and attractive. Your best friend's spouse seems to particularly enjoy your
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;I should have been aware of what my best friend is feeling.&quot;</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel happy with your appearance and personality.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel pleased to have made such a good impression.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think your best friend should pay attention to his/her spouse.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) You would probably avoid eye-contact for a long time.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q15.**
4. At work, you wait until the last minute to plan a project, and it turns out badly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel incompetent.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;There are never enough hours in the day.&quot;</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel: &quot;I deserve to be reprimanded for mismanaging the project.&quot;</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: &quot;What's done is done.&quot;</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q16.**
5. You make a mistake at work and find out a co-worker is blamed for the error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think the company did not like the co-worker.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;Life is not fair.&quot;</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would keep quiet and avoid the co-worker.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17.
6. For several days you put off making a difficult phone call. At the last minute you make the call and are able to manipulate the conversation so that all goes well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;I guess I'm more persuasive than I thought.&quot;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would regret that you put it off.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel like a coward.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: &quot;I did a good job.&quot;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) You would think you shouldn't have to make calls you feel pressured into.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18.
7. While playing around, you throw a ball and it hits your friend in the face.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel inadequate that you can't even throw a ball.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think maybe your friend needs more practice at catching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: &quot;It was just an accident.&quot;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19.
8. You have recently moved away from your family, and everyone has been very helpful. A few times you needed to borrow money, but you paid it back as soon as you could.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel immature.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;I sure ran into some bad luck.&quot;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would return the favor as quickly as you could.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: &quot;I am a trustworthy person.&quot;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) You would be proud that you repaid your debts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20. 9. You are driving down the road, and you hit a small animal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think the animal shouldn't have been on the road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;I'm terrible.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel: &quot;Well, it was an accident.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You'd feel bad you hadn't been more alert driving down the road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21. 10. You walk out of an exam thinking you did extremely well. Then you find out you did poorly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;Well, it's just a test.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;The instructor doesn't like me.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: &quot;I should have studied harder.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would feel stupid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23. 11. You and a group of co-workers worked very hard on a project. Your boss singles you out for a bonus because the project was such a success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel the boss is rather short-sighted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel alone and apart from your colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel your hard work had paid off.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would feel competent and proud of yourself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) You would feel you should not accept it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q24. 12. While out with a group of friends, you make fun of a friend who's not there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Q25.  
13. You make a big mistake on an important project at work. People were depending on you, and your boss criticizes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: “It was all in fun; it’s harmless.”</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel small...like a rat.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think that perhaps that friend should have been there to defend himself/herself</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would apologize and talk about that person’s good points.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26.  
14. You volunteer to help with the local Special Olympics for handicapped children. It turns out to be frustrating and time-consuming work. You think seriously about quitting, but then you see how happy the kids are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think your boss should have been more clear about what was expected of you.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel like you wanted to hide.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: “I should have recognized the problem and done a better job.”</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: “Well, nobody’s perfect.”</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27.
15. You are taking care of your friend's dog while they are on vacation and the dog runs away.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think, &quot;I am irresponsible and incompetent.&quot;</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think your friend must not take very good care of their dog or it wouldn't have run away.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would vow to be more careful next time.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think your friend could just get a new dog.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28.
16. You attend your co-worker's housewarming party and you spill red wine on their new cream-colored carpet, but you think no one notices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not likely 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very likely 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You think your co-worker should have expected some accidents at such a big party.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would stay late to help clean up the stain after the party.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would wish you were anywhere but at the party.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would wonder why your co-worker chose to serve red wine with the new light carpet.</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28. The following are ways people react to various difficult, stressful, or upsetting situations. Please mark a number from 1 to 5 for each item. Indicate how much you engage in these types of activities when you encounter a difficult, stressful, or upsetting situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very Much 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Schedule my time better</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Focus on the problem and see how I can solve it</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Think about the good times I've had</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Try to be with other people</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Blame myself for procrastinating</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do what I think best</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Preoccupied with aches and</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
<td>⬜️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Blame myself for having gotten into this situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Window shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Outline my priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Try to go to sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Treat myself to a favorite food or snack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Feel anxious about not being able to cope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Become very tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Think about how I have solved similar problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tell myself that it is really not happening to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Blame myself for being too emotional about the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Go out for a snack or meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Become very upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Buy myself something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Determine a course of action and follow it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Blame myself for not knowing what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Go to a party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Work to understand the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. &quot;Freeze&quot; and don’t know what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Take corrective action immediately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Think about the event and learn from my mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Wish that I could change what had happened or how I felt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Visit a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Worry about what I am going to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Spend time with a special person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Go for a walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Tell myself that it will never happen again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Focus on my general inadequacies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Talk to someone whose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Analyze the problem before reacting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Phone a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Get angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Adjust my priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. See a movie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Get control of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Make an extra effort to get things done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Come up with several different solutions to the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Take time off and get away from the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Take it out on other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Use the situation to prove that I can do it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Try to be organized so I can be on top of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Watch TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4.
This questionnaire is designed to assess the way in which you mentally represent important people in your life. You'll be asked to answer questions about your parents, your romantic partners, and your friends. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a number for each item.

Please answer the following questions about your mother or a mother-like figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk things over with this person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find it easy to depend on this person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often worry that this person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5.

Please answer the following questions about your father or a father-like figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk things over with this person.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find it easy to depend on this person.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7.

Please answer the following questions about your dating or marital partner (if no! in a relationship then answer for the most recent partner).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk things over with this person.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Click to write the question text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please answer the following questions about your best friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk things over with this person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find it easy to depend on this person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.
The following statements concern your perception about yourself in a variety of situations. Your task is to indicate the strength of your agreement with each statement, utilizing a scale in which 1 denotes strong disagreement, 5 denotes strong agreement, and 2, 3, and 4 represent intermediate judgments. In the boxes after each statement, click a number from 1 to 5 from the following scale:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither disagree nor agree
4. Agree  
5. Strongly agree  

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, so select the number that most closely reflects you on each statement. Take your time and consider each statement carefully.

I see myself as someone who...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is talkative</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tends to find fault with others</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does a thorough job</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is depressed, blue</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is original, comes up with new ideas</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is reserved</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is helpful and unselfish with others</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can be somewhat careless</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is relaxed, handles stress well</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is curious about many different things</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is full of energy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Starts quarrels with others</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is a reliable worker</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Can be tense</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Has a forgiving nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tends to be disorganized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Worries a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Has an active imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tends to be quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Is generally trusting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tends to be lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Is inventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Has an assertive personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Can be cold and aloof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Perserves until the task is finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Can be moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Does things efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Remains calm in tense situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Prefers work that is routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Is outgoing, sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Is sometimes rude to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Makes plans and follows through with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Gets nervous easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Has few artistic interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Likes to cooperate with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Is easily distracted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Is sophisticated in art,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q30. 1. How often do you attend a worship center (e.g. church, temple, mosque, etc) or other religious meetings?

- Never
- Once a year or less
- A few times a year
- A few times a Month
- Once a Week
- More than once a Week

Q31. 2. How often do you spend time in private religious activities, such as prayer, meditation or Bible study?

- Never or rarely
- A few times a month
- Once a week
- Two or more times a week
- Daily
- More than once a day

Q32. The following section contains 3 statements about religious belief or experience. Please mark the extent to which each statement is true or not true for you.

3. In my life, I experience the presence of the Divine (i.e., God)

- Definitely not true
- Tends not to be true
- Unsure
Q34. 4. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life

- Definitely not true
- Tends not to be true
- Unsure
- Tends to be true
- Definitely true of me

Q35. 5. I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life

- Definitely not true
- Tends not to be true
- Unsure
- Tends to be true
- Definitely true of me

Q48. We ask you to reconsider the first question once again.

Like before: Please take a few moments to think about the best possible life you could hope for, and then the worst possible life you could have. Once you have envisioned the two extremes, please continue to answer the following question.

Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel
you personally stand at the present time?

- [ ] best possible life
- [ ] 9
- [ ] 8
- [ ] 7
- [ ] 6
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 1
- [ ] worst possible life

Q36. What is your education level?

- [ ] Freshman
- [ ] Sophomore
- [ ] Junior
- [ ] Senior
- [ ] Graduate

Q37. What is your grade point average (GPA)?

[ ]

Q38. What is your zip code?

[ ]

Q39. What is your approximate household family income?

- [ ] 0-$20,000
- [ ] $20,000-$40,000
- [ ] $40,000-$80,000
- [ ] $80,000-$100,000
- [ ] >$100,000
Q40. What is your ethnicity?


Q41. What is your first language?


Q42. Gender

☐ Female
☐ Male

Q43. What is your sexual orientation?

☐ Heterosexual
☐ Gay/Lesbian
☐ Prefer not to say

Q44. How would you rate your physical health from 1 to 5?

☐ 1- Worst possible
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5- Great

Q45. How would you rate your mental health from 1 to 5?

☐ 1- Worst possible
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5- Great
Q46. How old are you?

Q47. What is your spiritual/religious affiliation?

Q61.
Thank you for participating in the study. All identifying information will be destroyed after you receive research credit for this course. Your participation is appreciated.
### Table 11

Summary of Bivariate Correlations for the Complete Sample (n = 740)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Guilt-proneness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shame-proneness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mother anxiety</td>
<td>-0.11**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mother avoidance</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Father anxiety</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Father avoidance</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Partner anxiety</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Partner avoidance</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Close-f anxiety</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extraversion</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Openness</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Task-oriented</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Distraction</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Social-diversion</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (1)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. SWB (2)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 11 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Close-f anxiety</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Openness</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.11**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Task-oriented</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Distraction</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Social-diversion</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (1)</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. SWB (2)</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 12

Summary of First-Order Correlations (Controlling Shame-Proneness) for the Complete Sample (n = 737)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Distraction</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Social-diversion</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (1)</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. SWB (2)</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01

Table 12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extraversion</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Neurotism</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Openness</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Task-oriented</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Distraction</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social-diversion</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 (continued)

*p < .05; **p < .01.
Table 12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (1)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (2)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 13
Summary of First-Order Correlations (Controlling Shame-Proneness) for Female Participants (n = 372)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilt-proneness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother anxiety</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father anxiety</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father avoidance</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner anxiety</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner avoidance</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-f anxiety</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (1)</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (2)</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (1)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (2)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 14
Summary of First-Order Correlations (Controlling Shame-Proneness) for Male Participants (n = 362)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilt-proneness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother anxiety</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother avoidance</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father anxiety</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner anxiety</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner avoidance</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father avoidance</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-f anxiety</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (1)</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (2)</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilt-proneness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother anxiety</td>
<td>-.22** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother avoidance</td>
<td>-.12** .37** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father anxiety</td>
<td>-.15** .47** .11* 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father avoidance</td>
<td>-.16** .13** .35** .46** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner anxiety</td>
<td>-.14** .27** .19** .24** .08 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner avoidance</td>
<td>-.23** .09 .12** .15** .10* .30** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-f anxiety</td>
<td>-.24** .45** .18** .41** .13** .34** .20** 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>-.22** .28** .20** .16** .12** .12** .21** .51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.15** .00 -.11* .02 -.06 -.12* -.16** -.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.50** .31** -.23** -.15** -.14** -.19** -.30** -.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.38** -.17** -.25** -.13** -.19** -.18** -.28** -.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.17** .15** .17** .08 .16** .11* .11* .16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.23** .04 -.06 .01 -.01 .04 -.15** -.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>.44** .04 -.16** -.06 -.20** -.11* -.22** -.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>-.05 .12** .13** .11* .01* .16** .01 .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>-.01 .06 -.02 .01 -.06 .08 .01 .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-diversion</td>
<td>.23** -.02 -.11* .01 -.11* .00 -.20** -.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religiosity</td>
<td>-.02 -.03 .06 -.04 .01 -.04 -.02 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>.06 -.04 -.04 -.02 -.09 .02 .02 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.14** -.04 -.17** -.06 -.11* -.10* -.08 -.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (1)</td>
<td>.14** -.11* -.16** -.11* -.20** -.13** -.08 -.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB (2)</td>
<td>.15** -.11* -.17** -.10* -.21** -.13** -.08 -.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extraversion</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Neuroticism</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Openness</td>
<td>-1.17**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Task-oriented</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Distraction</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social-diversion</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SWB (1)</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (2)</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Distraction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social-diversion</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SWB (1)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (2)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 16

Summary of First-Order Correlations (Controlling Shame-Proneness) for Non-Affiliated Participants (n = 142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Guilt-proneness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother anxiety</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mother avoidance</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Father anxiety</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Father avoidance</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Partner anxiety</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Partner avoidance</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Close-f anxiety</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extraversion</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Agreeableness</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Openness</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Task-oriented</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Distraction</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social-diversion</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SWB (1)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Close-f avoidance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extraversion</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Neuroticism</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Openness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Task-oriented</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Emotion-oriented</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Distraction</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social-diversion</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SWB (1)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (2)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 16 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Distraction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social-diversion</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Organized religiosity</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Non-org religiosity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Intrinsic religiosity</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. SWB (1)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SWB (2)</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.