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Previous research has distinguished self-conscious emotions (SCEs), such as shame, guilt and pride, from basic emotions due to the prerequisites of SCEs for self-awareness, self-representations and self-evaluation. In addition, individualistic assumptions and understandings of SCEs have been considered to reflect a perception of the self as an independent self-construal, which contrasts with the collectivistic interdependent self-concept. Whether existing models of SCEs are generalizable to collectivistic cultures remains an open question. The present research applied both quantitative and qualitative methodologies over a span of four studies to investigate cross-cultural differences in the experience of shame, adaptive and maladaptive guilt, and hubristic and authentic pride between Singaporean and Australian young adults. A cross-cultural exploration of SCEs and their relations with filial piety and psychological distress was also conducted.

Study 1 was as an explorative pilot study, from which separation guilt emerged as a culturally relevant SCE that distinguished young Singaporean adults (n=65) from their Australian counterparts (n=64). Study 2 contributed qualitative data in relation to the modus operandi of SCEs within collectivistic and individualistic cultures, whereby young Singaporean adults were found to report more shame and hubristic pride, while their Australian counterparts reported experiencing more authentic pride. Study 2 also found young Singaporean adults to experience more familial guilt (similar to separation guilt), as influenced by attitudes towards filial piety. Study 3 sought to further explore these findings, and young Singaporean adults (n=182) were found to report stronger attitudes towards both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety than their Australian counterparts (n=189). Finally, Study 4 examined the specific relations between separation guilt, hubristic pride, filial piety and psychological distress in a model for both young Singaporean and Australian adults. The overall findings indicated that shame appears to be a SCE that is strongly related to psychological distress for both Singaporeans and Australians. However, the hypothesized theoretical model indicated that attitudes towards filial piety appear to be particularly relevant for Singaporeans, with unique cultural relations existing between both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety and hubristic pride, as well as symptoms of depression and anxiety. Theoretical and clinical implications, as well as limitations and suggestions for future research, are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1: CULTURE AND SELF-CONSCIOUS EMOTIONS

In this thesis, the term “culture” is used to refer to historically acquired and socially conveyed ideas (e.g., symbols, language, values, and norms), and practices (e.g., rituals, mores, laws), as well as organisations (e.g., family structure) that are both products of human behaviour and generators of future action (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). For example, beliefs and practices of individuals in the past have shaped the behaviours and thoughts of individuals living today, just as current beliefs and practices created today will, in turn, influence the thoughts and behaviours of future generations. Anthropologists and cultural psychologists have applied the term “cultural model” to describe organised patterns of practices and ideas that are associated with specific social, physical, and psychological phenomena, which include the self and emotion (Strauss, 1992). This thesis will contribute to the literature a more complete understanding of self-conscious emotions by investigating how culture impacts on the individual experience of shame, guilt and pride, as well as the cultural relationships between self-conscious emotions and psychological distress.

An Exploration of the Universality of Emotions

One of the fundamental findings in the emotion literature is that a set of “basic” emotions – anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, and surprise – have distinctly unique, universally recognised, facial expressions. Ekman, Sorenson, and Friesen (1969; see also Ekman & Friesen, 1971) found that individuals from two pre-literate tribal cultures in New Guinea agreed with individuals from the United States, Brazil, Japan, and Borneo about the emotions relayed by facial expressions of each basic emotion. This research has contradicted the prevailing view that all emotions are entirely culture specific, and has, in general, supported Darwin’s claim that emotion
expressions are universal aspects of human nature which have evolved to serve specific adaptive functions.

With specific regard to the outward expression of self-conscious emotions, research has suggested that both pride and shame have nonverbal expressions that are recognised across cultures (Haidt & Keltner, 1999; Izard, 1977; Tracy & Robins, 2004b). In a study conducted in a remote village in Burkina, Faso, Africa, individuals living in preliterate tribal cultures that are highly isolated from Westernised countries were found to recognise physical expressions of pride and shame that have been previously documented in Western cultures (Izard, 1977; Keltner, 1995; Tracy & Robins, 2004b). Given that participants were unlikely to have learnt the pride or shame expressions through cross-cultural interactions, their accurate recognition suggested that the physical expression of these two self-conscious emotions expressions, like the basic emotion expressions, might be universal in nature. In addition, Haidt and Keltner (1999) found that individuals from India, who had particularly limited access to Western culture and Western media, identified the physical expression of embarrassment previously found in Western cultures (Keltner, 1995).

The findings of the cross-cultural agreement about the nonverbal expressions of self-conscious emotions have evoked new theories and research regarding emotion and the self. Given that shame, guilt, and pride are believed to be elicited by complex self-evaluative processes (Tracy & Robins, 2007b), the evidence of the universality of self-conscious emotions implied that these complex self-processes were also universal. However, while research may have found evidence that supports the universal recognition of the physical expression of shame and guilt, it is argued that subtle differences in the cultural variances of self-conscious emotions may emerge in the intrapersonal experience of shame, guilt, and pride.
Indeed, a growing body of research has suggested that culture has an extensive influence on how individuals define the self, which, in turn, is believed to impact upon the experience of self-conscious emotions (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). For example, individuals from collectivistic cultures tend to hold an interdependent self-concept, viewing the self as rooted within, and reliant upon, a larger social context; whereas individuals from individualistic cultures are more likely to hold a more independent concept of the self, whereby the self is perceived as largely distinct from one’s social context (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). According to this perspective, these cultural differences in self-concepts are believed to impact upon cultural differences in emotion experiences. Specifically, “other-focused” emotions, such as shame, have been argued to be more commonly experienced and lead to greater positive outcomes in individuals with interdependent views of the self, whereas “ego-focused” emotions, such as pride, may be more commonly experienced and self-enhancing for those with independent views of the self (Eid & Diener, 2001; Menon & Shweder, 1994; Scherer & Walbott, 1994).

The search for common ground between these findings and the concept of universal self-evaluations that elicit self-conscious emotions has been ongoing for decades, with researchers reaching some agreement that most emotions are likely to have both universal, as well as culture-specific components (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Goetz & Keltner, 2007; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992). For example, although some researchers agree that overt expressions of emotions generalise across cultures, there is also some consensus that there are significant cultural differences in the ways in which individuals internally experience and regulate these expressions through display rules (Matsumoto, Yoo, Hirayama, & Petrova, 2005). This view suggests that the link between emotions and automatic nonverbal expressions is at least partly derived from human nature, but that the way in which individuals experience, perceive, suppress or
exaggerate these expressions is possibly largely determined by culture (Tracy & Robins, 2007b).

Researchers have also suggested that the frequency of occurrence, as well as the intensity of specific emotions, has culture-specific factors (Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990; Menon & Schweder, 1994; Wong & Tsai, 2007). For example, shame has been found to be perceived as a less negative emotion in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures, due to the fact that it affirms the individual’s place and sense of belonging within the social group (Menon & Shweder, 1994; Wong & Tsai, 2007). Of particular interest, the antecedent appraisals that elicit these emotions have been found to generalise across cultures. Scherer and Walbott (1994) studied 37 cultures and found considerable cross-cultural similarities in the appraisal processes that generated and distinguished among emotions. Given that the generalisability of appraisals that elicit particular emotion across cultures occurs in spite of culturally distinct frequencies and valences, these cultural differences are likely to stem from the internal processes of the manner in which events are appraised and emotions are valued. For example, a person from a collectivistic culture may report feeling shame more frequently than a person from an individualistic culture, even though the same set of appraisals and attributions elicits shame in both people. This difference in reporting might occur because individuals in collectivistic cultures may be more likely to make the kinds of appraisals that universally elicit shame, and shame is more likely to be socially accepted in collectivistic cultures. Therefore, shame is less likely to be regulated and more likely to be self-reported (Tracy & Robins, 2007b).

There is also strong evidence that culture exerts a strong influence on the way that individuals appraise emotion-eliciting events (Mesquita, 2001). For example, an individual from a collectivistic culture who might hold an interdependent self-concept might not appraise a personal accomplishment as identity-goal congruent unless this
accomplishment reflects well on his family as well (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). As a result, the same antecedent event, such as a university lecturer highlighting an individual for attaining the highest score on a test that draws attention from others, might lead to divergent emotions depending on culture. For a person from an individualistic culture with an independent self-construal, this event will likely be evaluated as congruent with the culturally determined identity goal of appearing smart to those around him or her. If the individual also evaluates the event as internally caused, he or she will experience pride. In contrast, an individual with a more interdependent self-construal might feel shame instead of pride, because he or she might appraise this event as relevant to the culturally determined identity goal of fitting in with those around him or her, and, therefore, as incongruent with this goal.

Other cultural differences in appraisal process – such as the tendency for people from individualistic cultures to make more self-serving attributions for success and failure than people from collectivistic cultures (Heine et al., 1999; Kitayama, Takagi, & Matsumoto, 1995) – will produce similar differences in the frequency of particular emotional occurrences. Therefore, culture may affect how often particular emotions are experienced by influencing individuals’ propensity to make certain appraisals (Mesquita & Frijda, 1992).

Concerns with general existing models of shame and guilt

Mainstream emotion research and theory posit that shame and guilt are experienced when standards or norms have been violated (Lewis, 1987; Tangney, 1991). While shame occurs when one is negatively evaluated by others for behaving inappropriately, involves global and stable attributions for wrongdoings, and is associated with maladaptive consequences, guilt is suggested to occur when one has a negative appraisal of one’s own self for behaving inappropriately, involves specific and
temporary attributions for transgressions, and is associated with adaptive consequences (Wong & Tsai, 2007).

This general view of shame and guilt, however, is strongly reliant on certain assumptions that may not necessarily apply to other cultural contexts. For example, the concept that global, stable attributions result in shame and that specific, temporary attributions elicit guilt is based on the assumption that there is a stable self that can be differentiated from one’s temporary actions (Wong & Tsai, 2007). In a similar manner, the theory that shame has an external orientation, in that it is oriented to others’ standards or social norms, whereas guilt has an internal orientation, in that it is oriented to one’s own standards, assumes that internal and external orientation can be easily separated, and that internal orientation is somewhat more powerful and genuine than external orientation (Wong & Tsai, 2007). In essence, these assumptions reflect a view of the self that is conceptualised as predominantly independent in nature (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), which appears to be restricted and isolated from others, and largely defined by stable personal characteristics.

Additionally, this conventional model has been criticised for its assumption that being negatively appraised, whether by oneself or others, is entirely negative and non-beneficial to the individual, and that such experiences should be actively avoided. Researchers have suggested that this mainstream assumption may well reflect the value placed on positive feelings in many individualistic contexts (Heine et al., 1999; Wong & Tsai, 2007). Considering the significant research that has demonstrated that individualistic cultures promote an independent self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995), and considering that most models of shame and guilt have been based on Western samples, it is indeed likely that the conceptualisation of shame and guilt that has contributed to emotion research might be skewed towards an individualistic conceptualisation (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Exploring the experience of shame and guilt in
the context of other non-individualistic cultures that are rooted in other philosophical traditions and that have different views of the self might potentially reflect different views of shame and guilt (Camras & Fatani, 2004; Kitayama et al., 1995; Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004).

Collectivistic models of shame and guilt

Given the pivotal importance of the self in the emotions of shame, guilt and pride, having an interdependent self-concept has been argued to impact upon the appraisal, elicitors, and behavioural consequences of these self-conscious emotions (Wong & Tsai, 2007). In addition, having an interdependent sense of self may even blur the differentiation between shame and guilt in collectivistic cultures, as compared to individualistic cultures.

The differentiation between shame and guilt has been suggested to be less applicable in cultures that support an interdependent conceptualisation of the self (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Li, Wang, and Fischer (2004) produced a list of terms associated with shame in the Chinese language and requested participants to group the terms into different categories based on how similar or different the terms were to each other. Hierarchical cluster analyses revealed that participants perceived guilt as a component of shame, rather than as an independent construct of its own. Indeed, when translated into English, some Chinese terms that are related to shame are often translated as guilt (e.g., kui), or as a combination of shame and guilt (e.g., xiucan and xiukui) in English.

In many collectivistic cultures, the differences in the attributions associated with shame and guilt appear less salient than in individualistic cultures. In individualistic cultures, shame is associated with global and stable attributions, and guilt is associated with specific and temporary attributions. In contrast, Wikan (1984) found that shame was associated with temporary and specific actions in collectivistic cultures, rather than their global and stable characteristics. Swartz (1988) also argued that among the Swahili
of Mombasa in Africa, shame may result from the individual’s belief that others view his or her actions negatively. These findings have suggested that in some cultural contexts, shame is associated with the same attributions that are associated with guilt in Western individualistic contexts.

There is other evidence that shame and guilt may be more similar than different in collectivistic contexts. Bedford (2004) interviewed Chinese individuals and found three subtypes of guilt and four subtypes of shame in Chinese that were not distinguishable from each other in English. Although most subtypes of shame involved violations of others’ expectations and being negatively evaluated by others, one subtype of shame did not involve others’ judgments, and therefore reflected the individualistic concept of guilt. In addition, many subtypes of collectivistic shame appeared to incite pro-social behaviour, making it more similar to, rather than different from, individualistic guilt. For example, Bedford argued that can kui, a form of Chinese shame, worked to prompt individuals to perform to the best of their ability, and the fear of xiu kui, another form of Chinese shame that an individual experiences when he or she discovers inadequacies in their selves, was usually enough to deter shame-inducing actions.

Where shame has been distinguished from guilt within collectivistic contexts, the basis of the distinction also appears to be different from that of many individualistic cultures (Wong & Tsai, 2007). In describing shame and guilt in the Chinese culture, Bedford and Hwang (2003) argue that guilt is more effective as a regulatory emotion in individualistic cultures, as it is often related to more general standards that are held by the individual and others, but shame is more effective in collectivistic cultures, as it is associated with a code of standards that subjectively adapt to situations and relationships. Therefore, in collectivistic cultures, individuals might experience guilt when they feel an absolute standard is violated, whereas shame is experienced when a
situation-specific standard is violated (Wong & Tsai, 2007). This contrasts with the manner in which shame and guilt are distinguished in individualistic cultures and this cultural difference in the experience of shame and guilt has been argued to have its roots in Confucianism, a prominent practice and tradition in many East Asian cultures, which focuses heavily on situations and relations, contributing to the experience of shame in these contexts to be more socially appropriate than experiencing guilt (Bedford & Hwang, 2003; Cho, 2000).

Another problem in distinguishing shame from guilt in collectivistic cultures might also stem from the collectivist conceptualisation of the self, whereby individuals do not view themselves as independent of their relationships with others, their contexts, or their actions (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Consequentially, less emphasis is placed on having an internal orientation in collectivistic than in individualistic contexts (Morling, Kitayama, & Miyamoto, 2002). Therefore, the differences between shame and guilt in individualistic cultures, which predominantly rely on this distinction, may be less pronounced in collectivistic cultures.

The positive appraisal of shame in collectivistic cultures

The ancient Chinese philosopher, Confucius, has emphasised the positive value of shame in his statements, “To know the sense of shame is to draw close to courage” and “Guide them by example, subdue them by courtesy; they will learn shame, and come to be good”. In many collectivistic cultures, shame is understood as both a positive emotion and an appropriate emotional response to defeat or a wrongdoing (Wong & Tsai, 2007). As such, shame has a uniquely positive value in many non-Western cultures that is consistent with the interdependent goals of adapting to group standards and norms, and self-improvement (Wong & Tsai, 2007). In a study by Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, and Norasakkunkit (1997), Japanese participants were found to view acts of failure that evoked self-criticism as more pertinent to their self-
esteem than did their American counterparts, whereas Americans were found to perceive situations of success that enhanced their self-views as more relevant to their self-esteem than did the Japanese. These findings suggest that a negative appraisal of the self, which is an important element of shame, is not cross-culturally viewed as psychologically harmful. Indeed, negative perceptions of the self may have informational and motivational significance in collectivistic cultures.

Shame has also been found to be viewed more positively in the collectivistic Indian culture than in individualistic American culture. Menon and Shweder (1994) presented Indian and American participants with a list of three emotions (shame, happiness, and anger), and asked them to identify the emotion that was the most different from the other two. While Americans viewed happiness as being the most different from shame and anger, the Indians viewed anger as being the most different from happiness and shame. Menon and Shweder suggested that Indians viewed shame in a more positive manner than their American counterparts. Rozin (2003) subsequently replicated these findings and found that Americans perceived shame and anger as more similar to each other due to the negative valence placed on the two emotions, whereas Indians viewed shame and happiness as more similar to each other due to the more positive, pro-social attributions placed on the two emotions.

The positive appraisal of shame has also been found in Spanish individuals, who belong to a characteristically collectivistic culture. Fischer, Manstead, and Mosquera (1999) found that Spanish individuals, as compared to their Dutch counterparts, had more positive beliefs about shame and, therefore, were more prone to experiencing and expressing shame with other individuals. Another study comparing the semantic structure of emotions by Romney, Moore, and Rusch (1997) found that Japanese speakers perceived shame as more similar to other positive emotions, such as
excitement, love, and happiness, than for English speakers, for whom shame was perceived as more similar to negative emotions, such as anguish and fear.

Methods of parenting may largely contribute to the positive perception of shame in collectivistic cultures. Parents in Chinese cultures have been found to more likely endorse shaming as a strategy to educate and socialise their children about proper ways to behave than parents in the American culture (Fung, 1999; Fung & Chen, 2001; Fung, Lieber, & Leung, 2003). Chinese parents have been found to openly and publicly disclose and discuss their children’s wrongdoings for the purpose of evoking a sense of shame and motivating socially desirable behaviour in their children. Therefore, Chinese children appear to learn the word “shame” at an earlier age than do children in the United States and England (Shaver, Wu, & Schwartz, 1992). In addition to the influence of early socialisation, shame plays an important role in everyday life in many East Asian and other collectivistic contexts (Crystal, Parrott, Okazaki, & Watanabe, 2001). In comparison to American culture, Chinese culture has more elaborate models of shame and guilt. Li et al. (2004) found that 83 shame-related terms existed in a Chinese dictionary, and their Chinese participants were able to provide 113 terms and phrases that described shame. The multitude of shame terms suggests the complexity involved in the collectivistic conception of shame, such as in Chinese cultures, as compared to that of individualistic cultures (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Additionally, Tinsley and Weldon (2003) found that Chinese managers in Hong Kong were more likely than U.S. managers to use shame to resolve conflicts.

_Cultural differences in the elicitors of shame and guilt_

Elicitors of shame and guilt may also differ in individualistic and collectivistic contexts. Because individualistic cultural contexts understand the self as primarily separate and independent from others, only the individual who committed the wrongdoing typically feels shame or guilt (Wong & Tsai, 2007). However, collectivistic
cultural contexts understand the self as embedded within, and connected to, relationships with others (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Hence, in collectivistic models of shame and guilt, these emotions may be evoked by the action of others (Camras & Fatani, 2004). In a study where participants were presented with scenarios in which either they or a close family member was responsible for hypothetical misdeeds, Chinese individuals were found to be more likely to report feeling shame and guilt in response to a family member’s wrongdoing, as compared to their European American counterparts (Stipek, 1998). Likewise, in interviews with European American and Asian American college students, Liem (1997) found that when asked to describe a past shame event, Asian American students were more likely to talk about events experienced by close others than were European Americans.

Researchers have suggested that group-based shame, or vicarious shame, has been strongly associated with shame deterrence, whereby group-based shame has been argued to function as an in-group correction or deterrent device that prevents group members, and consequently the group itself, from breaching social norms and harming the group’s social status (Marques, Abrams, & Serodio, 2001; Welten, Zeelenberg, & Breugelmans, 2012). Shame, although often construed as a maladaptive experience, might serve as an internal deterrent that prevents individuals from engaging in wrongful behaviour (Heery, Keltner, & Capps, 2003; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). Researchers have proposed that while shame might function to motivate short-term avoidance of the wrongful act, it might even motivate a desire to change the self over time (Lickel, Schmader, & Spanovic, 2007). Such behaviour may have the adaptive function of improving in-group interpersonal relationships, as well as preventing ostracism or aggression from others (Lickel et al., 2007). Given that vicarious shame has been found to be more likely to be experienced by individuals from a collectivistic culture, there may be a greater possibility that shame may not only be more valued in
collectivistic cultures (Fung, 1999), but may also be more actively avoided, or deterred from, by collectivistic individuals for the purposes of maintaining social harmony.

Although the current literature has established that individuals from collectivistic and individualistic cultures differ in their proneness towards experiencing certain self-conscious emotions, such as shame, pride and guilt, there is a lack of research on the influence of cultural variations in shame, pride and guilt on the individual’s psychological well-being. The present study aims to contribute to the literature an understanding of how culture impacts on the individual’s experience of self-conscious emotions, and subsequently, how any associated psychological distress is managed by the individual within their cultural contexts. For example, individuals from collectivistic cultures may experience more guilt-proneness than individuals from individualistic cultures. However, owing to the way collectivistic cultures value interpersonal relationships, their greater levels of guilt-proneness may not actually manifest in greater psychological distress. It may be that collectivistic cultures might have existing social support systems that assist the individual with ways of regulating and diffusing negative self-conscious emotions. Though few in number, some studies have investigated the impact of shame and guilt on psychological well-being between different ethnic groups within the same wider cultural context (Meehan, O’Connor, Berry, Morrison, & Acampora, 1996). However, not many studies have specifically assessed the impact of self-conscious emotions on psychological well-being between collectivistic and individualistic societies (e.g. Singaporeans in Singapore versus Australians in Australia).

Cross-cultural perspectives on pride

As compared to shame and guilt, cross-cultural exploration into the experience of pride has received much less attention, and is, in general, an area of emotion research that has yet to be well established in the literature. Studies have yet to investigate
specific cultural differences between the experience of different types of pride (i.e.,
hubristic and authentic pride; Tracy & Robins, 2007c) between individualistic and
collectivistic cultures, as well as the culture-specific relationship of pride with
psychological well-being. The present study aims to contribute to the literature by
exploring and illuminating specific differences between individualistic and collectivistic
cultures in the experience of authentic and hubristic pride, so as to attain an
understanding of how pride, as a positive self-conscious emotion, operates cross-
culturally.

Although both the universal recognition of the expression of pride, as well as the
two-facet structure of pride have been established in the literature, researchers have
argued that there may be strong cultural differences in the experience and expression of
pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007a, Yan et al., 2015). The situations that elicit pride, as well
as the manner in which pride is perceived and appraised by the self and by others, have
been suggested to differ between individualistic and collectivistic cultures (Eid &
Indeed, studies have found that pride is perceived more negatively in collectivistic
cultures, as compared to individualistic cultures (Eid & Diener, 2001). Individuals from
China and Taiwan, two collectivistic cultures, were found to consider the emotion of
pride as undesirable, whereas individuals from individualistic cultures, such as the
United States of America, were found to report a positive value toward the emotion of
pride (Eid & Diener, 2001). Individuals belonging to an individualistic culture were also
found to readily express more positive feelings when describing their experience of
pride to others, as compared to individuals from a collectivistic culture (Mosquera,
Manstead, & Fischer, 2000).

In a study that assessed the emotion of pride in five cultures – Asian American,
European American, Hispanic American, Indian, and Japanese – Hispanic individuals,
despite belonging to a collectivistic culture, were found to report the greatest levels of pride-proneness, and the three Asian cultures were found to report the least (Scollon, Diener, Oishi, & Biswas-Diener, 2004). In addition, the intriguing complexity of the cultural differences of pride were further highlighted when Scollon et al. (2004) found that individuals from India associated pride with negative emotions, while individuals from Japan associated pride with positive emotions. Indeed, while it appears that collectivistic Asian cultures may have reported lesser levels of pride-proneness, the perceived value and social function of pride may also greatly differ from that of individualistic cultures.

Researchers have attempted to theoretically untangle the cultural differences of the experience of pride through the application of the two distinct facets of pride. Tracy and Robins (2007b) have suggested that the primary conceptualisation of pride in collectivistic cultures may be skewed toward the hubristic element, which may account for the more negative view of pride found in many collectivistic cultures. In addition, pride may be socially valued in collectivistic cultures, as long as the pride relates to the individual’s social group, as opposed to the individual’s self (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Stipek (1998) found that Chinese individuals, as compared to individuals from the United States of America, reported more positive views of pride that were associated with others’ accomplishments, rather than their own.

In general, pride has been universally considered as a positive and adaptive emotion that functions to gain, maintain and enhance an individual’s social status (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). However, culture appears to be a factor that may strongly influence the manner in which the two distinct facets of the emotion are regulated, expressed, evaluated and valued. Researchers have suggested that future research on pride should explore the existence of both hubristic and authentic pride cross-culturally, as well as to further disentangle the potentially unique functions of the two separate
functions of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). To my knowledge, cross-cultural interactions between the experiences of the two distinct facets of pride with other self-conscious emotions, or culturally salient variables, such as filial piety, have yet to be fully explored in the literature.

The collectivistic self: The role of filial piety

Filial piety (xiao) is a prominent concept in Confucianism that relates to important ideas about how children should treat their parents. It comprises physical and emotional requirements, such as support, memorialising, attendance, deference, compliance, respect and love, and its structures are often generalised to apply to authority relationships beyond the family (Yeh & Bedford, 2003). Undoubtedly, Confucian values consistently form the core of most Asian cultures, and continue to penetrate different levels of social life, and also set the standards for most families, communities and political behaviour (Yeh, Yi, Tsao, & Wan, 2013; Yim, Lee, & Ebbeck, 2011). For example, the prevalence of Asian education systems incorporating the bridging of Confucian values with different aspects of early childhood education has been documented in the literature (Yim et al., 2011).

Research on the role of filial piety in the context of modern Confucian societies has led to conflicting findings with regard to filial piety’s overall helpful or harmful impact on individual psychological development. For example, filial piety has been correlated with better intergenerational relationships (Lawrence, Bennett, & Markides, 1992), lower levels of parent-child conflict (Yeh & Bedford, 2003) and greater financial, physical and emotional support for parents (Ishii-Kuntz, 1997). However, filial attitudes have also been found to positively correlate with parental emphasis on obedience, indebtedness to parents, impulse control, proper conduct, overprotection, harshness and inhibition of children’s self-expression, self-mastery and general personal development (Ho, 1994).
Yeh (2003) developed a dual filial piety model that identified and integrated two focal concepts of filial piety - reciprocity and authoritarianism. Reciprocal filial piety is understood to encompass emotionally and spiritually attending to one’s parents out of gratitude for their efforts in having raised one, and physical and financial care for one’s parents as they age. The beneficial aspects of filial piety identified in previous research, such as enhanced interpersonal relationships, interpersonal skills, and psychosocial adjustment, reflect reciprocal filial piety (Yeh, 2009; Yeh & Bedford, 2003). In contrast, authoritarian filial piety entails the suppression of one’s own desires and compliance with one’s parents’ wishes because of their seniority in physical, financial or social terms, as well as continuing the family lineage and maintaining one’s parents’ reputation because of the force of role requirements. Authoritarian filial piety emphasises hierarchy and submission, and it reflects the generally negative findings on filial piety, such as neuroticism, depression and anxiety (Yeh, 2009; Yeh & Bedford, 2003). Researchers have argued that filial piety cannot be understood unless its dual nature is recognised and applied in both theory and research (Yeh, 2003; Laidlaw, Wang, Coelho, & Power, 2010). The dual filial piety model has been empirically validated to reflect filial piety in modern Chinese Confucianistic societies (Yeh & Bedford, 2003; Yeh et al., 2013).

Teaching young people about filial concepts in daily life has traditionally been seen as a basic duty of teachers and parents in Confucianistic societies, such as Singapore. Since 1990, Singapore’s Ministry of Education has made Civics and Moral Education (CME) a compulsory part of its curriculum in both public and private education institutions, spanning from the primary to the pre-college levels of education (7 to 18 years old). The Singapore government has emphasised the focus of CME to be nurturing people of good character and useful citizens. The CME syllabus is founded on six core values that reflect the teachings of Confucianism - namely, Respect, Resilience,
Responsibility, Integrity, Care and Harmony. Through the use of stories, case studies and real life situations, the CME programme has focused on teaching students these values and guiding them towards putting the values into practice in the domains of self, family, community, nation and the world.

*Filial Piety in Western Cultures*

In contrast to collectivistic Asian societies, Western cultures appear to encompass fewer philosophies of care that actively encourage sacrifice and care for older generations. When asked to report on age stereotype statements, younger people were found to hold negative attitudes towards ageing and older people (Slotterback & David, 1996). In addition, the education system in a Western culture, such as Australia, does not actively incorporate programmes, such as CME, as a part of its compulsory syllabus. Specifically, with regard to Australia, CME is more likely to be perceived as a valuable inclusion into the syllabus in private schools, as compared to their public school counterparts. This differing attitude towards filial piety in Western cultures, including the predominantly negative attributes that abound when talking about older people in a global, less personal way, has raised concerns about the increasing numbers of older people in society who are seen as burdens or drains on resources (WHO, 2002).

Culturally relevant concepts such as filial piety may be important to study in conjunction with self-conscious emotions and culture, as they may offer valuable insight into culturally-specific societal values. For example, reciprocal or authoritarian filial piety may relate to separation guilt, a form of maladaptive guilt that specifically relates to the belief that separating from, or differing from, one’s loved ones will cause them harm (O’Connor, Berry, Weiss, Bush, & Sampson, 1997). The distorted sense of disloyalty that characterises separation guilt, which has been found to result in behaviours that are motivated by the need to consistently protect and remain loyal to
parents and loved ones (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997; Weiss & Sampson, 1986), may have a specific relationship with authoritarian filial piety.

The current thesis will attempt to gain an understanding of the cross-cultural operation of the relationship between separation guilt and authoritarian filial piety, as well as the impact of this relationship on psychological well-being. Likewise, by conducting more fine-grained analyses on the cross-cultural relationships between filial attitudes, self-conscious emotions and psychological distress, the current literature’s understanding of the complex nature of self-conscious emotions will be extended.
CHAPTER 2: SHAME, GUILT AND PRIDE

Negative self-conscious emotions: Shame and guilt

The literature has established that, historically, the distinction between shame and guilt has been neglected by social emotion researchers (Tangney, 2001). One of the early attempts to differentiate shame from guilt (Ausubel, 1955) identified guilt as a private emotion, and shame as a public one. Empirical research, however, disconfirmed this distinction and suggested that the existence of an audience was not the key element that distinguished the two emotions (Tangney et al., 1996). Instead, a more metaphorical existence (Taylor, 1985), rather than an actual physical audience, was suggested to be one of the distinguishing features of guilt and shame (see also Crozier, 1998; Martenz, 2005). However, Taylor (1985) argued that an actual or imaginary audience was not necessary for an individual to experience shame. According to Taylor (1985), shame requires a self-critical and sophisticated self-consciousness, which is dependent upon the concept of another, such that this sophisticated self-consciousness allows the individual to realise the discrepancy of his/her own assumptions about his/her actual action or state and a possible detached observer-description of that action or state.

In general, according to the prevailing emotion literature, people experience both shame and guilt when they have violated standards or norms (Lewis, 1987; Tangney, 1991). However, while shame occurs when one is negatively evaluated by others for behaving inappropriately, involves global and stable attributions for transgressions, and is associated with maladaptive consequences such as withdrawal of oneself from social support, guilt is experienced when one negatively evaluates one’s own self for behaving inappropriately, involves specific and temporary attributions for transgressions, and is associated with adaptive consequences (Wong & Tsai, 2007).
The Social Function of Shame

Researchers have proposed that, according to the social self-preservation theory, (Dickerson, Gruenewald, & Kemeny, 2004; Kemeny, Gruenewald, & Dickerson, 2004), shame is experienced when the fundamental goal of maintaining a positive social self is threatened. Dickerson and colleagues (2004) have argued that situations that threaten the social self elicit a psychobiological response that is characterised by the experience of shame and physiological processes, which ultimately serve to signal and resource mobilisation functions to address the threat itself. Threats to the social self have been suggested to occur when there is an actual or potential loss of social status, esteem or acceptance (Gruenewald, Dickerson, & Kemeny, 2007).

Shame has been proposed to arise as the central emotion that is experienced when one’s abilities, competencies, or characteristics that are associated with a positive social image are compromised, or when the individual is subject to exclusion and rejection (Gilbert, 1997). Researchers have proposed that the social self is vital for maintaining social relationships for the evolutionary purpose of survival and reproduction (Gruenewald et al., 2007). A positive social self is believed to impact upon how much others will invest in, and provide resources to, the individual. Consequently, a positive social self has been linked to the fostering of cordial and cooperative social relationships (Seeman, 2000). While ensuring that the social self is enhanced and preserved allows the individual to thrive and survive, effective communication of an inferior social self with others has also been highlighted as critical to survival (Gruenewald et al., 2007). For example, recognising one’s own inferior social status may result in a diminishment of conflict and a reduced chance of being aggressed against by superior others (Gruenewald et al., 2007).

Shame has been argued to exist as the “premier social emotion” that arises in situations through which the social self, or a social bond, is at risk of being harmed.
Shame has been highlighted as an emotion that is part of the signalling process of a damaged social status, which is characteristic of a diminished social self (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995). Phenomenological research has found that shame experiences have been associated with a feeling of inferiority to others, social isolation, and a desire to withdraw from others (Tangney et al., 1996). Shame has also been found to be elicited in situations involving poor performance, causing emotional hurt to others, failure to meet one’s own or others’ expectations, and socially unacceptable behaviour (Keltner & Buswell, 1996). Izard (1977) has also highlighted the role of shame in promoting harmonious social relationships by sensitising individuals to the opinions of others. Indeed, empirical research has shown support for the link between shame and the threatened social self. For example, shame was found to increase to a greater degree when tasks were performed under social evaluation, which indicated that shame was more sensitive to social aspects of performance than other emotions (Gruenewald, Kemeny, Aziz, & Fahey, 2004).

**Characteristics of Shame**

The word ‘shame’ is believed to be derived from two Indo-European words, ‘(s)kem-’ and ‘(s)kam-’, whereby the meaning of these words is to cover (Schneider, 1980). Schneider (1980) associated shame with the particular desire to cover, or hide, something that has been exposed. The emotion of shame has been strongly associated with the quality of the entire self, as well as a painful and negative scrutinising of the self (Kaufman, 1989; Lewis, 1971). Although guilt also involves negative affect, the experience of guilt involves a specific action, or the absence of action, ultimately resulting in a self that is intact and preserved. In contrast, the experience of shame has the potential to be more devastating, as it has been strongly associated with a sense of
being exposed, feeling worthless, powerless, shrinking or wanting to hide, or sinking into the floor (Lewis, 1971).

Researchers have argued that shame-prone individuals learn to disengage from many of their basic human needs, such as the need for relationships, non-sexual touch, to nurture and be nurtured, as a result of having these needs shamed (Young, 1991), resulting in difficulties with achieving an integrated self-concept (Kaufman, 1989). As a result of their beliefs about their selves and others, shame-prone individuals make an effort to deter themselves from shameful experiences with others by developing defensive scripts such as denial, withdrawal, arrogance, blaming, perfectionism, and rage (Kaufman, 1989; Tangney, 1990). Kaufman (1989) proposed that anger is used by shamed individuals to alter the field of interpersonal interaction, so that they can turn the tides of power back to themselves and away from the perceived shaming other. Establishing a sense of power and dominance is believed to enable the shamed individual to protect his or herself from the fundamental fear of abandonment, and to minimise the risk of damaging interpersonal social relationships. Kaufman (1989) has also argued that shame can be fixed to the very experience of self in the shame-based identity scripts, such that the defensive scripts work to protect the self from being perceived as inadequate and, therefore, unlovable (Wallace & Nosko, 1993).

Both research and theory have also linked shame to aggression via a relational devaluation that results in social pain and social threat (Elison, Garofalo, & Velotti, 2014; MacDonald & Leary, 2005). From an evolutionary perspective, theorists have suggested that a psychobiological chain of events from shame to anger and aggression occur through the association between physical and social pain (Elison et al., 2014). MacDonald and Leary (2005) have proposed that the fight response is a common occurrence as evolution capitalised on the existence of physical pain, assimilating the physical pain mechanism and its related threat-defence strategies (MacDonald & Leary,
Therefore, individuals are suggested to have learnt to utilise the threat defence in response to the social pain that is involved in the experience of shame, even though the fight response is probably less adaptive in response to social threats than to physical threats (MacDonald & Leary, 2005). As such, shame and anger have been suggested to be psychobiologically linked as strategies for managing social and relational threats (Elison et al., 2014). Additionally, researchers have found that a tendency to externalise blame has been found to mediate the link between shame and aggression (Stuewig, Tangney, Heigel, Harty, & McCloskey, 2010). Velotti, Elison and Garofalo (2014) have highlighted the importance of understanding the function of anger and aggression by acknowledging the role of shame as a trigger to aggression. In particular, the link between shame and aggression has been observed in partner violence, incarcerated violent offenders, and personality disorders (Narcissistic, Borderline, Antisocial), with shame as a common antecedent to violence (Velotti et al., 2014).

Researchers have also differentiated between shame and guilt in terms of the nature of their elicitors. Some researchers argue that the emotions differ in their orientation to self or others. While shame is believed to typically involve the perception that one is being negatively evaluated by others, guilt has been suggested to typically involve the perception that one is being negatively evaluated by one’s own self (Smith, Webster, Parrott, & Eyre, 2002). Specifically, while shame has an “external” orientation (i.e., being oriented to others), guilt has an “internal” orientation (i.e., being oriented to the self). Overall, shame has been associated with the fear of exposing one’s defective self to others, and guilt has been associated with the fear of not living up to one’s own standards (Kitayama, Markus, & Matsumoto, 1995). Consistent with this distinction, studies have found that compared to guilt, shame has been found to occur more frequently in the presence of others (Smith et al., 2002). Similarly, Lewis (1985) argued that people who experience shame are more sensitive to contextual cues and pay more
attention to others than those who experience guilt (Lewis, 1985; Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

Phenomenological research has focused on the position and role of the self in the experience of shame and guilt attributions. Lewis (1971) was among the first to explore the emotion of shame from a phenomenological perspective, where shame was viewed as focusing on the entire self and as an affective state that emerged upon the foundations of internal, global, stable and uncontrollable attributions. While shame has been conceived as a socially-derived affect, involving the self’s attempts to maintain emotional relationships with others, Lewis’s (1971) introduction of the concept of the internalised other was largely responsible for extending upon the concept of shame beyond that of an emotional reaction to others’ disapproval. Instead, shame was conceptualised as an emotion arising out of negative self-evaluation, which may not necessarily have been triggered by the actual presence of public condemnation (Lewis, 1971). Shame has since been suggested by researchers to function as a means of inhibiting pride through diminishing the excitement that is associated with the fantasy of being admired or sought after by others (Lewis, 1971).

Three pivotal characteristics of the phenomena of shame, proposed by Lewis (1971), were later supported by many other researchers over time. The first of these involves the difficulty of identifying shame. Lewis (1971) proposed that there existed an inherent connection between shame and mechanisms of denial, whereby shame is conceptualised as such an intensely painful experience that, despite its availability to consciousness, the individual will not, and cannot, identify the feeling till it is in the process of dissipating. The term, “overt shame”, has been used to describe occasions when shame is difficult to identify, largely due to its potential to occur simultaneously with guilt (Lewis, 1971). For example, while an individual may blame themselves for a wrongdoing, they may also blame themselves for failing to live up to expectations.
Similarly, “bypassed shame” has been proposed to be another form of denial or distancing that leads to difficulty with identifying shame. In experiencing bypassed shame, the individual is believed to separate the cognitive and affective content of shame-related events, so that they only possess an awareness of the cognitive content of shame-related events, without any true emotional connection to shame (Lewis, 1971).

The focal point of evaluation – behaviour vs. self – is a widely established factor that determines the nature of shame and guilt. Most theories that distinguish guilt from shame agree that shame involves a sense that the entire self is bad, whereas guilt involves a focus on particular misdeeds (Barrett, 1995; Lewis, 1971 Tangney, 1991). Accordingly, guilt is experienced when an individual’s behaviour is the focus of evaluation, and shame is experienced when the individual targets his/her own self in the case of failure or wrongdoing (Tangney, 1998). Although both emotions occur when someone has committed a wrongdoing that results in being negatively evaluated by others, the emotions differ in the focal point of the misdeed. Specifically, when people attribute their transgression to their global and stable self (“I can’t believe I did that”), they are said to experience shame. In contrast, when people attribute their wrongdoings to behaviour or actions (“I can’t believe I did that”), they are said to experience guilt (Lewis, 1987; Tangney, 1991, 1998; Tracy & Robins, 2004a). It has been suggested that an individual who experiences guilt thinks that they committed a wrongdoing, by which the act of wrongdoing itself is separate to what he/she really is. In contrast, the experience of shame is associated with the belief that the misdeed is inextricably connected to the wrongdoer’s identity (Taylor, 1985; Tilghman-Osborne, Cole & Felton, 2010). Therefore, it is unsurprising that shame has been conceptualised as an emotion that is more devastating and detrimental to one’s self-concepts and self-esteem, as compared to guilt (Wong & Tsai, 2007).
The second characteristic of shame is the difficulty involved with dissipating the hostility of the emotion (Lewis, 1971). According to Lewis (1971), while both shame and guilt have been acknowledged as painful, negative self-appraisals, guilt is associated with a negative evaluation of a specific behaviour, and the self as the source of evaluation. In contrast, when experiencing shame, the self is proposed to be split, as it operates both as the object of evaluation, as well as the source of evaluation. The emotion of shame has been argued to cause a reduction of the self in both perceived size and functional efficacy, causing the individual to feel small, powerless, and wanting to withdraw or to crawl through a hole (Lewis, 1971; Tangney, 1991). Physical symptoms such as blushing and sweating have been reported to be accompanied by feelings of worthlessness, powerlessness and inaction (Tangney, 1990). What researchers have described as a powerless and ‘wordless’ blank state (Lewis, 1971) that accompanies shame has been associated with a temporary loss of self, likened to a dissociative reaction, that involves an interruption of cognitive processes.

Shame is believed to interrupt the individual’s cognitive functioning in that it possesses a tendency to result in obsessive rumination (Orth, Berking, & Burkhardt, 2006). Lewis (1971) argues that when experiencing shame, the self is divided, whereby the individual simultaneously experiences perceived intense condemnation by the other while in the activity of acute self-consciousness. Ironically, while in this state of heightened awareness, Lewis notes that the individual is actually not perceiving their self, nor the environment, accurately. Indeed, Lewis has proposed that it is this moment of split functioning that results in the difficulty for the individual to find an act of solution to the feeling of shame. Indeed, shame may render the individual incapable of and unable to take accurate and constructive action to repair the wrongful act, even when the emotion of shame is accurately acknowledged within the individual (Lewis, 1971). The aspect of controllability of an action’s consequence has also been applied to
distinguishing between shame and guilt by Weiner (1985). While guilt has been proposed by Weiner to be experienced as a consequence of failure due to a lack of effort, shame has been argued to emerge in the event that failure is self-related and uncontrollable, such as in the lack of ability.

External and Internal Shame

Theories of shame have developed to distinguish between an internally focused (on self) and externally focused (on the other) attention upon the individual (Arndt & Goldenberg, 2004). Gilbert (1997, 1998) suggested that when the focus of shame is on what others are thinking about the self, this can be called external shame. When external shame is experienced, the attention and monitoring systems are focused externally and primarily on what others might be thinking of the individual. External shame has been likened to other threat defences, such as an approaching predator, where feelings and actions are highly coordinated to tracking the actions, signals, and intents from others. However, threats in the social domain are significantly modified by various competencies, such as theory of mind and metacognition, and the self-perception of one’s existence for the other.

In contrast, internal shame has been linked to complex memory systems – for example, of scenes of previous episodes of being shamed (Kaufman, 1989), and self-evaluation where attention turns inward to the self and self-feelings and judgements (Tracy & Robins, 2004a). When internal shame is experienced, researchers argue that self-evaluation is partly linked to our imaginary audiences that have been created through experiences with others (Baldwin, 1997). Internal shame has also been linked to a process of shaming where individuals can be self-critical and self-persecuting. This dynamic has been stated to succeed the notion of self-blame, as it involves emotions, such as anger and contempt, in self-to-self relationships (Gilbert & Irons, 2005; Whelton & Greenberg, 2005). Extreme cases of internal shame have been found to
result in severe self-hate and a potential drive towards intentionally hurting oneself (Gilbert, 2007). Internal shame has been strongly linked to a self-perception of one being “unattractive”, whereby it is not merely a failure to reach a standard, but a closeness to an undesired and unattractive self (Gilbert, 2007).

If internal shame is linked to self-criticisms and having negative images of self in one’s own eyes, two factors may influence the degree of shame. One is the type of intensity of negative emotions directed at the self. The other is the ability to activate self-soothing systems when failing (Gilbert, 2007). Research has found that low self-critics find it easier to activate self-soothing when confronted by their own failure and criticisms. Evidence for this has been found in a study showing that self-criticism and depressive symptoms were significantly related to the inability to be self-reassuring (Gilbert, Clark, Hempel, Miles, & Irons, 2004). In another study, self-criticism was associated with difficulties in forming images of supportive and compassionate aspects of oneself (Gilbert, Baldwin, Irons, Baccus, & Clark, 2005). In both studies, self-criticism was reported to be highly associated with external shame, leading to the proposal that the experience of internal shame is linked to both the power of these emotions directed at the self and the inability to access self-soothing via positive images of, and feelings for, the self (Gilbert, 2007).

Clinical implications of shame within psychotherapy

It is only in recent years that shame has begun to receive more attention within the clinical context of psychotherapy. In clinical settings, shame can be elicited by the client, the therapeutic process, and the therapist (Tangney & Dearing, 2011). Specifically, clients take into the therapeutic process shame evoked from experiencing psychological difficulties and the stigma of mental illness and past failures in resolving their problems (Tangney & Dearing, 2011). The therapeutic context, in itself, can be shame evoking, due to the expectation that clients expose their vulnerabilities and
weaknesses before the therapist, who is often portrayed as an infallible fixer of psychological health (Greenberg & Iwakabe, 2011). Additionally, therapists, being human with limitations and vulnerabilities, can also experience shame in the therapeutic context via the perceived pressure of having to provide effective therapy and through the process of transference (Herman, 2011; Ladany, Klinger, & Kulp, 2011).

With particular regard to the Western context, the negative connotation of shame has rendered the emotion both easily overlooked and intentionally avoided by both clients and therapists alike (Teyber, McClure, & Weathers, 2011). Processing the emotion of shame effectively and efficiently within a psychologically safe space, such as psychotherapy, can afford the client vital improvement and independence in the realms of emotional and behavioural regulation, self-esteem, and perceived control over psychological distress. Master clinicians have argued for the need for therapists to be able to recognise both the primary and secondary indicators of shame in clients, such as via the verbal, nonverbal and paralinguistic cues that may signal underlying shame, as well as shame manifesting through defensive mechanisms and secondary emotions of anger, avoidance, denial, envy and grandiosity (Herman, 2011).

Therapists can assist clients to process the ubiquitous emotion of shame within psychotherapy by adopting a person-centred approach and motivational interviewing to reduce shame by validating and empowering clients, working on the basis of the client’s values (Tangey & Dearing, 2011). By gaining an understanding of the cross-cultural differences in the function of shame, clinicians will be better able to treat and tailor intervention of the individual’s shame-proneness within the context that the individual understands the emotion of shame. Self-conscious emotions, such as shame and guilt, have been suggested to be normalised in the therapeutic context, so as to empower clients with the skills to acknowledge painful emotions (Herman, 2011; Tangney & Dearing, 2011). In line with research that has supported shame-proneness to be highly
associated with self-criticism, master clinicians have identified the development of self-compassion as a vital method for shame regulation (Gilbert, 2011). Additionally, Greenberg and Iwakabe (2011) have suggested that inward-focused shame can be transformed into behaviour-focused guilt and other adaptive behaviour and emotions, which focuses on the client’s strengths, amending wrongdoings, and establishing or repairing social ties.

**Guilt: An Interpersonal Construct**

Guilt and shame have different and profound implications for social behaviour. Guilt is believed to arise in relation to moral circumstances, leading to approach behaviours, such as compensating for a misdeed (Wolf, Cohen, Panter & Chester, 2010). In contrast, shame may result from both moral transgressions, as well as non-moral events, such as experiencing feelings of inferiority (Benetti-McQuoid & Bursik, 2005), which may lead to avoidant behaviour, such as withdrawal or leaving the situation (Wolf et al., 2010). In general, guilt has been largely associated with moral behaviours, due to its focus on one’s own behaviour, whereas shame, which has been associated with a concern about the negative perspective of others on the individual, has been found to result in a sense of worthlessness.

In essence, guilt is experienced when one fails to meet internalised social standards (Orth, Robins, & Soto, 2010), leading to regret that is expressed over these failures and attempts to relieve the guilt experience by taking reparative actions (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). But, several discrepancies continue to cluster around the construct of guilt. When guilt has been conceptualised as an adaptive construct, negative correlations between guilt and psychological distress have been established (Tangney, 1994; Williams & Bybee, 1994). However, when conceptualised as a negative construct, positive correlations have been found to exist between guilt and psychological distress (Harder, 1995; Kugler & Jones, 1992). Therefore, the literature
has established that guilt, as an interpersonal construct, may have both adaptive and maladaptive qualities.

*Behavioural Correlates of Guilt and Shame*

Researchers have investigated the adaptive and maladaptive conceptions of guilt and shame by investigating behavioural correlates of such self-conscious emotions. Since the 1990s, empirical research has defined guilt as an agitation-based emotion, which is often accompanied by feelings of regret, fear, worry, anxiety, and a desire to amend the wrongdoing that is perceived as violation of an internal moral standard. By contrast, shame has been defined as a dejection-based emotion, often accompanied by feelings of helplessness, incompetence, and a wish to withdraw and isolate the self from others (Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999; Tangney, 1991; Tangney, Burggraf, & Wagner, 1995). Hoffman (1982) asserts that guilt-related emotions promote reparative behaviour and motivational activation, while shame-related emotions elicit withdrawal behaviour and motivational inhibition.

Both guilt and shame have been widely established in the literature as two moral emotions that may promote socially desirable behaviour (Eisenberg, 2000). The socio-functionality of guilt has been argued to contribute greatly to the development of morality, with specific regard to how the function of guilt in empathic arousal encourages prosocial behaviour (Hoffman, 1982). Studies have validated Hoffman’s theory of empathy-based guilt, whereby the experience of guilt has been found to lead to higher self-esteem, and an increase in prosocial behaviour, empathy and perspective taking (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994; Kochanska, De Vet, Goldman, Murray, & Putnam, 1994; Krevans & Gibbs, 1996; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, 1998), and reparative behaviours in children (Zahn-Waxler, 2000).

Children who express more guilt after a wrongdoing have been found to be less likely to violate desirable behaviour standards, and early guilt-proneness has been found
to predict future morality in young children (Kochanska, Gross, Lin & Nichols, 2002). Thus, with respect to the adaptive nature of guilt in young children, the feeling of guilt is considered necessary for social development as it assists the inhibition of behaviour that violates social rules (Kochanska et al., 2002). Guilt has also been argued to play a positive role in relationship enhancement and efficacy in interpersonal problem solving (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995; Covert, Tangney, Maddux, & Heleno, 2003; Konstam, Chernoff, & Deveney, 2001; Leith & Baumeister, 1998). In general, these studies have suggested that guilt is a feeling that is related to the development of conscience and pro-social behaviour in children, as well as conscientious behaviour in young adults.

In contrast, shame-proneness has been positively related to distressing and problematic behaviours and inversely related to empathic responsiveness (Dearing, Stuewig, & Tangney, 2005; Tangney, 1991). Indeed, shame has been argued to have a compounding effect upon itself, through which consequential rumination or physical effects such as blushing and perspiring, may act to further exacerbate the experience of shame (Lewis, 1971). This has led to the argument that the experience of shame not only warrants the desire to hide and withdraw from the immediate perceived shaming other, but also from similar future situations that may be perceived as having the potential to trigger a shame response (Tangney, 1991). In line with these findings, studies have reported that shame-prone individuals have been found to more likely engage in avoidance and withdrawal, to experience inward anger, and to blame others than are guilt-prone individuals (Lutwak, Panish, Ferrari, & Razzino, 2001; Tangney, 1991; Tangney & Fischer, 1995).

In the current literature, shame has been strongly linked to problematic psychological symptoms, such as anger, internalising and externalising behaviours, self-condemnation, suspiciousness, resentment, irritability, obsessive-compulsive behaviour
disorder, psychoticism, depression and personal distress (Ferguson et al., 1999; Lewis, 1987; Lutwak et al., 2001; Orth et al., 2006; Pineles, Street, & Koenen, 2006; Scheff, 1998; Tangney et al., 1995; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992; Tantam, 1998; Tracy & Robins, 2004a) and to physiological stress (Dickerson et al., 2004; Gruenewald et al., 2004). In addition, shame has been empirically demonstrated to be positively related to hostility and anger (Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992), depression (Tangney et al., 1995), secret-keeping in therapy (Hill, Thompson, Cogar, & Denman III, 1993), eating disorders (Cleary, 1992), as well as chemical addictions (Young, 1991), as well as a myriad of psychological symptoms of distress (Tangney et al., 1992). In contrast, shame-free guilt (guilt controlling for shame) has remained unrelated to such problem behaviours and has been found to be positively linked to empathic responsiveness (Ferguson et al., 1999; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Niendenthal, Tangney, & Gavanski, 1994).

Although the majority of the research in this area has converged in their findings regarding the maladaptive nature of shame, some researchers have found shame to be associated with empathy, motivations to repair, apologise and reform, at both the individual and group levels (De Hooge, Breugelmans, & Zeelenberg, 2008; DeHooge, Zeelenberg, & Bruegelmans, 2010; Fontaine, Luyten, De Boeck, & Corveleyn, 2001; Gausel, Leach, Vignoles, and Brown, 2012). Generally, the destructive nature of shame-proneness has been widely accepted in the literature (Baumeister et al., 1994; Tangney, 2001). However, it should be noted that much of the research that has confirmed the maladaptive nature of shame has been conducted within Western contexts, and there exists much debate on the universal validity of shame as a destructive self-conscious emotion. Recent research has suggested the possibility that shame might prompt both defensive, as well as prosocial motives (Tangney, Stuewig, & Martinez, 2014).
As much as the adaptive nature of guilt has been both theorised and empirically validated in the literature (Barrett, 1995; Bybee & Quiles, 1998; Campos, Mumme, Kermoian, & Campos, 1994; Ferguson & Stegge, 1998; Harder, 1995; Harder, Cutler, & Rockert, 1992; Kugler & Jones, 1992; Lindsay-Hartz, De Rivera, & Mascolo, 1995), there exists both theory and research that challenge the conceptualisation of guilt as an exclusively adaptive emotion (Tangney, 1991). From a functionalist perspective, emotions serve a purpose; whether they are adaptive or maladaptive is dependent upon the situation and on the function of the emotion in the context of the individual’s life (Barrett, 1995; Campos et al., 1994; Ferguson & Stegge, 1998; Ferguson, Stegge, & Damhius, 1991). Specifically, guilt may be adaptive in the event that it motivates the individual to be concerned with the well-being of others, and maladaptive when it causes the individual to focus on their own ego in the form of self-punishment and, eventually, excessively guilt-driven behaviours (Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995). Likewise, shame can be maladaptive when the individual adopts others’ perspectives as the only means of approaching a particular issue, but can also be adaptive when the emotion causes the individual to commit towards change that ultimately drives the resolving of the experienced shame (Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995). It has been proposed that such adaptive shame experiences can also assist the individual with acquiring self-knowledge through the others’ perspectives and foster deference to standards of group conduct (Barrett, 1995; Ferguson et al., 1991). In addition to the context in which self-conscious emotions are experienced, how the individual regulates the emotion can also contribute to how functional or dysfunction it is to the individual (Bybee & Quiles, 1998).

_A Multidimensional Construction of Guilt_

The consideration that guilt can function both adaptively and maladaptively (Ferguson & Stegge, 1998; Ferguson, Stegge, Eyre, Vollmer, & Ashbaker, 2000; Kugler
& Jones, 1992; Zahn-Waxler, Kochanska, Krupnick, & McKnew, 1990) and that degree of impact may vary as a function of cognition and affect (Kubany, Abueg, Kilauano, Manke, & Kaplan, 1997; Kubany & Watson, 2003) have led some researchers to conceptualise guilt as a multidimensional construct. Zahn-Waxler et al. (1990) proposed that action-oriented adaptive guilt is often accompanied by reparative behaviour and helping others, whereas maladaptive guilt encompasses an excessive, self-critical feeling that is often accompanied by a sense of responsibility for everything that goes wrong. This development of adaptive and maladaptive guilt has been widely assessed in children, whereby researchers have stated that maladaptive forms of guilt may develop during childhood years, during which the child is suggested to have formed an overgeneralised sense of responsibility and an unrealistic belief in the effect of their own behaviour on the adversity of others (Donenberg & Weisz, 1998; Kochanska et al., 1994; Zahn-Waxler & Kochanska, 1990; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1990).

Maladaptive guilt has been evidenced in the literature through research that has assessed the relationship between guilt, shame, and psychopathology in both clinical and non-clinical samples that have included children (Ferguson et al., 2000) and adults (Ghatavati, Nicolson, MacDonald, Osher, & Levitt, 2002; O’Connor et al., 1997). From a multidimensional perspective of guilt, O’Connor et al. (1997) investigated the relationship between interpersonal guilt, which comprises survivor guilt, separation guilt, omnipotent guilt, and self-hate guilt, shame and psychological problems that included depression, automatic self-related negative thoughts, optimism and pessimism. In both the clinical sample, which included only individuals suffering from drug addiction, and the non-clinical sample, a positive association was found between guilt and depression.

Researchers have argued for the consideration of the maladaptive component of guilt in studies of self-conscious emotions (O’Connor, Berry & Weiss, 1999). While the
positive aspects of guilt have been associated with positive consequences (Bruno, Lutwak, & Agin, 2009), the maladaptive component has been associated with distress, inhibitions and psychopathology (O’Connor et al., 1999, Tilghman-Osborne et al., 2010). Guilt is maladaptive when irrational beliefs and thoughts are attached to it. This notion is founded on Weiss’ (1986, 1993) perspective of guilt, in which guilt is derived from a concern and empathy for others. Guilt becomes maladaptive when pathogenic beliefs, such as an exaggerated concern for others, arise and guilt of this type leads to the maintenance and furtherance of psychological illnesses and psychopathology. An example would be an exaggerated sense of responsibility towards family and loved ones (O’Connor et al, 1997; Tangney et al., 1992; Weiss, 1993).

In addition, with reference to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fifth Edition (DSM-V), excessive or inappropriate guilt has been shown to present itself as a persistent diagnostic criterion for Major Depressive Disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), providing clinical relevance of the relationship between maladaptive guilt and negative psychological well-being. Guilt has also been found to play a role in Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD), due to the nature of OCD comprising the role of exaggerated personal responsibility (Esherick, O’Connor, Berry, Weiss, 1999). Additionally, guilt was also found to be a significant predictor of many obsessive-compulsive symptoms after controlling for the variable depression (Esherick et al, 1999). Indeed, excessive and irrational forms of guilt can lead to distress, contorted interpersonal ties and even psychopathology (O’Connor et al., 1997). As such, the maladaptive aspect of guilt must be considered in any comprehensive study of guilt as a self-conscious emotion. The study of maladaptive guilt has divided guilt into distinct constructs, two of which are survivor guilt and separation guilt (O’Connor et al., 1997).
While guilt can be generally broken down into reparative guilt and maladaptive guilt (Tilghman-Osborne et al., 2010), the study of guilt has reaped intriguing, yet confusing, results, largely due to the nature of constructs and the measures used to assess them. The positive relationships of guilt and empathy, guilt in relation to reparative action, and relationships between guilt and psychological distress appear to be heavily reliant on the type of instrument used to measure the relevant component of guilt (Bruno et al., 2009; Ferguson & Crowley, 1997; O’Connor et al., 1999). Research has shown that the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA-3; Tangney, Dearing, Wagner, & Gramzow, 2000), a tool widely used to assess guilt, might only measure one specific component of guilt that involves taking reparative actions (Robins, Noftle, & Tracy, 2007; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Scenario-based measures of self-conscious emotions, such as the TOSCA-3 scale, have generally failed to show positive relationships between guilt and psychological distress (O’Connor, Berry, Lewis, Mulherin, Crisostomo, Yi, 2007). However, measures using the Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire – 67 (IGQ-67; O’Connor et al., 1997), which specifically assesses for maladaptive forms of guilt, have found guilt to be positively correlated with depression and other forms of psychological distress. As such, research has indicated that the TOSCA-3 measures the adaptive and reparative component of guilt, whereas the IGQ-67 measures the maladaptive component of guilt. Thus, if guilt, as a multi-faceted construct, is to be studied comprehensively, both adaptive and maladaptive measures should be acknowledged and utilised.

Reparative guilt

Despite the negative portrayal of certain self-conscious emotions, such as shame and guilt, these emotions have occasionally been shown to positively correlate with prosocial or cooperative behaviours (Baumeister et al., 1995; De Hooge, Zeelenberg, & Breugelmans, 2007). In the past, guilt, as a negative self-conscious emotion, has been
studied largely in relation to psychopathology and its positive relationships with negative emotional outcomes (O’Connor et al., 1997). Recent studies, however, have seen a shift in paradigm to an emphasis on guilt as a moral emotion and its positive relationships with empathy and positive social behaviour, suggesting a functional and positive role for the emotion of guilt.

The adaptive or reparative component in guilt has been argued to motivate the individual towards acknowledging the wrongful act, and to take responsibility and necessary action to rectify their wrongdoings (Keltner & Buswell, 1996; Tangney et al., 1996). Here, guilt is seen to have a constructive purpose, due to its concern for reparation of a transgression. Baumeister et al. (1994) have argued that guilt is an interpersonal emotion that may act as a mechanism to maintain and repair social relationships. Guilt can lead to apology (Baumeister et al., 1995), and can be seen as a major motivator with regard to the process of seeking forgiveness (Riek, 2010), thus mending any broken social relationships. Guilt has also been studied widely in conjunction with empathy and prosocial behaviour (Batson, 1998; Tangney, 1995). Guilt has also been known to motivate pro-social behaviour, as a way of amending hurt caused by an individual’s actions. (De Hooge et al., 2007; Nelissen & Zeelenberg, 2009). Indeed, guilt can facilitate and/or maintain relationships and even engage an individual in prosocial behaviour.

In comprehending the adaptive and reparative nature of guilt, it is important to highlight the distinction between an inherent proneness to guilt and feeling appropriately guilty. A proneness to guilt can be acknowledged as adaptive in nature, as it leans towards being a personality trait that motivates individuals to engage in reparative behaviours to misdeeds (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). However, this concept of guilt propensity does not indicate that it is always adaptive and psychologically healthy to feel perpetually guilty. While feeling guilty can indicate the need to repair
broken social relationships, when one feels perpetually guilty without any eliciting event, or when one experiences guilt over an act that he or she lacks the capacity to amend, maladaptive forms of guilt may certainly be experienced (Wolf et al., 2010).

*Maladaptive Guilt: Survivor and Separation Guilt*

Survivor guilt and separation guilt provide important representations of maladaptive guilt in terms of irrational beliefs (O’Connor et al., 1997). Both survivor and separation guilt consist of an overpowering and overbearing sense of responsibility for others, especially towards one’s family members or the closest people in terms of relationship (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997; O’Connor, Berry, Weiss, Schweitzer, & Sevier, 2000). The term, survivor guilt, was coined based on a study of the severe depression found in survivors of the Nazi concentration camps. These survivors were found to feel guilty for surviving their loved ones (O’Connor et al., 2000). The concept of survival guilt has also been applied by Modell (1971) to less disastrous traumas that were common to disturbed family life. For example, survivor guilt was used to describe the negative emotion associated with self-inhibition of success, or engagement in self-destructive behaviours in response to unconscious guilt felt towards a family member, whom the individual has perceived to be more unfortunate than themselves (Modell, 1965, 1971). Survivor guilt is experienced when one feels guilty for surviving in the event that others do not, even if it is not one’s own fault (Bruno et al., 2009; O’ Connor et al., 1997). A study by Brockner, Davy and Carter (1985) found survival guilt to be present among people who kept their jobs when their co-workers were fired. In another study, participants reported feeling guilty about being allowed to stay and receive credit for research participation while fellow random confederates were dismissed without receiving any credit for their participation (Brockner, Greenberg, Brockner, Bortz, Davy, & Carter, 1986). It appears that survivor guilt stems from a perception of unequal outcomes for oneself, as compared to family
members, peers and colleagues (Baumeister et al., 1994). In essence, survivor guilt is characterised by the pathogenic belief that pursuing normal goals and achieving success and happiness will cause others to suffer.

Indirect experiences of survivor guilt have been documented in the literature, whereby individuals have been found to experience the emotion through witnessing the suffering of strangers, reading about victims of violence or even seeing homeless people on the streets (Baumeister et al., 1994). Research on survivor guilt has been found to be significantly associated with depression, pessimism and low self-esteem (Meehan et al., 1996; O’Connor et al., 2000). Specifically in studies of depression, survivor guilt has been found to significantly predict depression, as well as mediating between depression and empathy (O’Connor et al., 2000). Survivor guilt has been found to be indicated and identified by submissive behaviour, such that the individual may put themselves down in front of a person whom they feel sorry for, described in the literature as an act performed with the intention to ‘level the playing field’ (O’Connor et al., 2000).

Separation guilt, another form of maladaptive guilt, has been characterised by the exaggerated belief that to separate from, or be different from, loved ones will harm them. This distorted sense of disloyalty has been found to result in behaviours that are motivated by the need to protect and remain loyal to parents as well as loved ones (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997; Weiss & Sampson, 1986). Separation guilt stems from the fear of harming others, especially parents, as a result of pursuing one’s goals (O’Connor et al., 1997). As such, dysfunctional ties are maintained and perpetuated due to feared repudiation, but not as a source of enjoyment and pleasure from the relationship (Erreich, 2011). At present, there is a lack of research on separation guilt, with specific regard to possible cross-cultural differences in the maladaptive form of guilt. Given separation guilt’s key focus on the individual’s relationships with family and loved ones, cultural differences of the experience of separation guilt between
individualistic and collectivistic cultures should be investigated. Additionally, a deeper understanding of cross-cultural experiences of maladaptive guilt, and its impact on psychological well-being within the context of the experienced emotion, may assist both researchers and clinicians.

Theorists have often referred to Weiss’ (1986, 1993) Control Mastery theory for explanations on the relationship between interpersonal guilt and psychological distress and inhibitions. Weiss’ (1986, 1993) Control Mastery theory states that psychopathology is derived from pathogenic beliefs that develop in response to difficult childhood experiences. These pathogenic beliefs signal potential harm either towards the individual, or to a loved one, if they attempt to pursue normal developmental goals (O’Connor et al., 1999). According to Weiss (1986), it is believed that pathogenic beliefs that involve, or predict, causing harm to others result in the experience of guilt within the individual, and that any attempt, or contemplation to attempt pursuing these normal developmental goals will result in the experience of guilt, shame, anxiety and fear. In an effort to minimise or avoid the experience of maladaptive guilt, these pathogenic beliefs are proposed to further develop into pathogenic inhibitions. For example, individuals who suffered punitive punishment and neglect by parents have been reported to form the cognitive belief that they are deserving of similar negative treatment, so as to preserve the authority of the parent (Weiss, 1993). These individuals are believed to suffer from feelings of shame and accept their parent’s negative feelings toward them. Above all, this submission and compliance with the dysfunctional relationship is believed to work towards protecting themselves from experiencing the maladaptive guilt that they may be susceptible to, should they defy their parents’ opinion.
For the purposes of distinguishing the effects of guilt on psychological well-being, some researchers have controlled for the effects of shame, to assess for the relationship between both reparative and maladaptive guilt on psychological well-being (O’Connor et al., 1999; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Indeed, the concept of shame-free guilt has assisted in highlighting the distinct differences between the emotions of shame and guilt. For example, Tangney and Dearing (2002) found that when controlling for shame, shame-free guilt was found to be adaptive in nature, exhibiting an overall negative relationship between guilt and measures of psychological distress. However, when researchers specifically examined measures of maladaptive guilt that involved inappropriate attributions of responsibility, maladaptive guilt was consistently found to be positively associated with measures of psychological distress (O’Connor et al., 1999). The understanding of shame-free guilt has greatly assisted in distinguishing between the two distinct emotions of shame and guilt, as well as between adaptive and maladaptive guilt.

Although the conceptualisation of shame-free guilt may have assisted in distinguishing between specific effects of guilt or shame on psychological well-being, controlling for the effects of specific self-conscious emotions may not be as relevant for larger-scale modelling pertaining to the relationships between two or more self-conscious emotions with variables of psychological distress. It is suggested that the experience of self-conscious emotions do not occur in isolation, whereby two or more self-conscious emotions may often co-occur with other self-conscious emotions. Factors that mediate the effect that self-conscious emotions have on psychological distress have also recently been explored. For example, studies have assessed for the mediating effects of relevant variables, such as rumination, on the effect of shame and guilt on depression and anxiety (Orth et al., 2006). To my knowledge, the present study is the
first in the literature to assess, cross-culturally, mediating effects of filial piety on the
effect of self-conscious emotions on psychological well-being. It is my intention to
conduct analyses that are explorative in nature, and, for this reason, the concept of
shame-free guilt will not be included in the larger-scale latent variable modelling of
self-conscious emotions.

It must be emphasised that the prevailing conceptualisation of shame and guilt
rests heavily on certain assumptions that may not necessarily apply to other cultural
contexts. The mainstream model of shame and guilt has assumptions that reflect a view
of the self that appears largely solitary and separate from others, and defined by stable
personal characteristics, or what Markus and Kitayama (1991) refer to as an
independent self-conceptualisation. Additionally, this conventional model assumes that
being negatively evaluated by others or by one’s self is a negative experience that
should be actively avoided. This assumption may well reflect the value placed on
positive feelings in many individualistic contexts, but may not hold true for other
cultural contexts (Heine et al., 1999). For the purpose of attaining an in depth cross-
cultural understanding of self-conscious emotions, it is of crucial importance for both
researchers and clinicians to look to other cultures rooted in other philosophical
traditions that have different views of the self, and hence, potentially different views of
shame and guilt (Camras & Fatani, 2004; Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004; Kitayama et al.,
1995).

Pride

Unlike shame and guilt, the emotion of pride has been widely established in the
literature as a positively appraised emotion (Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010; Tracy &
Robins, 2004b; Weiner, 1985). Researchers have documented the relationship between
the experience of pride with positive affect, with particular regard to self-esteem and the
positive perception of pleasure that follows an achievement (Gruber & Johnson, 2009;
Takahashi et al., 2007). Pride has been found to be elicited when there is an internal appraisal and attribution of a positive event (Lewis, 2008). Specifically, the internal attribution of pride comprises the antecedent event being perceived as reflecting positively on the individual’s self, whereby the self has contributed, fully or partially, to the positive outcome of the event (Tracy & Robins, 2004b, Weiner, 1985).

Pride has been found to display universally recognisable nonverbal expressions, with specific regard to a small smile, expanded posture and head inclined approximately 15-20 degrees (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). The universality of pride has also been supported by studies that have highlighted the instinctive and spontaneous nature of pride, where congenitally blind athletes (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008) and 3-year-old children (Belsky & Domitrovich, 1997) have been found to display nonverbal expressions of pride when the self is recognised as the contributing cause of the positive event.

Pride is an important emotion that plays a critical role in many areas of psychological functioning. Pride is also likely to play a functional role in the maintenance and enhancement of social status, an essential component of social relationships and the individual’s survival (Tracy & Robins, 2008). Individuals experience pride after a socially valued achievement, and these feelings of pride may signal to them that their behaviour, or self, is valued by others and that they are, therefore, unlikely to be rejected by the group and may deserve an enhancement in their social status (Leary et al., 1995). These feelings may also positively reinforce the socially valued behaviours that produced the emotion (Hart & Matsuba, 2007; Herrald & Tomaka, 2002). The loss of pride is part of what provokes aggression and other antisocial behaviours in response to ego threats (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998).

The uniqueness of pride has been well established in the literature, in which not many other emotions have been subject to as much scorn and reverence as pride has.
Indeed, several researchers have argued that the extensive nature of the concept of pride is too broad for it to be considered as a unitary construct and it is better conceptualised as two or more distinct emotions (Ekman, 2003). Similarly, pride has been empirically and theoretically linked to highly divergent outcomes. While pride in one’s successes might promote positive behaviours in the achievement domain and contribute to the development of a genuine and secure sense of self-esteem (Herrald & Tomaka, 2002), the hubristic pride that has been theoretically associated with narcissism (Lewis, 2000) may contribute to aggression and hostility, interpersonal problems, relationship conflict, and various maladaptive behaviours (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Campbell, 1999; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Wubben, De Cremer, & van Dijk, 2012). This distinction has given rise to the suggestion of two different facets of pride, whereby the pro-social, achievement-oriented form of pride is separated from its self-aggrandising, hubristic form.

Similar to the way research has indicated that shame and guilt are distinct, negative self-conscious emotions with disparate antecedents and behavioural outcomes (Tangney & Dearing, 2002), pride has been conceptualised in a similar manner. Specifically, pride that results from a specific achievement or pro-social behaviour may be distinct from pride in one’s global self (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). This contrast resembles the conceptualisation of guilt as derived from a focus on negative aspects of one’s performed behaviour, and shame as derived from a focus on negative aspects of one’s inherent self (Lewis, 2000; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). In the same way that Tangney and colleagues (2002) have demonstrated that this distinction characterises the key differences between shame and guilt, and might be the source of the wide range of divergent outcomes associated with the two emotions, distinct facets of pride have been theoretically and empirically validated in the literature (Tracy & Robins, 2007c; Tracy & Robins, 2014).
Two Unique Facets of Pride

Empirical evidence has been found in favour of the existence of two distinct facets of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007c, Tracy & Robins, 2014), with findings held across studies examining both individualistic and collectivistic cultures, suggesting that the two distinct facets of pride are not unique to the Western culture (Yan et al., 2013). Specifically, authentic, or beta, pride (“I’m proud of what I did) is believed to result from attributions to internal, unstable, and controllable causes (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). In contrast, hubristic, or alpha, pride (Lewis, 2000), referring to pride in the global self (I’m proud of who I am), might result from attributions to internal, stable, and uncontrollable causes (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). For example, authentic pride might be related to one’s belief that they performed well as a result of their diligence and hard work, whereas hubristic pride might include one’s belief that they performed well because they are always great.

Authentic pride is based on specific accomplishments, and has been found to co-exist with genuine feelings of self-worth. This label also expresses the range of academic, social, moral, and interpersonal accomplishments that might be important elicitors of the emotion (Tracy & Robins, 2004a). Hubristic pride, in contrast, has elicitors that might be more loosely associated with actual accomplishments, and might involve a self-evaluative process that reflects a less authentic sense of self, such as distorted and self-aggrandised views of the self (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Empirical evidence has been found to support the theoretical distinction between authentic pride and hubristic pride, whereby pride has been found to not be a unitary construct, and that the two facets are indeed related, yet distinct (Carver et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007c; Wubben et al., 2012). Studies using photographs of the expression of pride and descriptions of the experience of pride have supported the robustness and conceptual validity of the distinction between the two facets (Carver et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins,
Both authentic pride and hubristic pride have also been found to be indiscernible by the antecedent events (achievement, personal, familial, relationship, and athletic) that elicit them (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Consistent with appraisal theories of emotion, it is not the specific event, but rather the way that the event is internally appraised that determines which facet of pride is experienced (Lazarus, 1991).

In many ways, the relation between the two dimensions of pride have been argued to be similar to the relation between shame and guilt, the two major negative self-conscious emotions (Tracy & Robins, 2007c). Both hubristic and authentic prides tend to be inter-correlated, and yet, appear to have divergent correlations with other relevant variables, suggesting that each emotion has meaningful and unique variance. Similar to shame and guilt, there are reliable and measurable individual differences in the proneness to experience both authentic and hubristic pride. Both pairs of self-conscious emotions are also distinguished by similar causal attributions. Specifically, shame and hubristic pride tend to be elicited by internal, stable, and uncontrollable attributions, whereas guilt and authentic pride tend to be evoked by internal, unstable, and controllable attributions (Tracy & Robins, 2006).

**Function of Pride**

Pride is believed to have evolved to aid two primary functions – to positively reinforce pro-social behaviours and to raise the individual’s social status by informing the individual and his or her social group of the individual’s success (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Researchers have argued that pride functions to motivate the individual to behave in ways that promote the achievement of social goals, as well as self-representations that are socially valued (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). The positive affect associated with the experience of pride has been suggested to further reinforce pro-social behaviour, and individuals have been found to execute tasks to a higher standard during and immediately after experiencing the emotion of pride (Herrald & Tomaka.
2002). The expression of pride has also been suggested to have an adaptive function, and researchers have proposed that expressing pride assists in signalling to others that the individual’s achievements have resulted in greater social acceptance and an enhanced social status (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Tracy and Robins (2008) have argued that the expanded posture associated with the expression of pride allows the individual to look physically larger, working to attract attention from others, as well as to relay to others a sense of authority and power. The small smile that is also associated with the expression of pride has been suggested to indicate to others a friendly relationship and association, and researchers have suggested that this allows pride to be expressed within a social context, without resulting in others trying to eliminate the dominant, prideful individual (Tracy & Robins, 2004b).

Both authentic and hubristic pride are believed to have evolved distinctly in order to address unique adaptive problems. For example, authentic pride may encourage behaviours aimed specifically at the long-term achievement and maintenance of status, whereas hubristic pride has been suggested to be a “shortcut” solution, promoting status enhancement that might be more immediate but temporary in nature (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Studies that have examined correlations between the two facets and the Big Five factors of personality also suggest that authentic pride might promote status through relationship-oriented, pro-social means, whereas hubristic pride might promote status more by obtaining the admiration, if not the liking, of others (Carver et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). These patterns of correlations, as well as the associations with self-esteem and narcissism, suggest that hubristic pride might be associated with psychopathy or Machiavellianism – two personality dispositions that might have short-term adaptive benefits despite causing long-term interpersonal problems (Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Tracy, Cheng, Robins, & Trzensniewski, 2009). The likely outcomes of hubristic pride, such as boastfulness and competitiveness, might be adaptive in
situations in which it is beneficial to demonstrate one’s relative superiority in order to intimidate an opponent (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). In contrast, authentic pride has been suggested to assist in the development and maintenance of long-term pro-social relationships (Tracy & Robins, 2007a).

Pride has been found to play an important role in goal regulation, whereby the emotion has been shown to be a predictor of goal achievement that is related to both competence and mastery (Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier, 2006, 2009; Williams & DeSteno, 2008, 2009). Because both authentic and hubristic pride are associated with the perception of an attained or achieved success, both facets of pride have been argued to relate to elevated levels of dispositional reward sensitivity, as well as proneness toward investing effort for the purpose of goal achievement (Carver et al., 2010). Authentic and hubristic prides have also been associated with unique motivational orientations (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Specifically, authentic pride has been proposed to be associated with mastery goals, whereas hubristic pride has been linked to performance goals (Dweck, 1999). Hubristic pride’s association with narcissism appears to be consistent with this assumption, given that narcissists have been found to appear more motivated by performance than the mastery aspects of a task (Morf, Weir, & Davidov, 2000). Indeed, narcissistic self-aggrandisers and hubristically proud individuals were found to be similar in that they scored consistently higher in measures of aggression, Machiavellianism, and deviant behaviours, as compared to authentically proud individuals (Tracy et al., 2009).

**Behavioural correlates of authentic and hubristic pride**

Pride has been argued to be a distinctly interpersonal and social emotion, whereby a particular behaviour that has been associated with the emotion has been noted as the individual’s act of establishing contact with others (Wubben et al., 2012). The pro-social nature of the two facets of pride has been studied intrapersonally, by
assessing whether proud individuals themselves behave in a pro-social manner, as well as interpersonally – whether others perceive proud individuals as pro-social and treat them likewise (Wubben et al., 2012).

The literature has indicated that, of the two distinguished facets of pride, authentic pride is the more pro-social emotion (Wubben et al., 2012). The mastery goals associated with authentic pride have been highlighted through authentic pride’s promoting of the gaining of skills, an authentic sense of self-esteem, as well as perseverance at difficult tasks (Williams & DeSteno, 2008). Indeed, authentic pride has been found to contribute to enhancing both the individual’s capacity and psychological resources to assist others, and studies have found that it has correlated positively with pro-social personality traits, such as conscientiousness and agreeableness (Tracy & Robins, 2007c). In addition, authentically proud individuals have been found to take greater pride in their volunteer work (Hart & Matsuba, 2007), and exhibit more organisational citizenship behaviour (Verbeke, Belschak, & Bagozzi, 2004).

In contrast, hubristic pride has been associated more strongly with personal superiority, motivating narcissists’ self-enhancing drive for social status, control, and admiration from others, ultimately leading to immoral behaviour towards others (Campbell & Foster, 2007; Tracy et al., 2009). Hubristic pride has been found to correlate with various behaviours consistent with antisocial traits, such as aggression, antipathy, hostility, selfishness and greed (Baumeister, Bushman, & Campbell, 2000; Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005; Tracy et al., 2009). While hubristically proud individuals report a proneness toward a grandiose self-opinion and arrogance, such individuals have also been suggested to be socially uncomfortable, as well as to experience anxiety with regard to relationships and insecurity with regard to social relationships (Tracy et al., 2009).
The interpersonal repercussions that arise as a consequence of the intrapersonal experience of both authentic and hubristic pride have recently been examined in the literature. Authentically proud individuals have been found to earn social status through nobility and positive influence, whereby their authority stems from others’ appreciation of their capability, skilfulness and contribution towards the group. Hubristically proud individuals have been suggested to gain social status through dominance and superiority, through which others may follow them out of a fear of being threatened, coerced or intimidated (Tracy et al., 2009; Wubben et al., 2012). Not only has hubristic pride been found to be less pro-social than authentic pride, but others have been found to respond hesitantly with regard to behaving pro-socially around hubristically proud individuals, and more willingly toward authentically proud individuals (Wubben et al., 2012). As compared to their hubristically proud counterparts, authentically proud individuals have been found to be perceived as more well-liked than hubristically proud individuals, perceived by subordinates as altruistic, and rated by peers as respectful and considerate (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010; Michie, 2009; Williams & DeSteno, 2009).

In accordance with the behavioural consequences and interpersonal effects of both hubristic and authentic pride that the literature has highlighted, cross-cultural differences in the experience of pride has been a topic of great interest in recent years. Within the therapeutic context, clinicians would benefit from gaining a cross-cultural understanding of pride and its impact on psychological distress, so that intervention can be individualised to distinguish between the relevant differences in the experience of pride within the individual’s specific cultural context. This thesis will attempt to illuminate the complex functions and differences of the experiences of shame, adaptive and maladaptive guilt, as well as authentic and hubristic pride, for individuals within both collectivistic and individualistic cultures.
CHAPTER 3: STUDY 1: A CROSS-CULTURAL EXPLORATION OF SHAME, GUILT AND PRIDE IN EARLY ADULTHOOD ON PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS

Self-conscious Emotions and Culture

Core to the experience of self-conscious emotions is one’s self-conceptualisation, which is inherently impacted by the culture in which one resides. Indeed, the literature has documented strong evidence that culture exerts a strong influence on the way that individuals appraise emotion-eliciting events (Mesquita, 2001). The East-Asian culture’s promotion of a healthy dissatisfaction with one’s self has been suggested to act as a motivation to improve oneself (Heine et al., 1999). In contrast is the independent self-concept of individualistic cultures, where individuals have been found to be self-enhancing in a more individually-focused manner, attributing less emotional attachment to their interpersonal relationships (Sun, Horn, & Merritt, 2004; Triandis, 1995).

Researchers have questioned the generalisability of existing models of self-conscious emotions to collectivistic cultures (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Prevailing views of shame and guilt are highly dependent on certain assumptions that may not necessarily apply to other cultural contexts. For example, the conceptualisation that global, stable attributions result in shame and that specific, temporary attributions elicit guilt is based on the assumption that there is a stable self that can be differentiated from one’s temporary actions (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Likewise, the notion that shame has an external orientation (is oriented to others’ standards or social norms) whereas guilt has an internal orientation (is oriented to one’s own standards) assumes that internal and external orientation can be easily separated, and that internal orientation is more powerful and genuine than external orientation (Wong & Tsai, 2007). These assumptions reflect a view of the self as an independent self-construal (Markus &
Kitayama, 1991), which appears to be restricted and independent from others, and largely defined by stable personal characteristics.

Additionally, the conventional model has been criticised for assuming that being negatively evaluated by others or by oneself is detrimental and non-beneficial to the individual, and that such experiences should be consciously avoided. Given the significant body of research that has demonstrated that individualistic cultures promote the independent self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995), and given that most models of shame and guilt have been based on Western samples, it is, indeed, likely that the perception of shame and guilt that has contributed to emotion research is an individualistic one (Wong & Tsai, 2007). To assist in a better cultural understanding of the experience of self-conscious emotions, it is important to look to other cultures rooted in other philosophical traditions that have different views of the self, and hence, potentially different views of shame and guilt (Camras & Fatani, 2004; Kitayama et al., 1995; Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004).

Individualist and collectivist societies are characterised by starkly different self-systems (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The self in collectivist cultures, such as Asian countries, has been largely characterised as interdependent and heavily reliant on, and defined by, social ties (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; 1994). In Singapore, three notions regarding such social ties exist - marriage, care of young children and filial piety (Quah, 1994) – and these notions are intricately interlaced with the nation’s ideas on filial piety and the family as a fundamental building block of society. This emphasis on family relationships has been so deeply entrenched in the Singapore system that there may exist a hidden responsibility, or even an obligation, for young adults to care for their parents under any circumstance. This sense of responsibility to care for one’s family is emphasised further by the government in the formulation of ageing policies that are founded on Confucian ethics of filial piety that encourage young adults to take care of
their ageing parents (Liu, 2000). Indeed, Singaporean individuals are largely representative of a collectivistic culture. However, with the rise of modernism and individualism in East-Asian societies (Brinkmann, 2010), an exploration of the experience of self-conscious emotions in young Singaporean adults may assist with a more current understanding of self-conscious emotions within a collectivistic culture, such as Singapore.

_Cultural Variations of Shame and Guilt_

Individuals in collectivistic cultures of East-Asian countries with an interdependent self-concept have been found to experience a larger proportion of negative self-conscious emotions, as compared to people from an individualistic culture in Western countries (Kitayama et al., 1995). This finding has been extended to Asian immigrants living in individualistic societies, whereby Asian Americans have been found to be more prone to experiencing shame than Caucasians living in America (Bedford & Hwang, 2003). While collectivistic Japanese individuals have been found to experience more negative, but self-engaging, self-conscious emotions, such as guilt, their American counterparts were found to be more prone to experiencing more positive, but disengaging, emotions such as pride and anger (Kitayama, Mesquita & Karasawa, 2006).

The desirability and functionality of self-conscious emotions are considered to be different in various cultures, due to innate cultural differences in the experience of these emotions. For example, self-criticism, which involves a reflection of one’s weakness and is associated with the emotion of shame, is highly encouraged in many Asian cultures and considered a necessity for self-improvement. Indeed, shame and guilt have been found to be perceived as more favourable in countries with a greater degree of collectivistic values (Campos, Keltner, Beck, Gonzaga & John, 2007; Heine et al., 1999). Examples of such countries with collectivist values are China and Taiwan,
versus those with individualistic values, such as Australia and the USA (Eid & Diener, 2001). The values that define and lie at the heart of collectivistic and individualistic cultures strongly contribute to, and inevitably affect, the experience of self-conscious emotions.

The current literature is sparse with regard to cross-cultural research on maladaptive guilt, with particular regard to survivor and separation guilt. Indeed, a cross-cultural exploration of maladaptive guilt, which focuses on emotions that are elicited by concerns over interpersonal relationships, may contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how such emotions are experienced across collectivistic and individualistic cultures. With regard to maladaptive guilt, the cultural operation of separation and survival guilt may be attributed to the differences in the conceptualisation of one’s self and the self in relation to others. Specifically, the different experiences of guilt may be partly accounted for by differences in various cultural backgrounds in shaping conceptualisations of the self (Bedford & Hwang, 2003; Tangey & Dearing, 2002). Bedford and Hwang (2003) found that the identity of a Chinese person of a Confucian culture was largely dependent on relationships with family and close friends, whereas the identity of an American from an individualistic western culture functioned as an independent individual, with a focus on being self-contained and self-sufficient. Given that guilt, when conceptualised as a negative construct, has been found to positively correlate with depressive symptoms (Harder, 1995; Kugler & Jones, 1992), the present study aims to explore how maladaptive guilt, namely separation and survivor guilt, might operate within both individualistic and collectivistic cultures to impact on psychological distress.

Cultural Variations of Pride

A few studies have investigated cultural differences in the experience of pride between cultures. Orth et al. (2010) found that Asians reported experiencing more
hubristic pride than European-Americans and African-Americans, which may be due to strong cultural differences in the experience and expression of pride. However, other studies have documented lesser levels of pride-proneness, as well as the negative perception of pride, in collectivistic Asian cultures, as compared to individualistic cultures (e.g., Eid & Diener, 2001). When pride has been conceptualised as a unitary construct, complex and conflicting results in relation to its frequency and desirability have emerged within collectivistic cultures (Scollon et al., 2004).

In general, a clearer understanding of cultural variances in pride has been attained when pride has been conceptualised as having two distinct facets – authentic and hubristic (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Ultimately, Tracy and Robins (2007a) suggested that it is the differences in the manner in which pride is understood and conceptualised between cultures that result in variations in how frequently pride is experienced, and how desirable it is within cultures. Indeed, collectivistic cultures have been suggested to understand the emotion of pride as predominantly hubristic in nature, which might impact on its negative view within collectivistic cultures (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Furthermore, it has been posited that collectivistic pride has a social element, by which pride can be desirable for a collectivistic individual when the pride is related to other’s accomplishments, or a social group’s achievement, rather than the individual’s self (Tracy & Robins, 2007a, Stipek, 1998).

While pride has been generally considered as a positive emotion that functions, universally, to preserve and increase social status (Tracy & Robins, 2007a), it is likely that culture may shape the way that authentic and hubristic pride are regulated, expressed, appraised and valued. Researchers have called for the need to better understand cultural variances in both authentic and hubristic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). To my knowledge, cross-cultural interactions between the experiences of the
two facets of pride and psychological distress have yet to be fully explored in the literature.

*Cultural Variations of Self-conscious Emotions and their Implications for Psychological Well-being*

Although the current literature has established that individuals from collectivistic and individualistic cultures differ in their proneness towards experiencing certain self-conscious emotions, there currently lacks research on cultural variations of shame, pride and guilt and their impact on the individual’s psychological well-being. Yet, an understanding of how culture impacts on the individual’s experience of self-conscious emotions is likely to impact on understanding how any related psychological distress is managed by the individual. For example, individuals from collectivistic cultures may experience more guilt-proneness than individuals from individualistic cultures. However, owing to the way collectivistic cultures value interpersonal relationships, their higher amount of guilt-proneness may not actually manifest as higher scores in depression. It may be that collectivistic cultures have social support systems already existing in such a way that they assist the individual with ways of managing negative emotions. Though few in numbers, some studies have investigated the impact of shame and guilt on psychological well-being between different ethnic groups within the same society (Meehan et al., 1996). However, very few studies have assessed the impact of self-conscious emotions on psychological well-being between collectivistic and individualistic societies, and none have specifically examined such relationships within the young adult population.

*Young Adults*

Young adulthood presents itself as a period of transitions that involve life-changing decisions. Identified as having the highest incidence of mental disorders of any age cohort (Rowling, Weber & Scanion, 2005), young adults remain a cohort...
worth investigating with regard to understanding the experience of self-conscious emotions and their relationships with mental well-being. The urbanisation of societies, coupled with vast improvements in lifestyles and education, has drastically changed the markers of development for this cohort of young adults. Arnett (2004) has argued that the road to adulthood is now much longer than before, with the inclusion of longer markers that are attained over a long period of time, instead of distinct, discrete markers, specifically for transiting into adulthood. These markers include values, such as taking responsibility for oneself, achieving financial independence and making independent decisions. Research on the psychological well-being of this cohort has identified some of their specific problems, which include work, financial difficulties and issues related to relationships (White & Wyn, 2004). In a study conducted by Janoff-Bulman and Frantz (1997), students in this transition period were found to perceive themselves as vulnerable, less confident and as lacking a sense of control. Within the transition from school to university, from home to college/shared accommodation and from school student to university student, from university student to a working individual, gains and losses were encountered, which resulted in a consequential negative impact on the mental health of the young adult as an individual (Rowling et al., 2005).

A recent study by Orth et al. (2010) that tracked the trajectories of shame, pride and guilt over the lifespan found that the largest age differences in self-conscious emotions occurred in adolescence, young adulthood and old age. Their research has attributed the dramatic trends in self-conscious emotions to crucial transitions in social roles and relationships during these life periods, and suggested that adolescence, young adulthood and old age are critical periods in the development of such emotions. Furthermore, the young adulthood age group was particularly distinctive, in that it was the only period during which large differences (steepest gradient) in the trajectories of
shame, guilt and pride were observed (see Figure 1, adapted from Orth et al., 2010). Given Orth et al.’s assertion that more research was needed to examine more closely the period of young adulthood, the present study aims to conduct more fine-grained analyses on the experience of self-conscious emotions during the period of young adulthood, across two different cultures.

*Figure 1.* Trajectories of self-conscious emotions from age 13 years to age 89 years. Emotions were converted to Z-scores in this study by Orth et al. (2010) for the analyses. Gradient was the steepest from 18-35 years old (Orth et al., 2010).

**Clinical Implications of Self-conscious Emotions**

While shame has been found to be associated with feelings of worthlessness and a sense of being exposed, guilt has been associated with feelings of regret and remorse (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Although both shame and guilt have been construed as negative emotions, shame has predominantly been considered the more intense and painful of the two. In accordance with attributional theories of depression (Gotlib & Abramson, 1999), shame would be more likely to cause symptoms of depression than
guilt, as the attributional pattern implied within the self-criticised, defective and flawed shamed individual is more maladaptive than guilt’s focus on amending the wrongdoing. However, empirical evidence has shown that shame explains substantial incremental variance in depression, even when attributional style is controlled for (Tangney et al., 1992).

When guilt has been conceptualised as adaptive in nature, research has found shame-proneness to be more strongly associated with symptoms of psychopathology, as compared to guilt-proneness (Tangney et al., 1992). Importantly, Tangney et al. found that the relationship between adaptive guilt and psychopathology symptoms was attributable to the shared variance between shame and guilt. Subsequent studies have supported Tangney et al.’s findings, showing that shame has been found to share specific relations with psychopathology symptoms, whereas the relationship between adaptive guilt and symptoms of psychopathology diminished after controlling for shame (Pineles et al., 2006). While these studies have assisted in attaining a better understanding of the distinguishing correlates of shame and adaptive guilt, both clinical and empirical literatures are still inconsistent with regard to the specific links between psychological symptoms and shame and guilt.

Shame and guilt have been related to both depressive affect in day-to-day life, as well as with depression as a clinically relevant disorder. Empirical studies have established the existence of an association between guilt and depression (Alexander, Brewin, Vearnals, Wolff, & Leff, 1999; Ghatavi et al., 2002; Jarrett & Weissenburger, 1990; Walters-Chapman, Price, & Serovich, 1995). Similarly, the relationship between shame and depression has also been widely established in the literature (Allan, Gilbert, & Goss, 1994; Andrews, 1995; Andrews & Hunter, 1997; Cheung, Gilbert, & Irons, 2004; Fontaine et al., 2001; Tangney et al., 1992).
Both shame and guilt have been reported to be important factors in the etiology of symptoms of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), as well in the development and maintenance of symptoms of social anxiety disorder (SAD) (Gilbert, 2000; Shafran, Watkins, & Charman, 1996; Valentiner & Smith, 2008). Anxious symptoms have also been argued to play a role in reducing the intensity of the negative emotion, such as guilt (Freeston, Rheaume, Letarte, Dugas, & Ladouceur, 1994). For example, the constant worrying that is characteristic of generalised anxiety disorder (GAD) is argued to operate, partly, as a means of reducing feelings of guilt in the individual (Freeston et al., 1994). Similarly, shame has been proposed to contribute to the reason why individuals may worry as well (Gosselin et al., 2003).

With respect to the self-conscious emotion of pride, there is currently a lack of cross-cultural research on its impact on psychological distress. In general, pride has been conceptualised as a positive self-conscious emotion that is related to acts of achievement (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). How these achievements are appraised results in whether the individual experiences the emotion of hubristic or authentic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). While authentic pride has been associated with high self-esteem and low levels of depression, hubristic pride has been related to depression and low self-esteem (Orth et al., 2010; Tracy et al., 2009).

This divergent relationship between the two facets of pride has been noted to mirror the relationship between shame and general guilt, as shame has been shown to associate with depression and low self-esteem, while guilt, in general, has been shown to be weakly associated with low levels of depression (Orth et al., 2010). Therefore, although previous studies have documented shame and hubristic pride to correlate weakly (r = .15) with each other, both emotions have been argued to reflect a maladaptive pattern, whereas guilt and authentic pride, despite correlating weakly (r = .08), appear to reflect a generally adaptive pattern (Orth et al.). To my knowledge, there
has yet to be conducted, an investigation of the impact of authentic and hubristic pride on symptoms of psychological distress from a cross-cultural perspective.

Importantly, unique differences may exist between cultures with regard to the relationship between self-conscious emotions and psychological well-being. Researchers have argued that existing assumptions inherent in the theoretical understanding of shame, guilt and pride may not necessarily apply in collectivistic cultures (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Indeed, cross-cultural differences in the experience of shame, guilt and pride may have important implications for the current understanding of the relationship between self-conscious emotions and psychological distress. As highlighted by other researchers, other cultures rooted in other philosophical traditions might have different views of the self, and hence, potentially different views of self-conscious emotions (Camras & Fatani, 2004; Kitayama et al., 1995; Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004).

Hypotheses

The aim of the present study was to conduct an exploratory examination of the impact of culture, gender and age on young adults’ experiences of self-conscious emotions, with specific regard to shame, both adaptive and maladaptive guilt, as well as both hubristic and authentic pride. The literature has well established the importance of interpersonal relationships in collectivistic cultures, whereby individuals define themselves through their close relationships that they share with in-group others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Given guilt’s central focus of fostering interpersonal relationships, it was hypothesised that Singaporeans, as a representation of a collectivistic culture, would experience greater levels of guilt-proneness – both adaptive and maladaptive, when compared to their Australian counterparts. Due to the collectivistic valuation of shame that has been documented in the literature (Compos et al., 2007; Heine et al., 1999), a greater level of shame-proneness was also expected for
Singaporeans, as compared to their Australian counterparts. With regard to authentic and hubristic pride, the literature has documented that Asians have reported greater hubristic pride-proneness than their Western counterparts (Orth et al., 2010). Hence, it was hypothesised that Singaporeans would report a greater level of both authentic and hubristic pride than their Australian counterparts.

The present study also aimed to explore how shame, guilt (adaptive and maladaptive) and pride (hubristic and authentic) related to psychological well-being, with specific regard to depression, anxiety and stress, after demographic variables, such as nationality, gender and age, were controlled for. Taking into consideration the inconsistent findings of previous research, the present study hypothesised that individuals who reported greater guilt-proneness would experience more symptoms of anxiety. Individuals who reported greater shame-proneness were expected to report more symptoms of depression. Given that the literature has distinguished between the appraisal processes of authentic and hubristic pride, the current study aimed to explore how authentic and hubristic pride, which have not been extensively researched with regard to their relationship with symptoms of psychological distress, relate to symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. Taking into account previous research that has associated hubristic pride with narcissism, psychopathy or Machiavellianism, it was hypothesised that hubristic pride would positively relate to symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. It was also hypothesised that authentic pride would correlate negatively with symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. The present study also aimed to explore cross-cultural differences in relationships between self-conscious emotions and psychological distress.

**Method**

*Participants*
The current study was approved by the Murdoch University Research Ethics Office, Division of Research and Development (Ethics Approval number 2011/102). The original sample consisted of 212 individuals. Out of the 212 participants, 58 individuals either did not manage to complete the entire questionnaire or possibly experienced a technical glitch in the survey, resulting in incomplete responses to the questionnaire. Only completed questionnaires from individuals who were within the age range of 18 to 35 years of age were included in the analysis. Consequently, the data from three participants aged 17, 38 and 42 years of age were excluded. The final sample consisted of 129 individuals, comprising of 65 Singaporeans, 64 Australians and 22 individuals who were of other nationalities. In alignment with the present study’s aim of investigating specific cultural differences, individuals of nationalities other than Australian and Singaporean were excluded from the data analysis. This thesis utilised a convenience sampling technique, whereby the Australian and Singaporean cultures were selected as representatives of an individualistic and collectivistic culture, respectively, due to the convenience of their accessibility to the researcher.

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the Australian and Singaporean participants. The mean age of participants was 23.4 years (SD = 4.50, range = 18-35). For the purposes of investigating scores within the early adulthood age range, participants were allocated into four different age bands. Age Band 1: 18-20 years (N = 37; 9 Males, 28 Females; 32 Australians, 5 Singaporeans), Age Band 2: 21-23 years (n = 35; 9 Males, 28 Females; 16 Australians, 21 Singaporeans), Age Band 3: 24-28 years (n = 38; 15 Males, 23 Females; 9 Australians, 29 Singaporeans), Age Band 4: 29-35 years (n = 17, 7 Males, 10 Females; 7 Australians, 10 Singaporeans). Of the total sample, 49.6% were Australians and 50.4% were Singaporeans, and slightly less than half (47.3%) of this cohort across cultures declared themselves to be financially independent.
Table 1

Demographics based on Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Mean age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>In Australia (%)</th>
<th>In Singapore (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaporeans</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sample</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

The Test Of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA-3; Tangney, Dearing, Wagner, & Gramzow, 2000). The TOSCA-3 is a measure widely used to assess proneness to shame and guilt (Robins et al., 2007; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989). Included in this measure are 16 scenarios from everyday life to which individuals indicate their reactions. Each scenario is paired with a set of four possible reactions. Responses are given on a Likert Scale which consists of 5 points, ranging from 1 (Not likely) to 5 (Very likely). A sample scenario is, “You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o’clock, you realize you stood him up.” The four possible reactions to the above scenario are: a) You would think, ‘I’m inconsiderate’ b) You would think: “Well they’ll understand” c) You would try to make it up to him as soon as possible d) You would think: ‘My boss distracted me just before lunch.” Reliability scores of .78, .77, .48, and .51 for their respective guilt, shame, hubristic and authentic
pride subscales of the TOSCA-3 were obtained in previous research (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). In the present study, the alpha coefficient for the test as a whole was .80, and for the guilt, shame, hubristic and authentic pride subscales, the alpha coefficients were .75, .80, .49 and .57, respectively.

Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire – 67. The Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire – 67 (IGQ-67; O’Connor et al., 1997) is a 67-item, self-report questionnaire designed to access and measure four types of guilt. As mentioned in the introduction, for the purposes of this study, two out of the four subscales will be used: Survivor Guilt Scale (22 items) and Separation Guilt Scale (16 items). Responses to items are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale and total scores are calculated by summing up the items’ scores under each subscale, having considered the reverse-scored items. Internal consistencies of .76 and .73 for Survivor Guilt and Separation Guilt Scales have been determined in previous research (O’ Connor et al., 1997). In the present study, the alpha coefficients were .81 for Separation Guilt and .84 for Survival Guilt.

Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales. The pride scales are a trait version measure of authentic and hubristic pride. The authentic pride scale includes items such as “accomplished” and “productive” and the hubristic pride scale includes items such as “arrogant” and “egotistical”. Responses are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In the present study, the alpha coefficients for the hubristic pride and authentic pride subscales were .90 and .89, respectively.

Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS). The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995) is used to access levels of depression, anxiety and stress. For the purposes of this study, the DASS will be used as a measure of psychological well-being and will be used to explore relationships of depression, anxiety and stress with measures of self-conscious emotions. Responses are measured
on a 7-point Likert-type scale from Very strongly disagree to Very strongly agree. A sample question is, “I feel comfortable that I can control how anxious I am feeling.” No items were reverse-scored. Test-retest reliability coefficients obtained from previous research (Crawford & Henry, 2003) was .95 for depression scales, .90 for anxiety, .93 for stress and .97 for DASS overall. In this present study, the alpha coefficients for the following scales of the DASS are: Depression scales .90, Anxiety scales .77, Stress scales .88 and DASS overall .92.

Procedure

Students from Murdoch University in Western Australia responded to an anonymous online survey (see Appendix A for full questionnaire) that was hosted by Murdoch University’s Social and Community On-line Research Database (SCORED) system, a website that provides access to a wide variety of psychological studies (http://scored.murdoch.edu.au). Participants accessed the online survey via one of two ways: the School of Psychology’s Subject Pool Research homepage, or via a Facebook website page that provided the link to the study published on SCORED.

Psychology students from Murdoch University received an hour’s worth of subject pool credit in return for their participation. The other participants had the option of participating in a draw to win a $50 ITunes voucher. The survey data was kept separate from the incentive entry list to ensure anonymity.

Results

Guilt Analysis

In examining whether the experience of guilt differed between nationality, age and gender groups, a three-way between groups MANOVA was performed. The three dependent variables used were the TOSCA-3 guilt scale and the two IGQ-67 subscales: survival guilt and separation guilt. The independent variables were nationality (Australian and Singaporean), gender (Male and Female) and age groups (1 through
Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations observed. The MANOVA on the combined dependent variables revealed main effects of gender \( F(3, 111) = 3.312, p = .023, \text{partial eta squared} = .08 \) and nationality \( F(3, 111) = 2.842, p = .041, \text{partial eta squared} = .07 \) but no significant effect was found for age. There was also an interaction effect between age and nationality \( F(9, 270), p = .025; \text{partial eta squared} = .06 \).

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .017, separation guilt showed statistical significance with regards to age bands, \( F(3, 113) = 3.525, p = .017, \text{partial eta squared} = .09 \). Specifically, the youngest participants, whose ages were between 18 to 20 years (Age band 1) \( (M = 45.469, SD = 2.486) \), were found to experience more separation guilt than the other participants (Age band 2: \( M = 39.95, SD = 1.85 \); Age band 3: \( M = 34.76, SD = 2.35 \); Age band 4: \( M = 42.40, SD = 2.63 \)). A main effect was found for nationality with regard to separation guilt, \( F(1,113) = 8.320, p = .005, \text{partial eta squared} = .07 \). Specifically, Singaporeans \( (M = 44.03, SD = 1.48) \) reported experiencing greater separation guilt than their Australians counterparts \( (M = 37.26, SD = 1.82) \).

An interaction effect between nationality and age was observed for separation guilt, \( F(3, 113) = 4.798, p = .003, \text{partial eta squared} = .11 \). Post-hoc tests were conducted to investigate the interaction effect between age and nationality for separation guilt. A one-way independent sample ANOVA was conducted separately for each of the four age bands to examine between-group effects for Singaporeans and Australians. Statistically significant differences in the experience of separation guilt between Singaporeans and Australians were found between age bands 1 (18-20 years old) and 3 (24-28 years old), with Australians scoring significantly lower than Singaporeans.
Gender effects were observed for TOSCA-3 guilt, $F(1, 113) = 6.567, p = .012$, partial eta squared = .06. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that females ($M = 66.04, SD = .84$) experienced more TOSCA-3 guilt as compared to males ($M = 61.32, SD = 1.64$). None of the independent variables had statistically significant effects on survival guilt.

**Shame Analysis**

In examining whether shame differed between Singaporeans and Australians, age and gender, a three-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of age, gender and nationality on the level of shame-proneness, as measured by TOSCA-Shame. Preliminary assumption testing for normality, linearity, univariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, revealed no violations.

There were no statistically significant interaction effects between age, gender and nationality. These included the interaction effect between gender and age group, $F(3, 113) = .239, p = .869$, partial eta squared = .01; gender and nationality, $F(1, 113) = 1.17, p = .281$, partial eta squared = .01; age group and nationality, $F(3, 113) = .02, p = .995$, partial eta squared = .001; and the interaction effect between age group and nationality, $F(3, 113) = .502, p = .681$, partial eta squared = .01.

The main effects for gender, $F(1, 113) = 3.112, p = .08$, partial eta squared = .27; nationality, $F(1, 113) = .566, p = .453$, partial eta squared = .01; and age group, $F(3, 113) = 1.042, p = .377$, partial eta squared = .03, also did not reach statistical significance.

**Pride Analyses**

In examining whether authentic and hubristic pride differed between nationality, gender and age groups, the adjective-based Pride Scales were examined separately from the TOSCA-3 Pride items. The decision to conduct separate analyses in this manner was
based on the unique difference in the nature of the structure and content of the items in the two measures – the TOSCA-3 pride items consisted of scenario-based items, whereas the Pride Scales consisted of self-rated adjectives.

**Scenario-based Pride Analyses: TOSCA-3 Pride**

In examining whether the experience of authentic and hubristic pride differed between nationality, gender and age groups, a three-way between-groups MANOVA was performed. The two dependent variables used were the TOSCA-3 scenario-based authentic and hubristic pride scales. Preliminary assumption testing for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, revealed no violations. With regard to the combined dependent variables, there were no statistically significant differences between male and female participants, $F(2, 112) = .301, p = .741$, partial eta squared = .01; age groups, $F(6, 224) = .69, p = .658$, partial eta squared = .02; and nationalities, $F(2, 112) = .146, p = .864$, partial eta squared = .003), and there were no statistically significant interaction effects. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, none of the differences for scenario-based authentic or hubristic pride reached statistical significance.

**Adjective-based Pride analyses: Pride Scales**

In examining whether the experience of authentic and hubristic pride as a trait differed between nationality, gender and age groups, a three-way between-groups MANOVA was performed to investigate nationality, gender and age group differences in the experience of hubristic and authentic pride in a self-rated adjective-based measure of pride. The two dependent variables used were the Pride Scales, authentic and hubristic pride. The independent variables were nationality, gender and age group. Preliminary assumption testing for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity found
violations noted for Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices, as well as the hubristic pride scale for Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances.

As the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was violated, the more robust Pillai’s Trace was used in assessing the combined dependent variables. There were no statistically significant differences between male and female participants, $F (2, 112) = .325$, $p = .723$; Pillai’s Trace = .006; partial eta squared = .006); age groups, $F (6, 226) = .432$, $p = .857$; Pillai’s Trace = .023; partial eta squared = .011); nationality, $F (2, 112) = .793$, $p = .455$; Pillai’s Trace = .014; partial eta squared = .014) and there were no statistically significant interaction effects.

*Cross-cultural Correlations of Self-conscious Emotions and Psychological Well-being*

Table 2

*Correlations between measures of Self-conscious Emotions and Psychological Well-being for Australians (scores for Singaporeans in parentheses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Shame</td>
<td>.27* (.26*)</td>
<td>.34** (.21ns)</td>
<td>.32** (.30*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Guilt</td>
<td>.07ns (.04ns)</td>
<td>.11ns (.03ns)</td>
<td>.15ns (.13ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation Guilt</td>
<td>-.15ns (.09ns)</td>
<td>.13ns (.23ns)</td>
<td>.08ns (.27*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival Guilt</td>
<td>.40** (.18ns)</td>
<td>.43** (.29*)</td>
<td>.24ns (.36**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Authentic Pride</td>
<td>.14ns (.11ns)</td>
<td>.03ns (.09ns)</td>
<td>.16ns (.05ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.21ns (.23ns)</td>
<td>.06ns (.09ns)</td>
<td>.11ns (.04ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Pride Scale</td>
<td>-.26* (.17ns)</td>
<td>-.18ns (.12ns)</td>
<td>.10ns (.21ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubristic Pride Scale</td>
<td>.16ns (.25*)</td>
<td>.12ns (.43***)</td>
<td>.24ns (.35**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001, ns non-significant*

Table 2 above shows the correlations between measures of self-conscious emotions and psychological well-being for both Australians and Singaporeans. While shame was found to be significantly and positively correlated to all measures of psychological distress for Australians, Singaporean participants demonstrated positive and significant correlations between shame and depression and stress, but not anxiety.
positive relationship was found between separation guilt and stress for Singaporeans, but not for Australians. Across both cultures, the TOSCA authentic and hubristic pride measures failed to yield statistically significant relationships between their respective measures of pride and psychological distress. Despite this, positive significant correlations were found between the adjective measure of hubristic pride and all three measures of psychological distress for Singaporeans, but not for Australians. No statistically significant relationships were evidenced between the adjective measure of authentic pride and psychological distress, with the exception of a significant negative relationship between authentic pride and depression for Australians only.

Given the present study’s findings of Singaporeans reporting significantly more separation guilt than Australians, the present study explored possible effects of separation guilt-free shame on psychological distress. Table 3 below shows the correlations between psychological distress and shame, with the effects of separation guilt controlled for.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>.27* (.31**)</td>
<td>.34** (.33**)</td>
<td>.32** (.31*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaporeans</td>
<td>.26* (.24ns)</td>
<td>.20ns (.14ns)</td>
<td>.30* (.24ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001, ns non-significant

Assessing the two cultures individually, Australians showed significant correlations between shame and the three measures of psychological distress, whereas Singaporeans showed significant correlations between shame and depression and stress, but not anxiety. Given the significant difference in levels of separation guilt found between Australians and Singaporeans in prior analyses, correlations between shame
and psychological well-being were analysed, with separation guilt controlled for. Of interest, when the shared variance with separation guilt was controlled for, correlations between shame and psychological distress remained significant only for Australians, but not for Singaporeans.

Psychological Well-being: How Self-conscious Emotions Predict Symptoms of Depression, Anxiety and Stress

Stepwise regression was used to examine how self-conscious emotions (shame, pride and guilt) related to levels of depression, anxiety and stress, with demographic variables such as nationality, gender, age groups controlled. Prior to interpreting the results, several assumptions were evaluated. First, inspection of the normal probability plot of standardised residuals, as well as the scatterplot of standardised residuals against standardised predicted values, indicated that the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of residuals were met. Furthermore, Mahalanobis distance did not exceed the critical value for any cases in the data file, indicating that multivariate outliers were generally not of concern. Lastly, relatively high tolerances for all predictors in the regression model indicated that multicollinearity would not interfere with the ability to interpret the outcome of the regression model.

How Self-Conscious Emotions Predict Symptoms of Depression

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the ability of shame-proneness, (TOSCA-3 Shame), guilt-proneness (TOSCA-3 guilt; IGQ Separation guilt; IGQ Survival guilt) and pride-proneness (TOSCA-3 pride; Pride Scales) to predict levels of depression, after controlling for the influence of demographic variables (gender, age and nationality). At the first step, the main effects of the demographic variables – nationality, gender and age were entered. Age was entered as a continuous variable and not according to age bands due to the unequal proportions of Singaporeans and Australians in each age band. The measures of shame-proneness, guilt-proneness
and both authentic and hubristic prides were entered at the second step. Each specific emotion was analysed separately, and grouped by their corresponding measures. For example, the guilt analysis consisted of all three measures of guilt: TOSCA-3 Guilt, IGQ Separation Guilt and IGQ Survival Guilt. The pride analysis consisted of TOSCA-3 Pride (Authentic and Hubristic) and the Pride Scales (Authentic and Hubristic). The shame analysis included the TOSCA-3 Shame measurement. Statistics for the regression analyses are shown in Table 4.

For shame-proneness and the prediction of depression in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining 8.1% of the variance in levels of depression. After entry of TOSCA-3 Shame at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 17.5%, $F(4, 124) = 6.59, p < .001$. The measure of shame explained an additional 9.4% of the variance in depression, after controlling for age, gender and nationality, $R^2$ change = .094, $F$ change (1, 124) = 14.11, $p < .001$. In the final model, only gender and shame-proneness were statistically significant, with gender recording a slightly higher beta value ($\beta = -.32, p < .001$) than TOSCA-3 Shame scale ($\beta = .31, p < .001$).

For guilt-proneness and the prediction of depression in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining 8.1% of the variance in levels of depression. After entry of TOSCA-3 Guilt, IGQ Separation and Survival guilt at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 18.6%, $F(6, 122) = 4.64, p < .001$. The three measures of guilt explained an additional 10.4% of variance in depression, after controlling for age, gender and nationality, $R^2$ change = .104, $F$ change (3, 122) = 5.21, $p = .002$. In the final model, only gender and survival guilt were statistically significant, with survival guilt recording a higher beta value ($\beta = .35, p < .001$) than gender ($\beta = -.30, p = .001$).
Table 4
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Depression in Young Adults from Singapore and Australia. (Unstandardised (B), Standardised (β) Regression Coefficients).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGQ Separation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGQ Survival</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *p < .01; **p < .01
For authentic and hubristic pride-proneness and the prediction of depression in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining 8.1% of the variance in levels of depression. After entry of the TOSCA-3 authentic and hubristic pride measurements and the Pride Scales (authentic and hubristic) at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 25.9%, $F(7, 127) = 6.06, p < .001$. The four measures of pride explained an additional 18% of variance in symptoms of depression, after controlling for demographic variables, $R^2$ change = .18, $F$ change (4, 121) = 7.27, $p < .001$. In the final model, gender, both authentic and hubristic Pride Scales, as well as TOSCA-3 Hubristic Pride were statistically significant, with authentic Pride Scale recording the highest beta value ($beta = -.35, p < .001$), followed by hubristic Pride Scale ($beta = .30, p = .001$), TOSCA-3 Hubristic Pride ($beta = .26, p = .033$), and finally gender ($beta = -.20, p = .018$).

**How Self-conscious Emotions Predict Symptoms of Anxiety**

Stepwise regression was used to assess the ability of shame-proneness, (TOSCA-3 Shame), guilt-proneness (TOSCA-3 guilt; IGQ Separation guilt; IGQ Survival guilt) and pride-proneness (TOSCA-3 pride; Pride Scales) to predict symptoms of anxiety, after controlling for the influence of demographic variables (gender, age and nationality). At the first step, the main effects of the demographic variables were entered. Age was entered as a continuous variable and not according to age bands due to the unequal proportions of Singaporeans and Australians in each age band. The measures of shame-proneness, guilt-proneness and both authentic and hubristic prides were entered at the second step. Each specific emotion was analysed separately, and grouped by their corresponding measures. For example, the guilt analysis consisted of all three measures of guilt: TOSCA-3 Guilt, IGQ Separation Guilt and IGQ Survival Guilt. The pride analysis consisted of TOSCA-3 Pride (Authentic and Hubristic) and the
Pride Scales (Authentic and Hubristic). The shame analysis included the TOSCA-3 Shame measurement. Statistics for the regression analyses are shown in Table 5.

For shame-proneness and the prediction of symptoms of anxiety within individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining a statistically non-significant 1.8% of the variance in levels of anxiety, $F(3, 125) = .75$, $p = .526$. After entry of TOSCA-3 Shame at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 9.8%, $F(4, 124) = 3.38$, $p = .012$. The measure of shame explained an additional 8.1% of the variance in anxiety, after controlling for age, gender and nationality, $R^2 = .098$, $F$ change (1, 124) = 11.11, $p = .001$. In the final model, only shame-proneness was statistically significant ($beta = .29$, $p = .001$).

For guilt-proneness and the prediction of symptoms of anxiety in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining a statistically non-significant 1.8% of the variance in levels of anxiety, $F(3, 125) = .75$, $p = .526$. After entry of TOSCA-3 Guilt, IGQ Separation and Survival guilt at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 19.8%, $F(6, 122) = 5.03$, $p < .001$. The three measures of guilt explained an additional 18.1% of variance in anxiety, after controlling for age, gender and nationality, $R^2 = .181$, $F$ change (3, 122) = 9.16, $p < .001$. In the final model, only separation and survival guilt were statistically significant, with survival guilt recording a higher beta value ($beta = .41$, $p < .001$) than separation guilt ($beta = .18$, $p = .041$).

For authentic and hubristic pride-proneness and the prediction of symptoms of anxiety in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining a statistically non-significant 1.8% of the variance in levels of anxiety, $F(3, 125) = .75$, $p = .526$. After entry of the TOSCA-3 authentic and hubristic pride measurements and the Pride Scales (authentic and hubristic) at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 18.9%, $F(7, 127) = 4.04$, $p = .001$. The four measures of
Table 5
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Anxiety in Young Adults from Singapore and Australia.
(Unstandardized (B), Standardised (β) Regression Coefficients).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Shame</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Guilt</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGQ Separation</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGQ Survival</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Authentic Pride</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.172**</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Pride Scale</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubristic Pride Scale</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01; **p < .01
pride explained an additional 17.2% of variance in symptoms of anxiety, after controlling for demographic variables, $R^2$ change = .172, $F$ change (4, 121) = 6.41, $p < .001$. In the final model, only authentic and hubristic pride of the Pride Scales were statistically significant, with hubristic pride scale recording a higher beta value ($\beta = .39, p < .001$) than authentic pride scale ($\beta = -.29, p = .001$).

How Self-Conscious Emotions Predict Symptoms of Stress

Stepwise regression was used to assess the ability of shame-proneness, (TOSCA-3 Shame), guilt-proneness (TOSCA-3 guilt; IGQ Separation guilt; IGQ Survival guilt) and pride-proneness (TOSCA-3 pride; Pride Scales) to predict symptoms of stress, after controlling for the influence of demographic variables (gender, age and nationality). At the first step, the main effects of the demographic variables were entered. Age was entered as a continuous variable and not according to age bands due to the unequal proportions of Singaporeans and Australians in each age band. The measures of shame-proneness, guilt-proneness and both authentic and hubristic prides were entered at the second step. Each specific emotion was analysed separately, and grouped by their corresponding measures. For example, the guilt analysis consisted of all three measures of guilt: TOSCA-3 Guilt, IGQ Separation Guilt and IGQ Survival Guilt. The pride analysis consisted of TOSCA-3 Pride (Authentic and Hubristic) and the Pride Scales (Authentic and Hubristic). The shame analysis included the TOSCA-3 Shame measurement. Statistics for the regression analyses are shown in Table 6.

For shame-proneness and the prediction of symptoms of stress within individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining a statistically non-significant 4.9% of the variance in levels of stress, $F$ (3, 125) = 2.13, $p = .100$. After entry of TOSCA-3 Shame at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 15.7%, $F$ (4, 124) = 5.76, $p < .001$. The measure of shame explained an additional 10.8% of the variance in stress, after controlling for age, gender and
Table 6
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Stress in Young Adults from Singapore and Australia. (Unstandardized (B), Standardised (β) Regression Coefficients).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>∆R²</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-3.82</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-3.57</td>
<td>-3.57</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-3.82</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-4.85</td>
<td>-4.85</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGQ Separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGQ Survival</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>-3.82</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-4.74</td>
<td>-4.74</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Authentic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-3 Hubristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01; **p < .01
nationality, $R$ squared change = .108, $F$ change (1, 124) = 15.90, $p < .001$. In the final model, only nationality and shame-proneness were statistically significant, with shame-proneness recording a higher beta value ($\beta = .33, p < .001$) than nationality ($\beta = -.21, p = .020$). Gender also had a marginally statistically non-significant beta value ($\beta = 0.17, p = .055$).

For guilt-proneness and the prediction of symptoms of stress in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining a statistically non-significant 4.9% of the variance in levels of stress, $F (3, 125) = 2.13, p = .100$. After entry of TOSCA-3 Guilt, IGQ Separation and Survival guilt at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 18.1%, $F (6, 122) = 4.48, p < .001$. The three measures of guilt explained an additional 13.2% of variance in stress, after controlling for age, gender and nationality, $R$ squared change = .132, $F$ change (3, 122) = 6.55, $p < .001$. In the final model, gender, nationality, separation guilt and survival guilt were statistically significant, with survival guilt recording the highest beta value ($\beta = .289, p = .002$), followed by nationality ($\beta = -.287, p = .003$), gender ($\beta = -.20, p = .030$) and finally, separation guilt ($\beta = .18, p = .040$).

For authentic and hubristic pride-proneness and the prediction of symptoms of stress in individuals, demographic variables were entered at Step 1, explaining a statistically non-significant 4.9% of the variance in levels of stress, $F (3, 125) = 2.13, p = .100$. After entry of the TOSCA-3 authentic and hubristic pride measurements and the Pride Scales (authentic and hubristic) at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 17%, $F (7, 127) = 3.53, p = .002$. The four measures of pride explained an additional 12.1% of variance in symptoms of stress, after controlling for demographic variables, $R$ squared change = .121, $F$ change (4, 121) = 4.41, $p = .002$. In the final model,
only nationality and both authentic and hubristic Pride Scales were statistically significant, with hubristic pride scale recording the highest beta value \((beta = .38, p < .001)\), followed by nationality \((beta = -.28, p = .003)\) and authentic pride scale \((beta = -.20, p = .026)\).

**Discussion**

The present study aimed to analyse the impact of nationality, gender and age on the experience of self-conscious emotions with specific regard to shame, guilt and pride, during the period of young adulthood. The experiences of these emotions were examined, and an exploration of how such emotions related to symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress was conducted.

*Cross-cultural Differences in Proneness towards Experiencing Self-conscious Emotions*

The results pertaining to separation guilt supported the hypothesis that Singaporeans would differ from Australians in their levels of guilt-proneness. Although Australians and Singaporeans were not found to differ significantly in their experience of adaptive guilt and survival guilt, Singaporeans were found to report significantly greater proneness towards experiencing separation guilt, a form of maladaptive guilt. Of the three forms of guilt examined in the present study, separation guilt was one of the maladaptive forms of guilt that represented the exaggerated belief that to be different, or to separate, from one’s loved ones causes the latter harm (O’Connor et al., 1997). Indeed, this over-amplified sense of responsibility towards loved ones is believed to lead to behaviours that are motivated by the need to protect and remain loyal to one’s parents and loved ones (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997; Weiss & Sampson, 1986). At the crux of separation guilt lies an intense fear of causing harm to others, especially one’s parents, at the expense of pursuing one’s own desired goals. As a consequence, dysfunctional relationships are believed to be maintained
and perpetuated due to feared repudiation, as opposed to a source of mutual enjoyment and pleasure from the relationship (Erreich, 2011).

Singapore is reflective of a collectivistic society that places a strong emphasis on filial piety and the family as fundamental building blocks of the society (Quah, 1994). Indeed, young Singaporean adults are bound by an undercurrent of cultural guidelines to provide and care for their aging parents. As opposed to the earlier period of adolescence, during which these individuals were more dependent upon their parents to provide for them, young Singaporean adults are more likely to be in the life-stage where they would have commenced further education or employment, thereby gaining greater independence and financial capacity. With this newfound independence comes a novel, and culturally-esteemed sense of responsibility to provide, care for and please their aging parents and family. Indeed, the characteristic notions of collectivistic social ties, including marriage, caring of young children and filial piety, may be so deeply and intricately intertwined within Singapore’s ideas on filial piety, and the family as core foundations of society has been so deeply entrenched in the system, that a hidden sense of responsibility for young adults to care for their parents may indeed set them apart from young adults who belong to individualistic cultures.

In contrast is the Australian culture, which is reflective of the individualistic culture that highly values a focus on the self, self-independence and self-enhancement (Sun et al., 2004; Triandis, 1995). Consistent with the literature, the present study’s finding of Australians’ lower level of separation guilt may reflect a different orientation of the self to their family and interpersonal relationships. Young Australian adults may consider entering tertiary education and the workforce, attaining financial independence and starting a family as key milestones. Indeed, it appears that the individualistic self may place critical
importance on the self as a unit of life and a source of identity (Heine et al., 1999). By contrast, familial and parental responsibility may have unique importance to young adults from collectivistic cultures, to the extent that irrational beliefs and large quantities of familial guilt may manifest themselves in the form of greater levels of separation guilt. These findings suggest a need to explore the clinically relevant implications of separation guilt’s relationship with psychological distress within both collectivistic and individualistic cultures.

It is interesting to note that the hypotheses that cultural differences would emerge in levels of shame-proneness and both hubristic and authentic pride-proneness were not supported in the present study. The present study’s finding that Singaporeans did not experience statistically greater or lesser shame-proneness than Australians may not be an accurate representation of the function of shame within collectivistic cultures. Although the positive perception of shame within collectivistic cultures has been demonstrated in the literature (Wong & Tsai, 2007), it is critical to note that shame-proneness has also been associated with greater deterrence of the emotion, for the specific purposes of reducing intrapersonal psychological distress and fostering and increasing interpersonal harmony (Tangney, 1990; Wallace & Nosko, 1993). Indeed, researchers have suggested that, as a result of their beliefs about their selves and others, shame-prone individuals make an effort to deter themselves from shameful experiences with others by developing defensive scripts such as denial, withdrawal, arrogance, blaming, perfectionism, and rage (Kaufman, 1989; Tangney, 1990) that effectively allow them to regain power back to themselves. Deterrance from shame allows for the establishment of power and dominance, which is believed to enable the shamed individual to protect himself or herself from the inherent fear of abandonment, and to prevent relational conflict.
Kaufman (1989) has also argued that shame relates directly to the conceptualisation of a flawed and defective self, whereby defensive scripts may assist in preventing the individual from experiencing the core self as inadequate and unlovable (Wallace & Nosko, 1993). The absence of cultural differences with regard to shame-proneness in the current study may have manifested as a result of a deterrence, which stems from the valuation, of the emotion of shame within the Singaporean sample. Indeed, the collectivistic valuation of shame may not evidence itself in quantitative analyses, but may be better analysed by means of qualitative analyses, which may assist in attaining a deeper and richer understanding of cultural conceptualisations of self-conscious emotions, such as shame.

In addition, the present study did not find statistically significant differences in the levels of pride-proneness between Singaporeans and Australians. These findings are inconsistent with the literature, which has reported a greater devaluation of pride within collectivistic cultures, and a greater valuation of pride in individualistic cultures (Eid & Diener, 2001; Mosquera et al., 2000). It should be noted that, although sparse within the literature, cross-cultural studies have also found inconsistent findings with regard to the individualistic and collectivistic perspectives on pride. Although the devaluation of pride in collectivistic cultures has been shown in previous studies, a few studies have also found that Asians were more likely to report experiencing greater levels of hubristic pride than individuals from individualistic cultures (Orth et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). The present study suggests that there might exist a discrepancy between the devaluation of pride within collectivistic cultures and the actual level of pride-proneness that collectivistic individuals experience. Specifically, it is suggested that a culture’s positive perception of a self-conscious emotion may not necessarily correspond with the actual quantity it presents. For example, even though collectivistic cultures’ devaluation of pride may result in the
absence of physical expression of pride, the intrapersonal experience of pride may still occur for individuals within collectivistic cultures, which may have certain clinical implications for psychological distress. It is, therefore, vital to attain a better cultural understanding of the relationship that pride has with psychological distress.

*Self-conscious Emotions and Psychological Well-being*

*Maladaptive Guilt and Psychological Well-being*

Similar to the psychological impact of shame, survival guilt related to, and predicted, overall negative psychological well-being, with specific regard to symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. As expected, and consistent with the literature, the adaptive guilt measure (TOSCA-3 Guilt) was not found to be a predictor of depression. In comparison to the isolation and withdrawal that is characteristic of shame, guilt, whether adaptive or maladaptive, has, at its crux, a reparative nature, with the focus being on amending broken social ties and cultivating healthy interpersonal relationships. What is interesting is the finding that survival guilt was related to symptoms of depression, whereas separation guilt and adaptive guilt were not found to predict depression. It is possible that survival guilt’s greater inward focus on the self, which distinguishes it from the other two forms of guilt, could contribute to its relation with depression. This pattern appears to parallel shame’s relationship with psychological distress, which suggests that the intrapersonal focus of survival guilt and shame may be more likely to predict future depressive symptoms. In contrast, the interpersonal focus that characterises both separation guilt and adaptive guilt appears to be predictive of anxious symptoms that may stem from a motivation towards repairing and amending broken social relationships.

In contrast to the inward focus of survival guilt and shame, separation guilt, which has an outward focus on one’s perceived need to be unconditionally available and loyal
towards their loved ones, was found to predict symptoms of anxiety and stress. In accordance with the general notion of guilt being a predominantly socially constructed emotion, separation guilt, a form of maladaptive guilt, has been associated with a desire to amend broken social relationships, particularly those that concern one’s parents and family. It is of interest to note that while separation guilt was found to be a predictor of anxiety and stress, it was not found to be a predictor of depression. The literature has established that a consequence of separation guilt is manifest in the form of dysfunctional familial relationships that are perpetuated by feared repudiation (Erreich, 2011). The findings of the present study indicate that the experience of separation guilt has an impact on the individual’s psychological well-being, whereby separation guilt relates to, and predicts, symptoms of anxiety and stress. This finding is consistent with the literature’s general establishment of the psychological impact of the experience of generalised guilt, where guilt has been associated with symptoms of anxiety, as opposed to depression, due to guilt’s outward, pro-social focus on mending broken social relationships.

*The Dark Side of Hubristic Pride*

It is interesting to note that even though pride has generally been regarded in the literature as a “positive” self-conscious emotion, its hubristic form was found to relate to psychological distress, after demographic variables, such as nationality, age and gender, were controlled for. Pride has been widely associated with positive thoughts, emotions and behaviour in the literature (Leary et al., 1995; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). However, the present study has found that even a “positive” self-conscious emotion, such as hubristic pride, could relate to, and even predict, psychological distress within the individual. This finding sheds light on the complexity of pride as a self-conscious emotion and further illuminates the finer-grained mechanism of the emotion within the individual. While
hubristic pride may indeed lead to the immediate experiencing of positive emotions such as joy (Tracy & Robins, 2007a), it may also contain a negative and more isolating aspect – one that has not been given much consideration in research thus far.

The present study’s findings were consistent with existing research, whereby hubristic pride was found to predict all three symptoms of negative psychological well-being – depression, anxiety and stress. Hubristic pride, due to its intrapersonal focus of attribution of value to the self, was associated with greater depressive, anxious and stressful symptoms. It is suggested that hubristically proud individuals may place greater pressure on the self to perform well consistently, because of the nature of their valuing of the self in terms of their performance. Authentic pride, however, negatively predicted all three symptoms of psychological distress. Authentic pride has been argued to differ from hubristic pride, in that it places value on the achievement, rather than on the individual (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Considering that the difference between hubristic and authentic pride is the internal or external attribution of the achievement – whether it is attributed externally to the act of achievement or internalised within one’s self-concept – the present study’s findings suggest the individual’s subjective attribution of achievement may pose implications for the experience of psychological distress. At the heart of hubristic and authentic pride lie an achievement and a value attribution. It is suggested that hubristic pride’s internal value attribution may contribute to a certain pressure towards consistent performance. In recent years, researchers have focused on the distinctions that have been drawn between the two facets of pride (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Gaining a comprehensive understanding of the individual’s unique internal or external attribution of the meaning and value of their experienced pride may assist clinicians in gaining a more
thorough understanding and assessment of the impact of pride on psychological distress itself.

*Cross-cultural Impact of Self-conscious Emotions on Psychological Distress*

Shame was correlated with all measures of psychological problems across both cultures, with the exception of anxiety for Singaporeans. However, with separation guilt partialed out, shame lost its significant associations for the Singaporean participants only and remained correlated with psychological distress for Australian participants. These results provide new insight on the possible cross-cultural impact of separation guilt’s shared variance with shame in the experience of psychological distress. It appears that separation guilt, to which Singaporeans were found to experience greater proneness, may interact with shame’s relationship with psychological distress for Singaporeans. When examining shame’s relationship with psychological distress, with separation guilt controlled for, the results have indicated that shame associates strongly with all three measures of psychological distress for Australians only.

While previous studies have documented a collectivistic valuation of shame (Wong & Tsai, 2007), as well as a greater tendency of collectivistic individuals to report shame-proneness (Bedford & Hwang, 2003), the present study suggests that, with particular regard to collectivistic cultures, shame may be operating with shared variance in other culturally relevant self-conscious emotions, such as separation guilt, to result in psychological distress. The results suggest that the actual emotion of shame itself appears to only be related to psychological distress within an individualistic culture, such as Australia, suggesting a possibility that collectivistic cultures, which value interpersonal relationships, may have existing social support for coping with negative self-conscious emotions, such as shame. In contrast, individualistic cultures, such as Australia, that possess an independent
self-construal may have lesser interpersonal and social resources that could assist the individual in coping with negative emotions of shame. These current findings also lend support to Wong and Tsai’s (2007) argument that existing models of self-conscious emotions could be skewed toward an individualistic conceptualisation, and support the consideration of unique models of self-conscious emotions within collectivistic cultures.

With specific regard to Singaporeans only, hubristic pride correlated with all three measures of psychological distress. This finding is of particular interest, and suggests that, despite a general devaluation of the emotion of pride within collectivistic cultures (Eid & Diener, 2001), collectivistic individuals, when experiencing pride that arises from attributions to internal, stable, and uncontrollable causes, are more likely to experience symptoms of psychological distress – namely, symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. These findings appear to present conversely to the collectivistic relationship between shame and psychological distress. Building on previous studies’ theories of the collectivistic valuation of shame and devaluation of pride (Eid & Diener, 2001; Wong & Tsai, 2007), the results of the present study suggest that the collectivistic valuation of shame may work to promote healthy social mechanisms that assist with coping with shame. However, the collectivistic devaluation of pride may inhibit the individual’s willingness toward expressing and disclosing the emotion of hubristic pride, which may result in lesser social resources for assisting with the internalised experience of hubristic pride, an emotion that has been associated with psychological distress and antisocial behaviour.

In contrast, the individualistic valuation of pride, as established in the literature (Eid & Diener, 2001), may explain the lack of a relationship between pride, both hubristic and authentic, and psychological distress for the Australian participants. However, the individualistic culture’s negative views towards experiencing shame and the self-criticism
associated with it (Bedford & Hwang, 2003; Kitayama et al., 1995), may result in less adaptive ways of coping with the emotion, which may explain the relationship between shame and psychological distress for Australians.

**Effects of Age on Separation Guilt**

The present study also explored significant age differences in the experience of shame, guilt and pride. Results indicated that such differences existed only for separation guilt. The younger group of young adults, aged 18-20 years old, was reported to experience more separation guilt than older young adults. In addition, Singaporeans significantly accounted for more separation guilt in two age groups (18-20 year-olds and 24-28 year-olds) than Australians. However, due to the disproportionate sample sizes of Singaporeans and Australians in these age bands, the results obtained require cautious interpretation and further confirmation with a larger and more proportionate sample. Of interest, significant differences across cultures for this young adult cohort were found for separation guilt, but not for adaptive guilt or survivor guilt. Two possible explanations of this are: 1) It further confirms that guilt is a multi-faceted emotion in which some of its components are highly correlated but are distinct in more than one way; 2) In the younger cohort, the steep gradient in changes could be due to the unique emphasis and relevance of separation guilt during this particular developmental stage. It may be possible that the concept of survivor guilt may be more relevant and pronounced during later stages of a lifespan, due to the nature of survivor guilt that involves surviving others in various events or situations. Guilt felt over these situations may not be prevalent in the young adult cohort, taking into consideration that the average age for this study was 23 years old. The present study’s findings also converge with findings from Orth et al. (2010) and Bruno et al. (2009) that,
pan-culturally and across the human adult lifespan, females experience more guilt than males.

**Limitations and Future Suggestions**

The present study was one of the first investigations into the young adult cohort with regard to the self-conscious emotions of shame, guilt, and pride, as well as their culture-specific relationship with symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. Given the result of greater separation guilt-proneness in Singaporeans, as well as the shared variance between separation guilt and shame on psychological distress in the Singaporean sample, future studies should examine culture-specific relationships and path influences of self-conscious emotions, between each other, as well as with measures of psychological distress.

In the present study’s cross-cultural investigation of the experience of self-conscious emotions and their relation to psychological well-being, findings have suggested the need to consider the mediating effect of external variables that may be influencing the impact of self-conscious emotions on psychological well-being. Given the present study’s finding of Singaporeans reporting a greater tendency to experience separation guilt, as well as the collectivistic valuation of families and caring for one’s aging parents, assessing for the mediating effects of variables such as filial piety may assist in expanding the understanding of the finer mechanisms behind the experience of separation guilt within a collectivistic culture.

Future studies should consider analysing the path of influence between self-conscious emotions, psychological well-being and culturally-relevant external variables that may mediate both the strength and the direction of relationships. The present study’s finding of separation guilt as a culturally unique self-conscious emotion not only
encourages an exploration of other mediating variables that may contribute to this effect, but also highlights the need to investigate the psychological impact of such emotions within their corresponding cultures. While Singaporeans may have been found to report a greater propensity to experience separation guilt, and while separation guilt has been found to be a predictor of symptoms of anxiety and stress, the collectivistic orientation of Singapore may already have a well-established healthy coping mechanism for young adults to function well with the anxiety and stress that is associated with separation guilt.

While the chosen measurements for shame, pride and guilt, as well as psychological well-being, provide a quantitative assessment of the experience of self-conscious emotions within the individual, conducting a qualitative analysis may assist with gaining a richer and more in-depth understanding of how shame, pride and guilt may operate in different cultures. Indeed, the results of the present study have suggested that there might exist a discrepancy between the valuation, or devaluation, of an emotion, and the levels of reported proneness towards experiencing such emotions using quantitative measures. A qualitative assessment would contribute to the richness of knowledge by expanding on the quantitative knowledge and gaining culture-rich information with regard to how and why these self-conscious emotions are experienced within the cultural context itself.
CHAPTER 4: STUDY 2: A QUALITATIVE CROSS-CULTURAL EXPLORATION OF THE EXPERIENCE OF SELF-CONSCIOUS EMOTIONS IN YOUNG ADULTS

While studies have found fundamental differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions in individualistic and collectivist cultures, very few have conducted cross-cultural, qualitative analyses investigating self-conscious emotions across a specific age group. Importantly, recent research has highlighted the lack of in-depth research with regard to possible differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions between cultures, with specific regard to the period of early adulthood. Indeed the period of early adulthood has been found to be the only period during which large differences in the trajectories of shame, guilt and pride were observed (Orth et al., 2010).

The Test of Self-Conscious Affect-3 (TOSCA-3) (Tangney & Dearing, 2002) is one of the most frequently used quantitative measures of shame and guilt, and its validity has been repeatedly confirmed (Robins et al., 2007). The TOSCA includes 16 scenarios from everyday life and measures the likelihood of several common reactions to those situations. By using a set of widely varying hypothetical scenarios, the TOSCA corresponds to the design of trait measures of guilt and shame. Responses are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not likely) to 5 (very likely).

Scenario-based methods have been most frequently used in research on individual differences in shame, guilt, and pride (Reimer, 1995; Tangney, Wagner, Burggraf, Gramzow, & Fletcher, 1990). Tangney and colleagues (1996) argued that it is difficult, if not impossible, to reliably distinguish between shame and guilt using conventional global self-report methods (e.g., “I always feel guilt”). To assess guilt about behaviour, distinct from shame about self, it is argued to be necessary to assess emotions that are embedded in
specific situations – yet it is precisely the introduction of specific situations that makes scenario-based methods sensitive to cultural effects.

This current study aims to qualitatively investigate similarities and differences in shame, guilt, and pride, as assessed in individuals of either Australian-Caucasian or Singaporean-Asian ethnicity. The present study will also investigate the cultural sensitivity of the TOSCA-3, by means of conducting a qualitative interview-version of the TOSCA-3. The qualitative version will consist of eight scenarios that are similar to those of the TOSCA-3, and will allow participants to expand on their responses. Importantly, the qualitative nature of the study will allow for a richer understanding of shame, guilt and pride than a quantitative measure alone will be able to achieve. Finally, the present study seeks to investigate the robustness of the TOSCA-3 as an efficient and effective primary measure of self-conscious emotions across both individualistic and collectivist cultures.

Method

Participants

The current study was approved by the Murdoch University Research Ethics Office, Division of Research and Development (Ethics Approval number 2011/086). Participants were recruited by means of personal contact to participate in a qualitative study investigating the experience and expression of self-conscious emotions – shame, pride and guilt.

The inclusion criteria for the participants in the study were that participants be of Australian or Singaporean nationality, and that they were within the ages of 19 and 35 years. In addition, Singaporean participants must not have resided in Australia for more than three months, so as to ensure that possible effects of the influences of the Australian culture on the Singaporean sample was kept to a minimum.
Participants consisted of five Australians and five Singaporeans. The mean age of the participants was 26.3 years. Five of the participants were women, and five were men. The Singaporean sample consisted of three young women and two young men. The Australian sample consisted of two young women and three young men.

Measures

A semi-structured interview was designed to elicit existential accounts with regard to self-conscious emotions. The interview was designed for the purpose of ensuring that the TOSCA-3, a frequently used quantitative measure of self-conscious emotions, was culturally sensitive and sufficiently rigorous to use as a main measure of self-conscious emotions in future studies. The TOSCA-3 consists of 16 different scenarios that involve self-conscious emotions, specifically pride, shame and guilt. The interview was designed as an extended and qualitative interview-version of scenarios similar to those of the TOSCA-3.

The semi-structured interview consisted of eight hypothetical scenarios that were associated with shame, guilt and pride (see Appendix B for the full set of interview scenarios). The semi-structured interview consisted of descriptive questions, through which participants were asked to provide a general account of their feelings towards the scenarios. Interviews were audio-recorded with a Sony PX720 voice recorder and transcribed verbatim.

Analysis

The data was analysed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Smith, 1995; Smith & Osborn, 2003). IPA is a qualitative research method that combines phenomenology with hermeneutics. It is phenomenological because of the focus on a detailed examination of the personal and lived experiences of the participants. Specifically,
IPA is concerned with attempting to understand how participants themselves make sense of their experiences. The main focus is on the meanings that these experiences have for the participants and not to produce objective data on the event itself. In this way, IPA involves two key processes: first, the participants are attributing meaning to their experiences; second, the researchers are trying to understand this process of meaning construction of the participants. Therefore, and in order to enhance the trustworthiness of the research process, it is necessary that the researcher try to set aside his or her own beliefs, thoughts and preconceived notions about the phenomenon under investigation, a process called “bracketing” (Willig, 2008). In this case, the participant is concentrating on making sense of his or her own experience of self-conscious emotions, and the researcher is attempting to comprehend that experience through the participant’s language and expressed emotion. The approach is both empathic and interrogative with close attention paid to cognition and emotion within the interview and pattern of speech and mode of expression in the transcript.

After each transcript was read through, first reflections, associations, and preliminary interpretations were noted down by the researcher. Next, keywords that captured the essential quality of the participants’ statements regarding helping processes were noted in the margin. At the same time, themes were listed on a separate sheet. Next, attempts were made to cluster the themes under master themes. With regard to the level of analysis, classification, which refers to the act of classifying meaning units or themes that emerged from the data, was used. With each subsequent transcript that was analysed, themes and master themes were continuously analysed and defined. Through this process, categorisation was refined and a more integrated set of master themes was developed. An
independent reviewer, who had access to participants’ transcripts and instructions on classification, verified the themes identified below.

Results

The qualitative analysis resulted in two recurring master themes: (1) Intrapersonal Experience of self-conscious emotions; and (2) Interpersonal Experience of self-conscious emotions. The different themes will be discussed consecutively in detail using descriptive statements, each time illustrated by one selected verbatim quotation of the participants.

Master Theme 1: Intrapersonal Experience of Self-conscious Emotions

The intrapersonal experience of self-conscious emotions refers to participants’ personal and inward experience of the emotions of shame, guilt and pride. Within this master theme, two constituent themes emerged – (1) Locus of Control and Blame; and (2) The Intrapersonal Experience of Shame, Guilt, and Pride.

Constituent Theme 1: Locus of Control and Blame

The first constituent theme that pervaded participants’ accounts and reappeared throughout their accounts was the “locus of control and blame”. This locus of control and blame was elicited by the scenarios that related to hypothetical situations of failure or success, and emerged as one of the core factors that determined the experience of the occurrence or co-occurrence of self-conscious emotions. The individual’s self-awareness and self-reflection on the scenarios of failure or success appeared to undergo a cognitive process that assessed the internalisation or externalisation of control and blame.

Individuals who appeared to employ an internal locus of control seemed to blame themselves for failure and appeared to experience their shortcomings as a harsh and intensely personal and berating experience. In a scenario that involved damaging a car that
the individual borrowed from a friend, the emotion of shame was observed as a prevalent feeling that followed this self-berating process.

“I would feel horrible about it because it would have been all my fault that it happened. I would be thinking to myself: how could I be so clumsy and stupid? I would want to fix it, but to be honest, I wouldn’t know where to put my face or how I would face my friend in the future. They would never lend me their car again. I’d probably put off fixing the car... I’m not sure what I’d do – it would be quite overwhelming for me” (Singaporean man, 20 years)

In contrast, individuals who accounted for an external locus of control seemed to place the cause of fault or failure on an external object or aspect that was clearly unrelated to their own ability or capability. It appeared that the emotion of guilt, more so than shame, often followed the train of consciousness for individuals who processed failure with an external locus of control.

“I’d be feeling bad about what happened but I would do my best to get it fixed. Actually, I might even explain to my friend that it was a really tight parking lot and I didn’t mean to scratch his car. I’d explain the situation and let him know that I’m sorry and I will get it fixed.” (Australian woman, 20 years)

Likewise, hypothetical situations relating to success seemed to also follow a similar cognitive filter through which the processes of self-awareness and self-reflection would result in feelings of pride. In a scenario that involved an individual’s essay being publicly praised and read out by a tutor to the class, individuals who appeared to internalise success seemed to relate their achievement directly to their own personal ability and effort. In
addition, it was often found that these individuals would even project their success onto their personal self-worth and being. This form of pride seemed most consistent with hubristic pride.

“I would feel pretty awesome about myself cos it says something about me and what I can do to achieve. I guess on the outside, if the tutor read out my essay as a model essay, I wouldn’t want to attract attention to myself… But on the inside I’d be happy to know that I did better than others in class. I’d feel smarter than them.” (Singaporean woman, 20 years)

In contrast, individuals who appeared to have an external locus of control seemed to experience similar feelings of achievement satisfaction. What set them apart, however, was whether their attribution of their success was placed upon their ability or their self-worth. Unlike individuals with an internal locus of control, individuals with an external locus of control did not appear to internally relate their success directly onto their personal self – their focus was more on the act of achievement, rather than the self who achieved.

“I’d be pretty proud and pleased that I wrote a good essay and that I did a good job. Obviously the effort would have paid off. I’d be happy that I did well and that my work was good enough to be read out by the tutor.” (Australian man, 20 years)

Constituent Theme 2: The Intrapersonal Experience of Shame, Guilt, and Pride

Shame

Shame appeared to be experienced as an intensely private and personal emotion that involved the perceiving of the self as unworthy in the eyes of the self or others. Participants related feelings of shame that highlighted intense negative feelings of inadequacy and a
threatened self-worth. It appeared that shame worked towards creating distance between the individual from others, especially others who could potentially evaluate the individual. It was noted that participants who appeared to react with feelings of shame occasionally displayed social behaviour that included speaking quietly, blushing, avoiding eye contact, and sitting in a slumped or hunched body posture. In a scenario that involved poor performance on exams despite investing much effort in preparation, participants who responded with shame-proneness often placed an emphasis on themselves as personal defects, keeping a strong focus on a self that was perceived as flawed. The notion of the failure to live up to standards of worth in the eyes of others, or their own selves, seemed to hold high relevance to these participants, and, in addition, they related a fear of being vulnerable to the possible judgement of others.

“I would feel terrible because if I’d known how much effort I put in it and I still did badly, I mean it says a lot. Either there’s something wrong about my studying style, or I’m a failure… You feel like a failure because you studied so hard but didn’t get the results… and also towards other people – you’ll be seen as a failure”
(Singaporean woman, 20 years)

Guilt

Participants who appeared to react with guilt seemed to place great emphasis on their need and want to repair the damage caused by their wrongdoing. They related a form of emotional discomfort within them that seemed to catalyse the motivation towards amending the situation. In scenarios that involved damaging a car that was borrowed from a friend and spilling a drink on a friend’s new dress, participants accounted for an intensely unpleasant emotional discomfort that stemmed from their actions that were either
incongruous with social standards, or their personal moral standard. They were quick to vocalise their subsequent step of action, which was to rectify their wrongdoing and repair social relationships. These included proposed acts of actively fixing the situation, making reparations, apologising, confessing or seeking forgiveness. The individual’s focus on the act of wrongdoing, and the subsequent planning towards rectifying the misdeed seemed to invoke a sense of personal consolation in participants. It was noted that participants initially presented as distressed when accounting for their feelings of guilt. However, they appeared to regain a calmer and brighter disposition once they started to speak about specific actions that they could take to amend their hypothetical act of wrongdoing.

“I’d be feeling guilty… like they’ve trusted me with their car, and I’ve done some damage to something that’s not mine… But after a couple of minutes, I’d be thinking ‘It’s okay, we can sort this out’. I’d try to think of how I can fix it for them” (Australian man, 19 years)

Pride

The two facets of pride – authentic and hubristic – pervaded participants’ accounts in their responses to scenarios that involved hypothetical situations of success, which included success in academics, family and friendship dimensions. It appeared that pride, in general, was experienced as a positive self-conscious emotion, which, in participants’ accounts, was stated to make them feel good about themselves. Participants linked their reactions to emotions such as happiness, contentment and satisfaction.

The distinguishing factor for the experience of authentic or hubristic pride lay in whether participants attributed their sense of pride to an internal, unstable and controllable
cause (effort) – resulting in authentic pride, or to an internal, stable and uncontrollable cause (ability) – resulting in hubristic pride.

Of interest, the nature of the inward experience of hubristic pride in Singaporean participants was found to not necessarily match its outward experience. In a scenario that involved the individual receiving a compliment on their attire, hubristic pride appeared to be experienced as an intensely private emotion that presented mainly within the individual’s private thoughts and feelings. This contrasted with the Australian participants’ accounts that involved hubristic pride. It seemed as though Australian participants were more likely to seek to communicate with others about their personal thoughts and feelings regarding their achievement.

“I would be really glad, because it means I look great. I’d feel great about myself. Honestly, I’d be feeling on top of the world… I would just say ‘Oh, thanks’ and talk about how I got it on sale… No I wouldn’t share it (participant’s feelings) with them.” (Singaporean woman, 26 years)

Master Theme 2: Interpersonal Experience of self-conscious emotions

The interpersonal experience of self-conscious emotions refers to participants’ experience of the emotions of shame, guilt and pride pertaining to their social interaction with others. Within this master theme, two constituent themes emerged – (1) Familial relationships; and (2) Non-familial social relationships.

Constituent Theme 1: Familial Relationships

Cluster Theme 1: Filial Piety

The concept of filial piety emerged as a significant cultural factor that differentiated Singaporean participants’ experience of shame and guilt from Australian participants’
experience of those emotions. While the notion of familial bonds seemed to be important for both Australians and Singaporeans, there appeared to be a strong feeling of responsibility and obligation towards remaining filial towards parents for Singaporean participants. In a scenario that involved the failure to fulfil a promise that was made to the individual’s parents, Singaporean participants accounted for feelings of guilt that included an intense urgency to repair their wrongdoing as soon as they could. Of interest, a sense of shame was present in their reaction as well, whereby negative self-evaluation in the form of self-blame appeared to take place in Singaporean participants’ accounts. There appeared to be a focus on the consequences of their failure to live up to the promise that they made to their parents, which included the possibility of their parents’ disappointment in them, possible hurt inflicted upon the parent, and a disappointment in themselves for causing disruption in their parents’ general well-being. Despite the co-occurrence of shame and guilt in Singaporean participants, the urgency to make amends and repair the relationship with their parents seemed to be of greater importance than the inwardly-directed shame.

“She’s my mother, I have an obligation to her, and I’ve obviously hurt her feelings… I’d feel terrible… I’d try to rush down and see how she is.” (Singaporean woman, 26 years)

While Australian participants accounted for plans to rectify the situation, it appeared that their predominant focus was on the self, rather than on the relationship that they had with their parents. Australian participants accounted for feeling guilt that stemmed from their own failure at fulfilling an action that they had set out to do. It appeared that their experienced guilt was directed at themselves for their incapacity to carry out their promise.
In addition, unlike their Singaporean counterparts, there did not appear to be a presence of shame in their account for the scenario regarding filial piety.

“I would feel guilty because I’ve made a promise and I haven’t kept it. And that is important to me. I’d feel bad and guilty, and a bit like I’ve disappointed them and myself… Because I said something is going to happen and I was meant to go through with it, but something failed in the process. So therefore, it was my doing that didn’t allow it to happen.” (Australian man, 32 years)

Cluster Theme 2: Sibling Relationships

Group-conscious emotions emerged as an important theme in participants’ accounts with regard to a scenario that involved the individual’s relationship with a hypothetical sibling. In the scenario, both the individual and the individual’s sibling were applying for the same prestigious course at university. Participants are then advised that the individual’s sibling is subsequently successful at gaining entrance to the course, while the individual is not. When participants were asked how they would feel about the situation, Singaporean participants initially appeared to focus solely on their feelings towards the sibling who succeeded them. Specifically, they accounted for feelings of jealousy, and even hatred, that was directed at the sibling. In addition, the Singaporean participants expressed feelings of internally-directed shame after the interviewer requested them to explore feelings that they had towards themselves. They reported feelings of intense disappointment and self-blame at what they perceived as failure.

“I’d feel really terrible, actually. Because if you really want to get into some place and you can’t get in, especially if you’ve worked harder than your brother… I’d be very disappointed with myself. (When asked about feelings towards the individual’s
sibling) I’d feel like it was unfair, maybe a bit angry towards your brother. But it’s an unspoken thing. You won’t express it on the outside, because it’s not his fault. You just move on, but just don’t talk to your brother – because you won’t want to know how he’s doing.” (Singaporean woman, 23 years)

“I guess I wouldn’t be very happy, because coming from an Asian family, my parents and relatives can be sometimes a little nosy. And sometimes I feel it’s not right, but they might be insensitive and highlight the fact that he got in and I didn’t. At the next meeting with them, I’d really be dreading meeting my relatives. (When inquired about personal feelings) Internally, I wouldn’t be happy. I’d probably feel quite bad about myself and unhappy (Singaporean woman, 26 years)

In contrast, Australian participants initially focused on emotions that were related to the self. Specifically, they accounted for feelings of anger and injustice towards the situation, rather than at themselves. The Australian participants, in general, did not appear to relate the situation of failure to their self-worth, and it seemed that their main focus was on the possible explanations for the situation of failure. For example, they explored reasons that could explain why they did not perform well enough, which included the lack of invested effort, or problems with the assessment methodology. In addition, it was of interest to note that most of the Australian participants did not account for feelings that they had towards their sibling, unless they were prompted by the interviewer.

I’d be very angry with myself. I don’t see it as a competition as such, but more a reflection of my own abilities. So if I didn’t get in, it’s because I didn’t do the work. Not defective as a whole person, just a little part of me that didn’t perform well
enough. (When asked about feelings towards the sibling) Depends on the relationship with my brother, if I’m really chummy with him, I might be really happy for him. (Australian man, 27 years)

“There’d be a mixture. I’d be quite torn about that. Because I’d be extremely disappointed, and I’d take it all on as I haven’t done a good enough job. So there’d be that aspect, but then I’d also be really, really pleased for my brother. There’d probably be a bit of jealousy as well – at his success. So that’d be a really complicated emotional experience.” (Australian woman, 32 years)

Constituent Theme 2: Non-familial Social Relationships

Other in-group members who were not related to the individual’s family were also found to impact the experience and expression of self-conscious emotions. Of interest, certain cultural differences were found to emerge in Singaporean and Australian participants’ accounts for situations that involved public exposure to one’s failures and shortcomings. In the hypothetical scenario that involved a work setting, the individual had committed a mistake at work that resulted in the boss publicly shouting at the individual. Participants were requested to comment on their feelings after being publicly berated by the boss. In addition, they were also asked how they would have felt if fellow colleagues had enquired about how they were feeling. Singaporean participants were found to account for intense feelings of guilt at their committed mistake, as well as an internalised shame for their wrongdoing and the public exposure of their mistake. Furthermore, they accounted for a sense of humiliation that appeared to particularly, and directly, affect their self-worth and self-esteem. With regard to their feelings associated with colleagues enquiring about the
situation and their well-being, Singaporean participants were found to account for feelings of shame, which resulted in a general withdrawal from social support. There did not appear to be any intention to share their feelings with other in-group members.

“Being yelled at for my mistake, I would feel hurt. I must have done really badly. Outwardly, I would be frustrated at the situation… Inwardly, I would feel guilty because it’s something that I could have stopped and prevented. (When asked about their feelings when colleagues enquired about the situation) I would just make a joke out of it. I guess I would be defensive, I’ll make a joke out of it so they wouldn’t ask anymore…” (Singaporean woman, 25 years)

By contrast, Australian participants firstly accounted for strong feelings of anxiousness, stress, and anger towards the individual’s boss for the public exposure of their misdeed. In addition, they reported feelings of guilt towards the act of wrongdoing that was associated with regret, as well as a desire to avoid the mistake in the future. Of interest, Australian participants appeared to react with feelings of appreciation for what they construed as social support from their co-workers and friends in the situation of public exposure to their failure. Most of the Australian participants reported that they would share their feelings about the situation with their colleagues who had enquired about it, stating that they would feel as though they had a network that cared for them.

“I’d feel anxiety and stress… that they’ve shouted at me for it. But there’s no reason why they should have shouted at me. I guess I must have done something really wrong. (When asked about colleagues enquiring about the situation) I’d feel good that they’re concerned, and I’d feel supported… like I’m a part of a supportive group and that I’m not alone.” (Australian man, 27 years)
Discussion

The present study investigated the cultural sensitivity of an adapted qualitative interview-version of the TOSCA-3 on Australian-Caucasian and Singaporean-Asian individuals aged between 19 and 35 years. The qualitative nature of the present study sought to explore and attain a richer understanding of the experiences of shame, guilt and pride across and within cultures, beyond that of the ability of a quantitative measure. The two major themes that emerged as crucial cultural and universal factors pertaining to self-conscious emotions were the intrapersonal nature of the experience of self-conscious emotions, and the interpersonal nature of the experience of self-conscious emotions.

Although this study utilised a different methodology (Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis) compared to other studies, the findings are consistent with most clinical and research reports of both universal and cross-cultural experiences of shame, guilt and pride. In line with cross-cultural studies that have found greater levels of shame and guilt for individuals from collectivist cultures compared to individuals of individualistic cultures (Kashima et al., 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1998; Miller, 2002), the present study found a consistency with the theme of shame and guilt to be reported by Singaporean participants. Researchers have theoretically and empirically established the moral value of guilt and self-criticism in collectivistic cultures such as Asia (Campos et al., 2007; Eid & Diener, 2001), and the present study’s finding of guilt and shame-proneness in Singaporeans supports previous findings that shame and guilt, in collectivist cultures, provide for the opportunity to self-reflect on one’s weakness and to work towards self-improvement to meet shared social standards. It should be noted that the degree of guilt and shame-proneness that was accounted for by Singaporean participants might not necessarily reflect a high amount of guilt or shame in Singaporeans. While researchers have argued that
shame has been considered to be a maladaptive response for the individual who experiences it, shame might serve as an internal deterrent that prevents individuals from engaging in wrongful behaviour in the first place (Heery et al., 2003; Tangney et al., 1996). It could well be possible that shame, in particular, might motivate avoidant-behaviours in Singaporeans in the short run, while motivating a desire to change the self, so as to avoid situations of shame over time.

In addition, the present study has found that both shame and guilt can co-occur for Singaporeans in scenarios that were shown to only elicit guilt in Australians. Despite the co-occurrence of shame and guilt for Singaporeans, the present study found a general trend where Singaporeans emphasised a final reparative behaviour that was predominantly motivated by guilt, with a specific motive of repairing broken social relationships. This finding is consistent with the literature that has documented the collectivistic self to be defined by the individual’s social roles and relationships, whereby the opinions of others have been found to be greatly influential on the individual’s sense of self (Kashima et al., 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1998).

In contrast to their Singaporean counterparts, the emotions of guilt and shame were reported to be experienced differently for Australians. In situations that involved failure, Australian participants accounted for feelings of guilt that stemmed from an external locus of control. Australian participants were found to express regret at the wrongdoing, rather than at their own self. In addition they expressed a motivation towards engaging in reparative acts to amend the wrongdoing. This pattern of guilt was found to be consistent with the established literature, in which guilt appears to stem from the attribution of a negative act to controllable behaviours carried out by the self (Lickel et al., 2007; Tracy & Robins, 2004a). The nature of the experience of guilt by Australian participants’ could also
be explained by studies that have emphasised the individualistic self to be largely defined by their identity as an independent self who is unique and autonomous (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and is driven towards the attainment of affirmed and stable positive attributes (Heine et al., 2001). By being more inclined to experiencing guilt, as compared to shame, individuals from individualistic cultures, such as Australia, could be working towards protecting their sense of self-esteem and self-worth, keeping the latter two concepts intact in their pursuit of an autonomous self with stable positive attributes.

The concept of filial piety emerged as a pivotal cross-cultural theme that had specific relevance to shame and guilt, as well as to the Singaporean culture. Singaporeans accounted for intense feelings of shame and guilt in response to situations that involved their wrongdoing in relation to their parents, or towards figures of authority. This contrasted greatly against the Australian respondents, who related their guilt to stem from a behaviour that was inconsistent with certain positive self-attributes. In line with research that has documented the sheer importance and prevalence of filial piety in Asian cultures, the present study found that Singaporeans placed extensive importance on feeling directly responsible for their parents’ happiness. In addition, the present study was also able to uniquely explore the internal experience within the individual during hypothetical situations involving filial piety, with specific regard to the proneness towards feeling shame and guilt, as elicited by situations of filial piety. Filial piety is, indeed, a central concept in a Confucianistic Asian society such as Singapore, and the present study has contributed to the literature by further exploring the dual filial piety model proposed by Yeh (2003). Reciprocal filial piety was observed to emerge as a theme especially for Singaporeans, who reported a sense of satisfaction at their ability to provide and care for their parents out of gratitude for their efforts in raising them. However, a major theme of authoritarian filial
piety was observed in the Singaporean sample as well, with specific regard to the internal experience of shame and guilt within the individual. Responses that involved authoritarian filial piety involved situations that related to the individual’s shame and guilt at their inability to emotionally and physically provide for their parents. Furthermore, it should be noted that Singaporeans also reported an obligation towards meeting their parents’ needs, at the expense of their own desires and wishes. This compliance with the individual’s parents’ wishes and the force of role requirements, together with the consequential shame and guilt experienced internally, reflect and further illuminate the authoritarian filial piety aspect of the dual filial piety model (Yeh, 2003).

The present study found group-conscious emotions to penetrate through various levels of social life, setting the standards for not only families, but also communities and political behaviour. In situations that involved figures of authority in the workplace, Singaporeans were observed to behave submissively and respectfully towards the hypothetical figure of authority. Additionally, they reported internal feelings of shame and guilt at their perceived failure. In contrast, Australians were found to report feelings that were consistent with guilt and anger that were directed externally at the behaviour and the situation of failure. Of interest, the internalisation and self-blaming aspect of shame that was experienced by Singaporeans was reported to result in the tendency to withdraw, which consequentially led to a decrease in social support. By contrast, Australians appeared to be open to and accepting of the notion of social support. While the tendency to withdraw from social support may be perceived as an act that works towards preserving social harmony, the present study’s findings of Singaporeans’ guilt and shame that occur due to the pervasiveness of collectivistic values raise questions regarding the expense at which such pervasive values are practised.
Authentic pride was found to be generally consistent for both the Australian and Singaporean sample across the scenarios. In addition, the present study’s findings also supported previous research that observed a greater likelihood for Asians to experience hubristic pride than Caucasians. In the present study, Singaporeans were found to attribute and internalise their personal achievements to reflect directly onto their personal self-worth. In contrast, Australians were more likely to attribute their achievements to the affirmation of their unique positive attributes. Beyond exploring the cross-cultural experience of pride, the present study was also able to explore the nature of the expression of pride in Singaporeans and Australians. Singaporeans, in general, were found to experience hubristic pride only in an internalised form – through thoughts and feelings. Singaporeans emphasised their reluctance to exhibit behavioural cues that might reveal their feelings of pride, and reported an unwillingness to share their feelings of hubristic pride with others, even with members who were part of their close social group. In this case, the intensity of the experience of hubristic pride within the individual was found to be inconsistent with the level of behavioural expression of the feeling. This finding further illuminates the experience of pride in collectivist cultures, shedding light on the discrepancy between the experience and the expression of pride in individuals from collectivist cultures. In addition, the present study also found that Australians were observed to be generally open towards sharing their internal experience of authentic or hubristic pride with members of their social group.

Future studies should investigate some of the key findings of the present study. Specifically, the relation of filial piety to the experience of shame and guilt to collectivist cultures requires more in-depth and empirical analyses. In addition, the experience of elicited shame in both a public and private context should be further explored, with specific
regard to a cross-cultural analysis. Importantly, the nature of the co-occurrence of shame and guilt within the individual, with specific regard to the interaction between both guilt and shame, and the discrepancy between the internal experience and the external expression of shame, guilt and pride, both universally and cross-culturally, is also recommended for further exploration.

Future research should also consider Asian emigrants to western cultures, with specific regard to the generational effects on filial piety and self-conscious emotions. It may be that Asian emigrants face certain challenges of living in cultures that may not understand or endorse traditional values such as filial piety, and this may impact on the internal and external experience and evolution of these values from one generation of emigrants to another. It would be of interest to investigate the children of emigrants, who may become more acculturated to an individualistic culture and may therefore potentially reject traditional collectivist values.

Certain potential limitations of the present study need to be addressed. It should be noted that the small sample size of participants resulted in the need for cautious interpretations of the data with regard to self-conscious emotions and gender within a specific nationality. In addition, the IPA methodology of the present study meant that the depth and richness of data collected was subject to the extent that participants were willing to disclose such personal information. Researchers have highlighted the need for a particular focus on the experience of shame, guilt and pride during the period of early adulthood, and the present study has specifically addressed this and contributed to the literature through the qualitative exploration of these self-conscious emotions. The present study has also been able to highlight specific and vital differences in the experience of shame, guilt and pride between Australians and Singaporeans. The interview method of
data collection has also allowed for the attainment of qualitative responses that have provided for a deeper understanding of the experience and expression of shame, guilt and pride within and between an individualistic and collectivistic culture. Importantly, data from the present study has also supported the cultural sensitivity and robustness of the TOSCA-3 as a quantitative measure of self-conscious emotions.
Self-conscious Emotions: Cultural Concerns

In November 2012, Gallup published results of an international poll where it was reported that Singapore ranked as the “least emotional country in the world” (Clifton, 2012). Specifically, it was reported that “Singaporeans are the least likely in the world to report experiencing emotions of any kind on a daily basis” (Clifton, 2012). Gallup claimed that the 36% of Singaporeans who reported feeling either what they termed “positive” or “negative” emotions was the lowest percentage in the world. In contrast, 50% of Australians were reported to experience emotions of any kind on a daily basis.

The present study challenges the Gallup poll’s bold claim that Singaporeans are “emotionless”, and suggests that issues of methodology and cultural factors should be considered in examining cultural differences in the study of emotions. Firstly, the Gallup poll posed questions that related to basic emotions, where examples of the poll’s questions included “Did you smile or laugh a lot yesterday?” and “Did you experience the following feelings (enjoyment, worry, stress, anger, physical pain) during a lot of the day yesterday?” Indeed, it is clear that the content of the poll’s questions related purely to basic emotions, which differ greatly from self-conscious emotions that require self-evaluation and that are complicated in their relationship with psychological distress (Kim, Thibodeau, & Jorgensen, 2011). In addition, the results of the Gallup poll raise questions in relation to the discrepancy between the inward experience and the outward expression of emotions, as well as relevant cultural differences in the inward experience and outward expression of
emotions – let alone self-conscious emotions. Moreover, the research evidence in the current program of research in this thesis challenges that of the Gallup poll.

Study 2 (Qualitative Study) has shed light on the collectivistic individual’s internal experience of self-conscious emotions, and how it may differ from the manner in which it is actually expressed outwardly. Additionally, Study 1 (Pilot Study) found that Singaporeans experience significantly more separation guilt than Australians, suggesting that there are certain specific self-conscious emotions that Singaporeans experience more than Australians. Importantly, Study 1 (Pilot Study) also found that when hubristic pride is experienced, and its shared variance with separation guilt is controlled for, Singaporeans, when compared to their Australian counterparts, were more likely to experience psychological distress, such as symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. In contrast, no relationship was found between hubristic pride and psychological distress for Australians.

Study 1 found that Singaporeans were more prone than their Australian counterparts to experience maladaptive separation guilt. Despite this, no statistically significant cultural differences emerged for measures on shame, adaptive and survival guilt, or hubristic and authentic pride. With specific regard to psychological distress, Study 1 found that when Singaporeans experienced shame, the latter was not associated with symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. However, shame experienced by Australians was found to be associated with psychological distress. Interestingly, Study 1 also found that when Singaporeans, but not Australians, experienced hubristic pride, the latter was associated with psychological distress. The findings of Study 1 highlight key cultural variations in the function of different self-conscious emotions, as well as the psychological impact on the individual.
Study 2 qualitatively examined cultural differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions, through its qualitative adaptation of the TOSCA-3 measure. The findings of Study 2 highlighted unique cultural differences in the experience of shame and guilt, whereby the concept of filial piety emerged as a major point of reference for Singaporeans in their experience of self-conscious emotions. In addition, Study 2 also shed light on the possibility of a discrepancy that may exist between the internal experience and external expression of self-conscious emotions, especially within a collectivistic culture. For example, it was found that while Singaporeans reported that they would experience hubristic pride intrapersonally (inwardly), they reported that they would not be inclined to express the hubristic pride interpersonally (outwardly). Singaporeans expressed an acknowledgment of a cultural devaluation of pride, and stated that they would keep the emotion of hubristic pride private, a finding that converged with research that had documented an interpersonal-orientation within collectivistic cultures. In contrast, Australians were found to readily experience and express the emotion of hubristic pride, supporting studies that have argued for the independent self’s strive for personal enhancement.

Gender Differences in the Experience of Self-conscious Emotions

In general, women have long been stereotyped as generally more emotional than men (Barratt & Bliss-Moreau, 2009; Brody & Hall, 2008; Shields, 2002). However, some variation exists in the direction of gender differences with regard to specific basic emotions. Women are stereotyped as experiencing more awe, distress, fear, happiness, love, sadness, shyness, surprise and sympathy than men, whereas men are stereotyped as experiencing more anger than women (Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000). With regard to the experience of self-conscious emotions, women have been stereotyped as experiencing
greater levels of guilt and shame, whereas men have been stereotyped as experiencing more pride (Plant et al., 2000). Interestingly, ethnic variation has been evidenced for gender stereotypes, with larger gender differences found among Caucasians than African Americans, Latin Americans and Asian Americans (Durik et al., 2006). Studies have found empirical evidence that suggests that while women may generally express more emotion and emotional intensity than men, there exists mixed evidence of gender differences in emotional experience (Grossman & Wood, 1993; Shields, 2002). With respect to self-conscious emotions, studies have documented a pattern of gender similarities in authentic pride, women scoring higher on shame and guilt, and men scoring higher on hubristic pride (Brody & Hall, 2008; Ferguson & Eyre, 2000; Roberts & Goldenberg, 2007; Tracy & Robins, 2007a).

Hypotheses

Guided by theories in the existing literature, as well as empirical findings of Studies 1 and 2, the present study was an explorative study that aimed to investigate cultural and gender differences between young Australian and Singaporean adults, with regard to shame, guilt (adaptive and separation guilt), hubristic and authentic pride, as well as reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. The present study also sought to explore culture-specific relationships between self-conscious emotions, as well as attitudes towards filial piety, and various aspects of psychological distress. It was hypothesised that Singaporeans, as compared to Australians, would report greater levels of separation guilt and hubristic pride. Young Singaporean adults were also hypothesised to report higher levels of reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety than their Australian counterparts.
Method

Participants and Procedure

The current study was approved by the Murdoch University Research Ethics Office, Division of Research and Development (Ethics Approval number 2012/033). Data used for the present study was collected via the Murdoch University’s Social and Community Online Research Database (SCORED) system, a website that provides access to a wide variety of psychological studies (http://scored.murdoch.edu.au) (see Appendix C for the full questionnaire). Participants were recruited using several strategies: The Murdoch University Subject Pool Research website and via a Facebook website page that provided the link to the study published on SCORED.

Psychology students from Murdoch University received an hour’s worth of subject pool credit in return for their participation. The rest of the participants had the option of participating in a draw to win a $500 Apple voucher. The survey data was kept separate from the incentive entry list to ensure anonymity.

The original sample consisted of 443 individuals. Only completed questionnaires from individuals who were within the age range of 18 to 35 years of age were included in the analysis. Consequently, the data from six participants aged 14, 15, and 17 years of age were excluded. The final sample consisted of 182 Singaporeans and 189 Australians. In alignment with the present study’s aim of investigating specific cultural differences, individuals of nationalities other than Australian and Singaporean (n = 66) were excluded from the data analysis. Table 7 shows the demographics of Australian and Singaporean participants. The mean age of participants was 24.9 years (SD = 4.56, range = 18-35). Of the total sample, 49.6% were Australians and 50.4% were Singaporeans.
Table 7

Demographics based on Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Mean age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaporeans</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sample</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

Demographics. Demographic data on gender, age, occupation, nationality and country of residence were collected.

The current study utilised some measures that were identical to Study 1. These measures included the TOSCA-3, DASS and MACSA-R.

The Test Of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA-3; Tangney et al., 2000) In the present study, the alpha coefficient for the test as a whole was .80. The alpha coefficients for the shame, guilt, hubristic pride and authentic pride subscales were .80, .75, .51 and .52, respectively.

Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire – 67 (IGQ-67; O’Connor et al., 1997; Bruno et al., 2009) For the purposes of the present study, only the Separation Guilt Scale was used. The original 16-item subscale was trimmed down to 13 items. This process of elimination excluded items that had the lowest factor correlation to the overall subscale measure in Study 1. Responses to items are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale and scores are
calculated by summing up the items’ scores under each subscale. For the present study, the alpha coefficient was .82 for Separation Guilt.

**Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales** (Tracy & Robins, 2007c) This measure is an expansion of the original Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (Tracy & Robins, 2007c). Its modification includes scales for both shame and guilt. The scales are a trait version measure of shame, guilt, authentic and hubristic pride. The shame scale includes items such as “disgraced” and “devalued”, and the guilt scale includes items such as “remorseful” and “regretful”. Analyses of internal consistency resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .88 for the Authentic Pride scale, .88 for the Hubristic Pride scale, .88 for the Shame scale, and .79 for the Guilt scale. The alpha coefficient for the test as a whole was .87.

**Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995).** In this present study, the alpha coefficients for the following scales of the DASS are: Depression scales .90, Anxiety scales .83, Stress scales .86 and DASS overall .93.

**Modified Affective Control Scale for Adolescents – Revised (MACSA-R; Geddes & Dziurawiec, 2007).** The MACSA-R is a revised and shorter version of the Modified Affective Control Scale for Adolescents (MACS-A; Geddes & Dziurawiec, 2007). Geddes and Dziurawiec (2007) adapted the 42-item Affective Control Scale (ACS) originally developed by Williams, Chambless, and Ahrens (1997) to create the MACS-A. The MACSA-R is an 18-item self-report measure of the fear of various emotions, which is defined as a fear of losing control over one’s emotions and one’s reactions to emotions. The MACSA-R is comprised of three subscales: Fear of Anxiety, Fear of Depressed Mood and Anger, and Lack of Control of Anxiety. In the present study, the alpha coefficient for the test as a whole was .91. The specific subscales of Fear of Anxiety, Fear of Depressed Mood and Anger, and Lack of Control of Anxiety were .84, .87, and .70, respectively.
Dual Filial Piety Scale (DFPS; Yeh & Bedford, 2003). The DFPS is a 16-item self-report measure of both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. Respondents indicated how important each statement was to them. Examples of items measuring reciprocal filial piety included “Hurry home upon the death of a parent, regardless of how far away you live” and “Be grateful to parents for raising you”. Authoritarian items included “Live with parents even after marriage” and “Compliment your parents when needed to save their face”. For the present study, analysis of internal consistency resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .88 for the reciprocal and .80 for the authoritarian filial piety subscales. The overall Cronbach alpha was .87 for the entire measure.

Results

Cultural Effects on Self-conscious Emotions

A series of MANOVAs was conducted to assess for the effect of nationality on specific self-conscious emotions. The self-conscious emotions were grouped into four main groups: 1) Maladaptive separation guilt and filial piety; 2) Shame; 3) Adaptive guilt (TOSCA-3 Guilt subscale and Adjective-Scales Guilt subscale); and 4) Pride (Both hubristic and authentic subscales of the TOSCA-3 Pride and Adjective Pride Scales). For the purpose of conducting an exploratory study, a Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level of .05 was not conducted for the analyses. The present study’s exploratory aim is not to prove or replicate existing theories and models, but to explore the possible existence of the impact of culture on measures of specific self-conscious emotions and filial piety. Table 8 below shows the correlations between measures of filial piety and the self-conscious emotions.

For separation guilt and its relationship with other self-conscious emotions and attitudes towards filial piety, the strongest positive correlation was observed to occur
between separation guilt and authoritarian filial piety. Weaker and moderate correlations were observed between separation guilt and reciprocal filial piety, shame and guilt. There was also a weak, negative correlation between separation guilt and authentic pride.

Results indicated that reciprocal filial piety shared moderate, positive correlations with authoritarian filial piety and guilt, as measured by the guilt scale. Additionally, there was a weak, positive correlation between reciprocal filial piety and authentic pride, as measured by the Authentic Pride Scale. Weak, positive correlations were found between authoritarian filial piety and shame, guilt and pride.

There was a strong, positive correlation between the TOSCA-Shame and the TOSCA-Guilt scales. Additionally, a moderate, positive correlation was found between the TOSCA-Shame and the Shame Scale measures. In general, moderate to strong, positive correlations were found between shame and guilt. There was also a moderate, positive correlation between shame, as measured by the Shame Scale, and hubristic pride, as measured by the Hubristic Pride Scale. A moderate and negative correlation was also found to exist between shame and authentic pride, as measured by the Authentic Pride Scale.

When adaptive guilt was measured by the Guilt Scale, a moderate, positive correlation was found between adaptive guilt and hubristic pride (Hubristic Pride Scale). In contrast, the TOSCA-Guilt Scale revealed a weak, negative correlation between adaptive guilt and hubristic pride (Hubristic Pride Scale). There was also a weak, negative correlation between adaptive guilt, as measured by the Guilt Scale, and authentic pride, as measured by the Authentic Pride Scale.
Table 8

*Correlations of measures of Self-Conscious Emotions and Filial Piety (Australians above the diagonal, Singaporeans below diagonal)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Separation Guilt</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TOSCA-Shame</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOSCA-Guilt</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shame Scale</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Guilt Scale</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TOSCA- Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TOSCA- Authentic Pride</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hubristic Pride Scale</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Authentic Pride Scale</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05; **p < .01
Maladaptive Separation Guilt and Filial Piety Analysis

In examining whether the experience of separation guilt and filial piety (reciprocal and authoritarian) differed between nationality and gender, a two-way between groups MANOVA was performed. The three dependent variables used were the IGQ-separation guilt subscale and the two DFPS subscales: reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. The independent variable was nationality (Australian and Singaporean). Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations observed. There was a statistically significant difference between Australians and Singaporeans on the combined dependent variables, $F(3, 347) = 10.55, p < .001$, Wilks’ Lambda = .92; partial eta squared = .08, as well as for gender, $F(3, 347) = 5.00, p = .002$, Wilks’ Lambda = .96; partial eta squared = .04. No interaction effects between nationality and gender were observed.

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, all three dependent variables evidenced statistical significance for the effect of nationality. With specific regard to nationality effects, separation guilt reached statistical significance, $F(1, 349) = 6.23, p = .013$, partial eta squared = .02; reciprocal filial piety reached statistical significance, $F(1, 349) = 8.82, p = .003$, partial eta squared = .03; and authoritarian filial piety reached statistical significance, $F(1, 349) = 30.01, p < .001$, partial eta squared = .08. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that Singaporeans reported higher levels of separation guilt, reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety than their Australian counterparts.

With specific regard to gender effects, two of the three dependent variables reached statistical significance. Separation guilt reached statistical significance, $F(1, 349) = 9.91, p = .002$, partial eta squared = .03; and reciprocal filial piety reached statistical significance $F$
An inspection of the mean scores indicated that females reported higher levels of separation guilt and reciprocal filial piety than their male counterparts. Table 9 shows the mean values on the measures of separation guilt, authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety, for nationality and gender.

Table 9

Mean scores of Nationality and Gender on measures of Separation Guilt and Filial Piety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australians</th>
<th>Singaporeans</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>F value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep Guilt</td>
<td>30.52</td>
<td>32.63</td>
<td>6.23**</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>9.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>30.01***</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>8.82**</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>5.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Note: Sep Guilt = Separation Guilt; AFP = Authoritarian Filial Piety; RFP = Reciprocal Filial Piety

Shame Analysis (TOSCA-3 Shame and Shame Scale)

In examining whether the experience of shame differed between nationality and gender, a two-way between groups MANOVA was performed. The two dependent variables used were the two measures of shame – TOSCA-3 Shame subscale and the Shame Scale. The independent variables were nationality (Australian and Singaporean) and gender (male and female). Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations observed. There was a statistically significant difference between males and females on the combined dependent variables, $F (2, 351) = 13.71, p < .001$, Wilks’ Lambda = .93; partial eta squared = .07. No nationality, or interaction between nationality and gender, effects were observed. When results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the only gender difference to reach statistical significance was the TOSCA-3 Shame subscale measure, $F (1, 352) =$
27.49, \( p < .001 \), partial eta squared = .07. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that females reported higher levels of shame (\( M = 53.00, SD = .50 \)) than males (\( M = 47.56, SD = .90 \)).

**Adaptive Guilt Analysis (TOSCA-3 Guilt and Guilt Scale)**

In examining whether the experience of adaptive guilt differed between nationality and gender, a two-way between groups MANOVA was performed. The two dependent variables used were the two measures of adaptive guilt – TOSCA-3 Guilt subscale and the Guilt Scale. The independent variables were nationality (Australian and Singaporean) and gender (male and female). Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations observed. There was a statistically significant difference between male and female respondents on the combined dependent variables, \( F (2, 356) = 5.60, p = .004 \), Wilks’ Lambda = .97; partial eta squared = .03. No nationality, or interaction between nationality and gender, effects were observed. When results for the dependent variables were considered separately, the only gender difference to reach statistical significance was the TOSCA-3 Guilt subscale measure, \( F (1, 357) = 11.03, p = .001 \), partial eta squared = .03. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that female respondents reported higher levels of shame (\( M = 65.72, SD = .37 \)) than male respondents (\( M = 63.17, SD = .68 \)).

**Pride Analyses (TOSCA-3 Pride and Pride Scales)**

Due to low correlations between the Scale Hubristic Pride measure with the other three measures of pride (TOSCA-3 Hubristic and Authentic subscales and Scale Authentic Pride), analysis for the effects of gender and nationality on pride were conducted separately.
Firstly, a two-way between groups MANOVA was performed using three dependent variables, the two measures of authentic pride (TOSCA-3 Authentic Pride and Scale Authentic Pride), and the TOSCA-3 Hubristic Pride subscale. The independent variables were nationality (Australian and Singaporean) and gender (male and female). Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity, with no serious violations observed. There was no statistically significant difference for nationality ($F(3, 353) = 1.79, p = .15, \text{partial eta squared} = .02$), or gender ($F(3, 353) = .48, p = .70, \text{partial eta squared} = .004$) on combined dependent variables. There was also an absence of an interaction effect between gender and nationality, $F(3, 353) = 1.20, p = .31, \text{partial eta squared} = .01$.

Secondly, a two-way between groups ANOVA was used to examine the effect of gender and nationality on hubristic pride, as measured by the Scale Hubristic Pride. The Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances was significant, indicating that the variance of scores on Scale Hubristic Pride across groups was not equal. As suggested by Pallant (2010), a more stringent alpha value of .01 was set for evaluating the results of the ANOVA. There were no statistically significant results for the main effects of nationality ($F(1, 352) = 1.57, p = .21, \text{partial eta squared} = .004$), or gender ($F(1, 352) = .84, p = .36, \text{partial eta squared} = .002$), as well as no interaction between gender and nationality ($F(1,352) = 3.13, p = .08, \text{partial eta squared} = .009$).

It should be noted that when an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the Scale Hubristic Pride scores for Singaporeans and Australians, a significant difference between Australians and Singaporeans was found, $t(336.63) = -2.71, p = .007$, two-tailed). As the equality of variances for the two groups was found to be violated
(Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances), the alternative t-value corresponding to equal variances not assumed was used. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that Singaporeans reported higher levels of hubristic pride ($M = 11.77$, $SD = 4.13$) than Australians ($M = 10.68$, $SD = 3.36$). An independent-samples t-test that was conducted to compare gender differences with regard to scores on Scale Hubristic Pride found no statistically significant differences between males and female respondents, $t (354) = .995$, $p = .32$, two-tailed).

*Cultural Relations between Self-conscious Emotions, Filial Piety, and Psychological Well-being*

*Table 10*

*Correlations between measures of Self-conscious Emotions, Filial Piety and Psychological Distress for Australians (scores for Singaporeans in parentheses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation Guilt</td>
<td>.18* (.12ns)</td>
<td>.31** (.25**)</td>
<td>.16* (.14ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>.07ns (-.06ns)</td>
<td>.17* (.02ns)</td>
<td>.09ns (.01ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>.06ns (.08ns)</td>
<td>.25** (.15*)</td>
<td>.06ns (.00ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Shame</td>
<td>.40** (.32**)</td>
<td>.44** (.34**)</td>
<td>.48** (.30**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Guilt</td>
<td>.09ns (.10ns)</td>
<td>.23** (.14ns)</td>
<td>.20** (.09ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Shame</td>
<td>.53** (.48**)</td>
<td>.56** (.44**)</td>
<td>.41** (.36**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Guilt</td>
<td>.50** (.55**)</td>
<td>.52** (.46**)</td>
<td>.38** (.50**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Authentic Pride</td>
<td>.03ns (-.11ns)</td>
<td>.02ns (-.02ns)</td>
<td>.05ns (-.02ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.03ns (-.10ns)</td>
<td>-.01ns (-.01ns)</td>
<td>.003ns (-.05ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Authentic Pride</td>
<td>-.37** (-.23**)</td>
<td>-.15* (-.12ns)</td>
<td>-.10ns (-.10ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.20** (.34**)</td>
<td>.12ns (.34**)</td>
<td>.12ns (.35**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACS Average</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong> (.56**)</td>
<td><strong>0.59</strong> (.59**)</td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong> (.62**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, ns non-significant*
Table 10 shows the correlations between the measures of shame, adaptive and separation guilt, hubristic and authentic pride, filial piety, fear of affect and measures of psychological distress for Australians and Singaporeans. Maladaptive separation guilt was related to all three measures of depression, anxiety and stress for Australians, but only to symptoms of anxiety for Singaporeans. Reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety was related to symptoms of anxiety for Australians, while only a low magnitude correlation \( (r = .15) \) was found between authoritarian filial piety and anxiety for Singaporeans. Moderate magnitude correlations were found between shame and psychological distress for Australians and Singaporeans, with Singaporeans showing slightly weaker correlations across all three subscales of psychological distress.

While weak to moderate correlations were found between adaptive guilt, as measured by the TOSCA-Guilt subscale, and symptoms of anxiety and stress within the Australian sample, adaptive guilt remained unrelated to psychological distress for the Singaporeans respondents. However, adaptive guilt, as measured by the Scale Guilt, was found to be moderately correlated to all three components of psychological distress across both nationalities. These findings indicate that the scenario-based measure, the TOSCA-Guilt subscale, may be a more culturally sensitive measurement of adaptive guilt than its trait-based counterpart, the Scale Guilt subscale.

In general, the TOSCA measure of hubristic and authentic pride found no statistically significant correlations between pride and psychological distress for both nationalities. However, the Pride Scales appeared to tap into cultural differences. For both Singaporeans and Australians, Authentic pride correlated negatively with symptoms of depression. Authentic pride was also negatively and weakly related to anxiety within the Australian population. Within the Singaporean sample, hubristic pride, as measured by the
Pride Scales, showed significant positive correlations at a moderate level with all three measures of depression, anxiety and stress. In contrast, hubristic pride was only found to correlate weakly with depression for the Australian sample.

Table 11

*Correlations between measures of Self-conscious Emotions, Filial Piety and Fear of Affect Control for Australians (scores for Singaporeans in parentheses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Anxiety</th>
<th>Fear of Depressed Mood and Anger</th>
<th>Fear of Loss of Control</th>
<th>Mean MACS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation Guilt</td>
<td>.20** (.27**)</td>
<td>.20** (.27**)</td>
<td>.10ns (.16*)</td>
<td>.25** (.30**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>.06ns (-.05ns)</td>
<td>-.06ns (-.05ns)</td>
<td>-.02ns (-.02ns)</td>
<td>.00ns (-.04ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>.09ns (-.02ns)</td>
<td>.07ns (.06ns)</td>
<td>-.01ns (.03ns)</td>
<td>.11ns (.09ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Shame</td>
<td>.58** (.47**)</td>
<td>.53** (.47**)</td>
<td>.22** (.21**)</td>
<td>.59** (.50**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Guilt</td>
<td><strong>26</strong> (-.08ns)</td>
<td>.18* (.16*)</td>
<td>.11ns (-.05ns)</td>
<td>.23** (.11ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Shame</td>
<td>.51** (.42**)</td>
<td>.44** (.47**)</td>
<td>.36** (.28**)</td>
<td>.54** (.49**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Guilt</td>
<td>.49** (.47**)</td>
<td>.41** (.48**)</td>
<td>.32** (.32**)</td>
<td>.50** (.53**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Authentic Pride</td>
<td>.08ns (.12ns)</td>
<td>.03ns (.03ns)</td>
<td>-.14ns (-.16*)</td>
<td>.02ns (.04ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSCA-Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.04ns (.04ns)</td>
<td>-.06ns (-.05ns)</td>
<td>-.11ns (-.15*)</td>
<td>-.04ns (-.04ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Authentic Pride</td>
<td>-.34** (-.29**)</td>
<td>-.37** (-.28**)</td>
<td>-.30** (-.36**)</td>
<td>-.41** (-.35**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.13ns (.30**)</td>
<td>.14ns (.33**)</td>
<td>.12ns (.27**)</td>
<td>.16* (.36**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, ns non-significant

Table 11 above shows the correlations between measures of self-conscious emotions, filial piety, and fear of affect for both Australians and Singaporeans. Both Singaporeans and Australians showed low to moderate magnitude positive correlations.
between separation guilt and fear of affect control. Across both nationalities, reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety showed no statistically significant relationships with affect control. For both nationalities, moderate magnitude correlations were found between shame, as measured by both the TOSCA-Shame subscale and the Scale Shame measure, and affect control. In general, TOSCA-3 adaptive guilt was found to positively correlate with affect control for Australians only. Similar to correlations between psychological distress and TOSCA-Pride subscales, no statistically significant relationships were found for TOSCA-Pride (authentic and hubristic) and affect control for both Singaporeans and Australians. While authentic pride, as measured by the adjective-based scale, showed consistently negative correlations with affect control and its three subscales for both nationalities, the scale measure of hubristic pride showed significant positive correlations with affect control for Singaporeans only.

**Discussion**

Cross-cultural research on the experience of self-conscious emotions and its relationship with psychological distress remains sparse, and further exploration of the understanding of the modus operandi of such emotions has been recommended in the literature, especially with regard to young adults (Meehan et al., 1996; Orth et al., 2010; Wong & Tsai, 2007). The current study examined cultural and gender differences with regard to attitudes towards filial piety and the experience of self-conscious emotions, namely maladaptive separation guilt, adaptive guilt, shame, and hubristic and authentic pride. Cultural relationships were also explored with regard to the association between self-conscious emotions and filial piety with psychological distress.
Cultural Differences in the Experience of Self-conscious Emotions and Attitudes towards Filial Piety

The present study’s findings suggest that, as compared to their Australian counterparts, Singaporeans experience greater levels of separation guilt. This finding replicates those of Studies 1 and 2, and contributes to the literature a more in-depth and cross-cultural understanding of separation guilt as a form of maladaptive guilt. While the present study did not confirm cross-cultural differences in the experience of adaptive guilt, separation guilt appears to be of greater significance to young adults in Singapore, who are reflective of a collectivistic culture. Separation guilt refers to a maladaptive form of guilt that consists of an exaggerated belief that separation or differing from one’s loved ones will cause the latter harm (O’Connor et al., 1997). Importantly, it involves a distorted sense of loyalty which is argued to result in behaviours that are motivated by the need to constantly protect and remain loyal to parents and loved ones (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997).

The current literature is lacking in studies that have assessed differences in the experience of separation guilt between individualistic and collectivistic cultures (Meehan et al., 1996). Furthermore, to my knowledge, most of the studies in this area have researched cross-cultural differences in various self-conscious emotions within a population that resided within an individualistic culture. For example, Meehan et al. (1996) examined differences in the experience of various forms of maladaptive guilt, including separation guilt, between African-Americans, Euro-Americans and Latin Americans, all of whom resided in the United States. In the present study, 74.3% of Singaporean participants and 99.5% of Australian participants were residents in their respective countries during data collection. Given that a key component of separation guilt is the notion of separation from one’s parents or loved ones, the present study’s findings indicate that this separation
transcends beyond a physical separation, and it is suggested that an emotional separation from loved ones may be of particular importance in the understanding of collectivistic separation guilt.

The present study’s findings of greater levels of separation guilt in Singaporeans than Australians supports existing theories that argue that culture may be an important variable in the experience of self-conscious emotions (Mesquita & Walker, 2003; Tracy & Robins, 2007b). Indeed, collectivistic individuals are proposed to hold interdependent self-construals, with the self viewed as embedded within, as well as dependent upon, a larger social context (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In contrast, individuals from individualistic cultures have been found to possess self-construals that are more independent in nature, whereby the self is viewed as primarily separate from the social context (Heine et al., 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The finding of greater separation guilt that was reported by Singaporeans aptly reflects the notion of a collectivistic and interdependent self-construal that places a key importance on one’s social context. In addition, it also raises questions with regard to the pathogenic potential of maladaptive guilt within collectivistic cultures. At its heart, separation guilt is a form of maladaptive guilt, which stems from excessive and irrational forms of guilt (O’Connor et al., 1997). This is in great contrast to the more pro-social and beneficial form of adaptive guilt that is reported in the literature. Results of the present study indicate that the collectivistic individual’s relationships with family, especially parents, may be of key importance in the current theoretical understandings of the interdependent nature of the collectivistic self and its social context.

The present study also found that Singaporeans held stronger attitudes towards both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety than their Australian counterparts. Indeed, researchers have argued for the importance of taking into account the dual nature of filial
piety in both theory and research (Laidlaw, et al., 2010; Yeh, 2003), whereby both reciprocal and authoritarian forms of filial piety have been empirically validated in the literature (Yeh & Bedford, 2003). The findings of the present study support the literature, which has documented strong associations between the general concept of filial piety and collectivist contexts, as compared to individualist contexts (Schwartz et al., 2010). However, it is important to note that, as compared to Australians, Singaporeans were found to hold stronger attitudes towards reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. These findings suggest that the collectivistic individual may possess stronger beliefs that reflect the importance of attending to parents out of a genuine gratitude, as well as suppressing one’s own desires, so as to comply with their parents’ wishes.

The present study’s findings of weaker attitudes towards filial piety in Australians, as compared to their Singaporean counterparts, is in line with the existing literature, which has documented a weaker endorsement towards filial piety values in Western populations than Asian, African-American and Latin-American populations (Schwartz et al., 2010). The extant literature has mostly studied cross-cultural differences in attitudes towards a general unidimensional conceptualisation of filial piety, and has related filial piety to both positive psychological well-being, as well as psychological distress (Schwartz et al., 2010). Researchers have highlighted that there is an aspect of filial piety that goes a step further and implies a lifelong subjugation of self for the family, including obligations to obey, honour, care for, and avoid shaming one’s parents (Schwartz et al., 2010). The present study’s consideration of a dual-concept of filial piety (Yeh & Bedford, 2003) has contributed to the literature a more in-depth understanding of attitudes towards filial piety in both a collectivistic and individualistic society. Australians, as representative of an
individualistic culture, appear to place less of an importance on genuine gratitude towards one’s parents, or subjugating the self for the family.

In line with the findings from Study 1, results from the present study suggest no statistically significant differences in the levels of shame-proneness between Singaporeans and Australians. This outcome might be interpreted as inconsistent with the extant literature that has reported a general valuation of the negative self-conscious emotion of shame within collectivistic cultures, in which shame is perceived as a virtue and is intentionally instilled within children from a young age (Fung et al., 2003; Wong & Tsai, 2007). However, it is suggested that shame may operate in the young adult Singaporean context to motivate short-term avoidances of wrongful acts. Indeed, researchers have proposed that shame may work to deter individuals from committing wrongful acts, and may even motivate a desire to change the self over time (Lickel et al., 2007). From a collectivistic perspective, deterrence from shameful behaviour would indeed have the adaptive function of improving interpersonal relationships, as well as preventing ostracism or aggression from others (Lickel et al., 2007). Additionally, it may be possible that Singaporeans’ greater levels of authoritarian filial piety and separation guilt may work to contribute to a sense of subjugation of the self for the family, which may include avoidance of incurring shame or disrespect to one’s family (Schwartz et al., 2010). These factors may have contributed to a lower level of reported shame-proneness within the collectivistic Singaporean sample in the present study.

Consistent with the quantitative findings of Study 1, the present study did not find statistically significant differences in the levels of pride-proneness between Singaporeans and Australians. The extant literature has been somewhat scattered in its reporting of the cultural valuation and experience of pride. While some studies have reported a greater
devaluation of pride within collectivistic cultures, and a greater valuation of pride in individualistic cultures (Eid & Diener, 2001; Mosquera et al., 2000), other cross-cultural studies have found inconsistent findings with regard to the individualistic and collectivistic experiences of pride (Orth et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Despite the documentation of the devaluation of pride in collectivistic cultures, some studies have also found that Asians were more likely to report experiencing greater levels of hubristic pride than individuals from individualistic cultures (Orth et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). It is suggested that there may exist a discrepancy between the valence (or value) of pride within collectivistic cultures and the actual level of pride-proneness in collectivistic cultures such as Singapore. Specifically, it is suggested that a culture’s valuation of a self-conscious emotion may not necessarily correspond with the actual measurable quantity that it presents. Instead, gaining an understanding of cultural differences in the experience of pride and its relation to psychological distress may assist in a more meaningful comprehension of the impact of pride on psychological well-being.

_Culturally Relevant Relations among Self-conscious Emotions, Filial Piety and Psychological Distress_

_Multicultural Effects of Shame on Psychological Distress_

Although Australians and Singaporeans were not found to differ in their levels of shame-proneness, the strongest correlations were found to exist between the emotion of shame and all three symptoms of psychological distress – depression, anxiety and stress – for both nationalities. In contrast, depression was not related to adaptive (reparative) guilt for either Australians or Singaporeans, and was only weakly related to separation guilt for Australians. These findings are in line with the literature, which has widely documented the strong relationships between shame and depressive symptoms (Kim et al., 2011). The
present study’s findings support the literature, which claims that shame has conjured the reputation for being viewed as more devastating and more detrimental to the individual’s self-concept and self-esteem, as compared to guilt (Wong & Tsai, 2007). This unique link between shame and depressive symptoms may be explained in a few ways. Firstly, shame is characterised by a serious state of social rejection, which has been argued to threaten the fundamental need of belongingness. This social rejection has been theorised to elicit depressive symptoms. Guilt, in contrast, has been argued to show weaker and less consistent links to depressive symptoms as it is unlikely to signal such a serious state of social threat. Second, shame, but not guilt, involves an intense and internally directed focus on the flawed self, which is likely to elicit ruminative processes that have been shown to predict depressive reactions to negative events (Nolen-Hoeksema, 2000; Nolen-Hoeksema, Parker, & Larson, 1994). Third, shame, but not guilt, has been characterised by specific causal attributions that share a substantial overlap with attributions that predict depressive symptoms (Abramson et al., 2002). Fourth, the unique factor of withdrawal and social isolation associated with shame may relate to depressive symptoms due to decreased social support, as well as lessened contact with positively reinforcing stimuli (Joiner, Coyne, & Blalock, 1999; Lewinsohn, Gotlib, & Hautzinger, 1998).

_How Maladaptive is Separation Guilt?_

The present study found that separation guilt was related to all three symptoms of psychological distress for Australians, but only to anxious symptoms for Singaporeans. Even then, a weaker relationship between separation guilt and anxious symptoms was found to exist for Singaporeans, as compared to Australians. When compared to adaptive guilt, separation guilt was unique in its relation to depressive symptoms for Australians only. Additionally, adaptive guilt was related to anxious and stressful symptoms for
Australians, but not for Singaporeans, for whom psychological distress remained unrelated to adaptive guilt. It is suggested that the maladaptive aspect of separation guilt may have particular psychological implications for Australians, with its specific relation with depressive symptoms. In support of this argument, prior studies, which have argued for the maladaptive nature of separation guilt, have found similar relationships to those seen in the Australian sample between separation guilt and depressive and anxious symptoms (O’Connor et al., 1999). It should also be noted that participants in the O’Connor et al. (1999) study resided in the United States, which is a known individualistic society. It is suggested that the collectivistic, interdependent self that values, and is defined by, social relationships may aid with the maladaptive nature of separation guilt. Specifically, the existence and valuation of social relationships within a collectivistic society, such as Singapore, may provide increased social support and positively reinforcing stimuli, which may work to prevent a relation with depressive symptoms that was found for Australians. It may be that in prioritising the individual person over group allegiances and obligations (Hofstede, 2001), Australians, as reflective of an individualistic culture, may not have the unique protective function against depressive and stressful symptoms, which the collectivistic Singaporean culture may possess. These findings contribute to the literature a richer cultural understanding of how both maladaptive separation guilt, as well as adaptive guilt, may be more strongly associated with psychological distress within an individualistic culture, such as Australia’s, as compared to Singapore’s collectivistic culture.

Filial Piety’s Relation to Psychological Distress

While authoritarian filial piety was related to anxious symptoms for both Australians and Singaporeans, anxious symptoms were also weakly related to reciprocal filial piety for Australians only. These findings are of interest, especially given that
Singaporeans were found to report stronger attitudes towards reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety than Australians. To my knowledge, the extant literature has not investigated cross-cultural differences in the relationships between a dual-conceptualisation of filial piety and psychological distress, and the present study is unique in its contribution to the literature. Although the present study found that authoritarian filial piety related to anxious symptoms for both the Australian and Singaporean participants, Singaporean participants demonstrated a weaker link between authoritarian filial piety and anxious symptoms, as compared to their Australian counterparts. Indeed, authoritarian filial piety has been characterised by hierarchy and submission towards one’s parents’ wishes, at the individual’s own expense (Yeh & Bedford, 2003), and has been positively related to parental emphasis on obedience, indebtedness to parents, impulse control, proper conduct, overprotection, harshness and inhibition of children’s self-expression, self-mastery and all-round personal development (Ho, 1994).

Results of the present study indicate that the beneficial aspects of reciprocal filial piety may be unique to a collectivistic society, such as Singapore’s. Reciprocal filial piety encompasses emotionally and spiritually attending to one’s parents out of gratitude for their efforts in having raised one, and physical and financial care for one’s parents as they age (Yeh, 2003). Despite reciprocal filial piety being associated with better intergenerational relationships (Lawrence et al., 1992) and lower levels of parent-child conflict (Yeh & Bedford, 2003), a positive relation was found for reciprocal filial piety and anxious symptoms for Australians. It might be that Australians who hold strong attitudes towards reciprocal filial piety may not cope, as effectively as their Singaporean counterparts, with the pressure that may be related to attending to one’s parent’s physical, emotional and mental needs. Furthermore, the period of young adulthood may find Australian individuals
experiencing challenging transitions that may involve taking responsibility for oneself and achieving financial independence (White & Wyn, 2004). These challenging transitions that are relevant to the period of young adulthood may take precedence in their lives over familial concerns of filial piety (Hofstede, 2001), whereby even reciprocal filial piety may be related to anxious symptoms for young adult Australians. Again, collectivistic values of interpersonal harmony and social support are suggested to contribute towards a protective function against psychological distress, which appears to be absent within the individualistic Australian context.

Pride’s Relation to Psychological Distress

Consistent with the findings of Study 1, with specific regard to Singaporeans only, hubristic pride was found to strongly relate to all three measures of psychological distress. In contrast, hubristic pride was only related to depression for Australians. As mentioned before, the extant literature has been scattered in its documentation of the valuation and proneness of pride within collectivistic cultures (Eid & Diner, 2001; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). The present study’s findings suggests that, despite a general devaluation of the emotion of pride within collectivistic cultures (Eid & Diener, 2001), collectivistic individuals, when experiencing hubristic pride that arises from attributions to internal, stable, and uncontrollable causes, are more likely to experience symptoms of psychological distress. It is suggested that the collectivistic devaluation of pride may inhibit the individual’s willingness toward expressing and disclosing the emotion of hubristic pride with interpersonal others, which may result in lesser social resources that may assist with the internalised experience of hubristic pride, an emotion that has been associated with psychological distress and antisocial behaviour. The collectivistic individual’s knowledge of the social devaluation of pride may also result in depressive, anxious and stressful
emotions. In contrast, the individualistic culture’s valuation of pride, as established in the literature (Eid & Diener, 2001), may explain the lack of a relationship between hubristic pride and symptoms of anxiety and stress for Australians.

Authentic pride, by contrast, was negatively associated with depressive symptoms for both Australians and Singaporeans. In addition, it was weakly and negatively associated with symptoms of anxiety for Australians. Consistent with the literature, the results of the present study suggest that, for both Australians and Singaporeans, authentic pride may promote the individual’s status in a more pro-social and psychologically beneficial manner than hubristic pride. While the literature has established that authentic pride may promote the enhancement of one’s status through relationship-oriented and pro-social means (Carver et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007a), the present study’s findings suggest that authentic pride may also benefit the individual’s psychological well-being, through its protective function that may aid against depressive and anxious symptoms.

Gender Differences in the Experience of Self-conscious Emotions and Attitudes towards Filial Piety

Gender stereotypes of emotion maintain that while men experience more pride, women experience more guilt and shame (Else-Quest, Higgins, Allison, & Morton, 2012). Indeed, women have generally been stereotyped as being more emotional than men (Barrett & Bliss-Moreau, 2009; Brody & Hall, 2008; Shields, 2002). In line with previous studies that have documented women scoring higher on measures of shame and guilt (Brody & Hall, 2008; Ferguson & Eyre, 2000; Orth et al., 2010), the present study found that women reported greater levels of shame, adaptive guilt and separation guilt than men. Acknowledging that women may experience higher levels of shame and guilt, whether adaptive or maladaptive in nature, is suggested to be a vital component of attaining a richer
understanding of, and improving, women’s mental health. Consistent with the results of a meta-analysis of gender differences in self-conscious emotions (Else-Quest et al., 2012), the present study found gender similarities in the emotion of pride. These results provide evidence that gender stereotypes regarding men experiencing more pride than women may not necessarily be accurate. In addition, the present study’s results also indicated that women were also found to report stronger attitudes toward reciprocal filial piety than men.

Limitations and further research

Wong and Tsai (2007) have called to attention the need for models of self-conscious emotions that reflect other cultural contexts that differ from the dominant individualistic culture, from which most of the current understandings of self-conscious emotions are derived (Camras & Fatani, 2004; Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004). Taking into consideration the findings of Singaporeans’ greater levels of separation guilt (also evidenced in Study 1) and stronger attitudes towards both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety, as compared to Australians, as well as the strong association between hubristic pride and psychological distress in Singaporeans, future research should consider studying the relationships and influences of specific self-conscious emotions, attitudes towards filial piety, and their relationship with psychological distress. Future research should also consider widening the age group of participants to examine the developmental trajectories of culturally variant self-conscious emotions, such as separation guilt or hubristic pride within collectivistic cultures. Lastly, the results of the present study require caution in their interpretation due to the cross-sectional design of the study. To investigate cultural differences in the causal relationships of self-conscious emotions, future research may benefit from the application of a longitudinal design.
A growing body of research has suggested that culture has a profound influence on the way individuals define the self, which, in turn, is believed to impact upon the experience of self-conscious emotions (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). For example, individuals from collectivistic cultures tend to hold an interdependent concept of the self, viewing the self as rooted within, and reliant upon, a larger social context; whereas individuals from individualistic cultures are more likely to hold a more independent concept of the self, viewing the self as largely distinct from one’s social context (Heine et al., 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Conventional and prevailing models of self-conscious emotions, such as shame and guilt, have been criticised for holding assumptions that negative appraisal by others, or oneself, is entirely negative and non-beneficial to the individual (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Indeed, this prevailing assumption may effectively reflect the value placed on positive feelings in many individualistic cultures (Heine et al., 1999; Wong & Tsai, 2007). However, given that research has demonstrated that individualistic cultures promote the independent self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995), and given that most models of shame and guilt have been based on Western samples, it is likely that the perception of self-conscious emotions that has contributed to emotion research might be skewed towards an individualistic conceptualisation (Wong & Tsai, 2007).

Findings from Study 2 have suggested that attitudes of filial piety may impact on collectivistic individuals’ experience of separation guilt. Additionally, results from studies
1, 2 and 3 have found that young Singaporean adults experience significantly greater levels of separation guilt, as well as stronger filial attitudes, as compared to their Australian counterparts. Study 3 has also found that young Singaporean adults demonstrated strong relationships between hubristic pride and symptoms of stress, anxiety and depression. Taken together, it appears that filial attitudes may work towards impacting upon self-conscious emotions, and the present study has aimed to investigate the specific relations between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride, and psychological distress within both Singaporean and Australian contexts.

Culturally relevant concepts such as filial piety may be important to study in conjunction with self-conscious emotions and culture, as they may offer valuable insight into culturally-specific societal values. For example, it may be possible that reciprocal or authoritarian filial piety relates to separation guilt, a form of maladaptive guilt that specifically relates to the belief that separating from, or differing from, one’s loved ones will cause them harm (O’Connor et al., 1997). The distorted sense of disloyalty that characterises separation guilt, which has been found to result in behaviours that are motivated by the need to consistently protect and remain loyal to parents and loved ones (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997; Weiss & Sampson, 1986), may have a specific relationship with authoritarian filial piety. Focusing on filial concerns with regard to its relation to self-conscious emotions may bring to light a more comprehensive understanding of the complex internal experience of emotions held by people within families, when directed more specifically at an individual rather than societal level.

It is possible that separation guilt, with its emphasis on an exaggerated belief that separating or differentiating from one’s loved ones will cause them harm, may share some common ground in an individual’s filial attitudes. Indeed, separation guilt’s distorted sense
of loyalty, which motivates the need to protect and remain loyal to parents and loved ones (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997), appears to share some common factors with filial piety’s emphasis on meeting one’s parents’ material and emotional needs. For example, separation guilt might relate to authoritarian filial attitudes, due to its stemming from a fear of harming others, especially one’s parents, as a result of pursuing one’s own desires (O’Connor et al., 1997). Examining the manner in which societal values, such as filial piety, might impact on relations between different self-conscious emotions, such as separation guilt and hubristic pride, might assist in gaining a more in-depth understanding of the experience and function of self-conscious emotions within individualistic and collectivistic cultures.

Findings from Study 3 have indicated that young Singaporean adults, as compared to their Australian counterparts, demonstrate stronger relationships between hubristic pride and symptoms of psychological distress, namely stress, anxiety and depression. Even though pride has been conceptualised as a positively valenced emotion (Carver et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2004a), hubristic pride, in particular, has been associated more strongly with selfishness, personal excellence, and motivating a self-enhancing drive for social status, power, and adoration from others (Campbell & Foster, 2007; Tracy et al., 2009). Researchers have yet to explore the possible relations between filial attitudes and the self-conscious emotion of hubristic pride. Given that Study 3 has found that Singaporeans demonstrate stronger relationships between hubristic pride and psychological distress, it would be beneficial to explore whether one or both facets of filial piety directly contribute to the experience of hubristic pride within individualistic and collectivistic individuals. It is suggested that both reciprocal and authoritarian filial attitudes, when contributed to by
separation guilt, might contribute directly to feelings of hubristic pride, which may impact upon subsequent psychological distress.

Hypothesised Theoretical Model

Guided by theory and the findings of Studies 1, 2, and 3, the present study aimed to investigate the possible relations between filial piety, two self-conscious emotions – separation guilt and hubristic pride, as well as anxious and depressive symptoms. Hubristic pride, given its unique relationship with symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress for Singaporeans, was also highlighted as a self-conscious emotion of particular interest. The present study is innovative in a number of ways. In conducting structural equation modelling, the present study aimed to assess whether filial piety may play a culture-specific role in its interaction with separation guilt and hubristic pride, as well as with symptoms of depression and anxiety. Figure 2 below shows the hypothesised model for the proposed relations between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and psychological distress.

![Hypothesised theoretical model relating separation guilt, filial piety and hubristic pride to psychological distress (depression and anxiety).](image)

*Figure 2.* Hypothesised theoretical model relating separation guilt, filial piety and hubristic pride to psychological distress (depression and anxiety).
As past research, as well as the findings from Studies 1 and 2, have shown that the experience and valuation of self-conscious emotions have been found to differ distinctly between individualistic and collectivistic cultures, the present study sought to investigate how filial piety, both reciprocal and authoritarian, may mediate the relationships between separation guilt, hubristic pride and psychological distress for both Australians and Singaporeans.

**Method**

*Participants and Procedure*

Data used for the present study is identical to that of Study 3.

*Measures*

*Interpersonal Guilt Questionnaire – 67.* In this present study, the alpha coefficient was .82 for the 12-item Separation Guilt subscale (see Table 3 for the alpha coefficients for trimmed subscales used in the present study).

*Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales.* Analyses of internal consistency on the original 7-item subscales resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .88 for the Authentic Pride scale, .88 for the Hubristic Pride scale, .88 for the Shame scale, and .79 for the Guilt scale (see Table 3 for the alpha coefficients for trimmed subscales used in the present study).

*Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS).* In the present study, the alpha coefficients for the original 7-item subscales of the DASS are: Depression subscale .90, Anxiety subscale .83, and Stress subscale .86 (see Table 3 for the alpha coefficients for trimmed subscales used in the present study).

*Dual Filial Piety Scale (DFPS).* Analysis of internal consistency of the original two 8-item subscales resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .88 for the reciprocal and .80 for the
Data Analysis

All statistical analyses, with regard to structural equation modelling, were conducted with AMOS 18 to examine the relationships between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and psychological distress. All data available were used applying casewise maximum likelihood (Wothke, 1998). Following the recommendations of Hu and Bentler (1999) and Kline (2005), (a) the chi-square test statistic and the $p$ value, (b) the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), (c) the standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR), and (d) the comparative fit index (CFI) are presented. For RMSEA, a cutoff value close to .05 is required for a relatively good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999), and a value lower than .08 indicates a reasonable model fit (Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). Furthermore, Hu and Bentler (1999) recommended a value close to .08 for SRMR. In addition, a cutoff value of .90 has been considered representative of a well-fitting model (Bentler, 1992), although some researchers have suggested a CFI cutoff value close to .95 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). However, given the exploratory nature of the present study, the process of testing for equivalence of a causal structure can be substantively meaningful, as both practical and statistical significance can be taken into account (Byrne, Shavelson, & Muthen, 1989; Tanaka & Huba, 1984).

Results

Descriptive Information

Reliability analyses were performed to evaluate the model-based internal consistency of the subscales. As shown in Tables 12 and 13, the internal consistency of the scales was acceptable to good.
Table 12
Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Retained Number of Original Items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGQ-Separation Guilt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.93 (7.07)</td>
<td>36 (15-51)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.65 (4.55)</td>
<td>21 (27-48)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.07 (6.59)</td>
<td>32 (8-40)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubristic Pride Scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.22 (3.79)</td>
<td>17 (7-24)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS-Depression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.14 (9.03)</td>
<td>42 (0-42)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS-Anxiety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.63 (7.47)</td>
<td>34 (0-34)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Alpha coefficient based on trimmed scales used in the present study’s model)

Table 13
Comparison table of Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency Coefficients between Australians and Singaporeans

**Australians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Retained Number of Original Items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGQ-Separation Guilt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.01 (6.75)</td>
<td>35 (15-50)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.09 (4.34)</td>
<td>20 (27-47)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.88 (5.84)</td>
<td>25 (8-33)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubristic Pride Scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.68 (3.36)</td>
<td>15 (7-22)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS-Depression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.24 (9.07)</td>
<td>36 (0-36)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS-Anxiety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.83 (7.76)</td>
<td>34 (0-34)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Singaporeans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Retained Number of Original Items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGQ-Separation Guilt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.88 (7.27)</td>
<td>35 (16-51)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.22 (4.70)</td>
<td>20 (28-48)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.31 (6.57)</td>
<td>32 (8-40)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubristic Pride Scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.77 (4.13)</td>
<td>17 (7-24)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS-Depression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.03 (9.03)</td>
<td>42 (0-42)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS-Anxiety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.42 (7.18)</td>
<td>28 (0-28)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Alpha coefficient based on trimmed scales used in the present study’s model)
Tables 14 and 15 present the pairwise correlations between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and symptoms of depression and anxiety.

Table 14

Correlations between Subscales of Separation Guilt, Filial Piety, Hubristic Pride and Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Separation Guilt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DASS-Depression</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DASS-Anxiety</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 15

Comparison of Correlations between Subscales of Separation Guilt, Filial Piety, Hubristic Pride and Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety for Australians and Singaporeans (Australians above the diagonal, Singaporeans below the diagonal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Separation Guilt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reciprocal Filial Piety</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authoritarian Filial Piety</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DASS-Depression</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DASS-Anxiety</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19 show the correlation statistics, including the mean and standard deviation values, for each survey item that was originally in the scale.
Table 16

Correlations between items in original IGQ Separation Guilt Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</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>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Top row shows the mean (standard deviation in parentheses) for each item)
Table 17  
**Correlations between items in original Dual Filial Piety Scale (DFPS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</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>
<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>1</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Odd-numbered items refer to Authoritarian Filial Piety items; even-numbered items refer to Reciprocal Filial Piety items; top row shows mean values (standard deviation in parentheses) for each item)
Table 18

**Correlations between items in the original Hubristic Pride Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Item 1 “Arrogant”; Item 2 “Conceited”; Item 3 “Egotistical”; Item 4 “Pompous”; Item 5 “Smug”; Item 6 “Snobbish”; Item 7 “Stuck-up”) (Top row shows the mean values (standard deviation in parentheses) for each item)

Table 19

**Correlations between items in the original Depression and Anxiety subscales of the DASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Top rows for each subscale shows the mean (standard deviation in parentheses) values for each item)
Development and Validation

To study the stability of the exploratory factor structure, CFA was conducted on each of the psychometric measurements used. Based on high modification indices (MI), which implied loadings on multiple factors, theoretical relevance, and wording of the items, a reduction of items was performed in a systematic way, with fit indices examined at each step. IGQ-Separation guilt had a reduction from 12 to 8 items; DASS-Depression and DASS-Anxiety both had a reduction from 7 to 5 items; Scale Hubristic Pride had a reduction from 7 to 5 items; and Authoritarian and Reciprocal Filial Piety had reductions from 8 items each to 5 and 4 items, respectively. The changes resulted in each measurement showing acceptable fits, as shown in Table 20 below.

Table 20

Summary of Goodness of Fit Statistics for Subscales of Separation Guilt, Filial Piety, Hubristic Pride and DASS-subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation Guilt</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.037, .086</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFPS</td>
<td>118.55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.081, .116</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride Scales</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.031, .068</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS</td>
<td>161.41</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.037, .060</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DFPS included subscales of both Reciprocal and Authoritarian Filial Piety; Pride Scales included two subscales of Hubristic Pride and Authentic Pride; DASS included subscales of Depression, Anxiety and Stress)

For the Separation Guilt subscale, three pairs of error correlations were allowed, due to very similar content between pairs of items. Specifically, a correlation between the error terms of Item 3 (“I wish I could be more like my parents”) and Item 10 (“I am glad I am not like my parents”) was allowed, due to the similar content and use of the word “like” in both
items. A second correlation between the error terms of Item 4 (“I feel that bad things may happen to my family if I do not stay in close contact with them”) and Item 5 (“It makes me anxious to be away from home for too long”) was also allowed, as the content of both pairs was very similar. Lastly, a third correlation between two error terms of two items was allowed (Item 1 “It makes me uncomfortable to have critical thoughts about my parents” and Item 2 “I feel bad when I disagree with my parent’s ideas or values, even if I keep it to myself”), taking into account the similar content of both items. Items 7, 8, 9 and 12 were deleted, as they had the weakest loadings on the Separation Guilt subscale.

With regard to the Dual Filial Piety Scales (DFPS), from the Reciprocal Filial Piety subscale, Items 9, 11 and 15 were deleted, as high MI values indicated that these items loaded highly on the Authoritarian Filial Piety subscale as well. From the Authoritarian Filial Piety subscale, Items 14 and 16 were deleted, as both items loaded on the Reciprocal Filial Piety subscale and had weak loadings on their corresponding subscale. Items 4 of the Authoritarian subscale, and Item 13 of the Reciprocal subscale were also deleted as the three items had the weakest loadings on their respective subscales.

For the Pride Scales, based on high MI values, which indicated loadings on both Hubristic and Authentic factors, Item 25 (“Snobbish”) and Item 14 (“Egotistical”) of the Hubristic Pride Scale, as well as Item 22 (“Self-worthy”) and Item 19 (“Productive”) of the Authentic Pride Scale were deleted.

For the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS), high MI values for Item 8 (“I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy”) of the Stress Scale indicated that the item was loading on other factors as well, which resulted in the item being left out. A correlation between the error terms of two items regarding symptoms of Stress, pertaining to Item 1 (“I found it hard to wind down”) and Item 12 (“I found it difficult to relax”) was allowed, as
the content of both pairs of items was very similar. For the Anxiety Scale, a correlation between the error terms of two items regarding symptoms of anxiety, Item 4 (“I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g. excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion)”) and Item 7 (“I experienced trembling (e.g. in the hands)”) was allowed, taking into account the similar content of both pairs of items. Furthermore, Items 3 and 5 of the Depression subscale, as well as Items 2 and 19 of the Anxiety subscale were left out, due to weak loadings on their corresponding subscales.

*Testing for Multigroup Invariance of Instrument Scores (Measurement Model)*

Testing for factorial equivalence between instrument scores for Australians and Singaporeans encompassed a series of hierarchical steps that started with the determination of a baseline model for each group separately. Following the completion of this preliminary task, tests for the equivalence of parameters were conducted across groups at each of several increasingly stringent levels. Specifically, the pattern of factor loadings for each observed measure was tested for its equivalence across groups. Once the measures that were group-invariant were identified, these parameters were constrained equal while subsequent tests of the structural parameters were conducted. As each new set of parameters was analysed, the previous sets that were known to be group-invariant were cumulatively constrained equal. Therefore, the entire process of ascertaining nonequivalence of measurement and structural parameters across groups involved the testing of a series of increasingly restrictive hypotheses.
Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation Guilt</td>
<td>55.43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.020, .060</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFPS</td>
<td>159.92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.062, .088</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubristic Pride</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.042, .103</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASS – Depression and Anxiety</td>
<td>115.96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.031, .059</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DFPS included subscales of both Reciprocal and Authoritarian Filial Piety; Pride Scales included two subscales of Hubristic Pride and Authentic Pride; DASS included subscales of Depression, Anxiety)

Tables 22, 23, 24 and 25 show summaries of goodness-of-fit statistics for tests of multigroup invariance with regard to factorial equivalence of instrument scores for the DFPS, separation guilt subscale, hubristic pride scale, and the DASS-depression and DASS-anxiety subscales.

Testing for equivalence of structural model

Table 26 below shows the summary of goodness-of-fit statistics for tests of multigroup invariance of the hypothesised structural model. As identified in Table 27, four regression paths – Separation guilt $\rightarrow$ Anxiety; Reciprocal Filial Piety $\rightarrow$ Hubristic Pride; Reciprocal Filial Piety $\rightarrow$ Anxiety; and Authoritarian Filial Piety $\rightarrow$ Anxiety were found to be noninvariant between Australians and Singaporeans.
Table 22

Summary of Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Tests of Multigroup Invariance for DFPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Configural model; no equality constraints imposed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159.92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measurement model</td>
<td>(Model A) All factor loadings constrained equal</td>
<td>2A versus 1</td>
<td>170.86</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>7 NS</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structural model</td>
<td>Model 2A</td>
<td>3 versus 1</td>
<td>190.86</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>7 NS</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\Delta\chi^2$ = difference in $\chi^2$ values between models; $\Delta$df = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; $\Delta$CFI = difference in CFI values between models; RFP = Reciprocal Filial Piety; AFP = Authoritarian Filial Piety.

Table 23

Summary of Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Tests of Multigroup Invariance for Separation Guilt Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Configural model; no equality constraints imposed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measurement model</td>
<td>(Model A) All factor loadings and error covariances constrained equal</td>
<td>2A versus 1</td>
<td>67.84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>10 NS</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structural model</td>
<td>Model 2A</td>
<td>3 versus 1</td>
<td>67.84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>10 NS</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\Delta\chi^2$ = difference in $\chi^2$ values between models; $\Delta$df = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; $\Delta$CFI = difference in CFI values between models
### Table 24

**Summary of Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Tests of Multigroup Invariance for Hubristic Pride Subscale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \Delta\chi^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta df )</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>( \Delta\text{CFI} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Configural model; no equality constraints imposed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measurement model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model A) All factor loadings constrained equal</td>
<td>2A versus 1</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model B) Factor loading for Item 7 constrained equal</td>
<td>2B versus 1</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( NS )</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structural model</td>
<td>Model 2B</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( NS )</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \( \Delta\chi^2 \) = difference in \( \chi^2 \) values between models; \( \Delta df \) = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; \( \Delta\text{CFI} \) = difference in CFI values between models*

### Table 25

**Summary of Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Tests of Multigroup Invariance for DASS-Depression and Anxiety Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \Delta\chi^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta df )</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>( \Delta\text{CFI} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Configural model; no equality constraints imposed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115.96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measurement model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model A) All factor loadings and error covariance constrained equal</td>
<td>2A versus 1</td>
<td>122.82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>( NS )</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structural model</td>
<td>Model 2A with covariance between DEP and ANX constrained equal</td>
<td>3 versus 1</td>
<td>122.82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>( NS )</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \( \Delta\chi^2 \) = difference in \( \chi^2 \) values between models; \( \Delta df \) = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; \( \Delta\text{CFI} \) = difference in CFI values between models; DEP = DASS-Depression subscale; ANX = DASS-Anxiety subscale*
Table 26

*Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Configural and Measurement Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Invariance Tests</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CF I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Configural model; no equality constraints imposed on regression paths (all factor loading constraints in measurement model imposed except for the 2 items identified as noninvariant)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1387.71</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B. Configural model 1 + all error correlations constrained equal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1392.33</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measurement Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model A) All regression paths constrained equal</td>
<td>2A versus 1B</td>
<td>1426.54</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0001$</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model B) Regression path for SEP-Guilt $\rightarrow$ FPR constrained equal</td>
<td>2B versus 1B</td>
<td>1394.15</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model C) Model B + regression path for SEP-Guilt $\rightarrow$ FPA constrained equal</td>
<td>2C versus 1B</td>
<td>1394.15</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model D) Model C + regression path for FPR $\rightarrow$ HP constrained equal</td>
<td>2D versus 1B</td>
<td>1405.28</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model E) Model C + regression path for HP $\rightarrow$ DEP constrained equal</td>
<td>2E versus 1B</td>
<td>1394.18</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model F) Model E + regression path for FPA $\rightarrow$ HP constrained equal</td>
<td>2F versus 1B</td>
<td>1400.41</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model G) Model F + regression path for FPR $\rightarrow$ ANX constrained equal</td>
<td>2G versus 1B</td>
<td>1408.87</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Regression Path</td>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>CFI Difference</td>
<td>Delta DF</td>
<td>p Value</td>
<td>CFI 1</td>
<td>CFI 2</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>H</td>
<td>SEP-Guilt → ANX</td>
<td>constrained equal</td>
<td>1405.87</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>FPA → ANX</td>
<td>constrained equal</td>
<td>1407.38</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>DEP → ANX</td>
<td>constrained equal</td>
<td>1400.68</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** ∆χ² = difference in χ² values between models; ∆df = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; ∆CFI = difference in CFI values between models; SEP-Guilt = Separation guilt; FPR = Reciprocal Filial Piety; FPA = Authoritarian Filial Piety; HP = Hubristic Pride; DEP = DASS-Depression subscale; ANX = DASS-Anxiety subscale
Testing the Full Hypothesised Model of the Relationships among Separation Guilt, Filial Piety, Hubristic Pride and Psychological Distress

A split-half analysis was conducted on the full data set \((n = 371)\) to examine the structure of the hypothesised model. Comparable findings were found for the analysis of the first half \((n = 175)\), \(\chi^2 (451) = 621.46, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.38, \text{RMSEA} = .047, 90\% \text{CI} [.037, .055], \text{SRMR} = .073, \text{CFI} = .924\), and the second half of the data set \((n = 196)\), \(\chi^2 (451) = 713.98, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.54, \text{RMSEA} = .055, 90\% \text{CI} [.047, .062], \text{SRMR} = .076, \text{CFI} = .909\).

Testing the configural model on Singaporeans alone, the goodness-of-fit measures revealed an acceptable model fit, \(\chi^2 (451) = 713.09, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.58, \text{RMSEA} = .057, 90\% \text{CI} [.049, .064], \text{SRMR} = .078, \text{CFI} = .91\). Testing of the configural model on Australians revealed an acceptable model fit, \(\chi^2 (451) = 655.70, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.45, \text{RMSEA} = .049, 90\% \text{CI} [.041, .057], \text{SRMR} = .073, \text{CFI} = .91\).

Multi-group analysis structural equation modelling was applied to test the theoretically hypothesised model relating separation guilt and hubristic pride to filial piety and symptoms of depression and anxiety. All variables in the model were entered as latent constructs. Table 27 below shows a summary of the goodness-of-fit statistics for comparative tests of multigroup invariance on the full model. Goodness-of-fit results from this test of invariant factor loadings provided evidence of a well-fitting model \(\chi^2 (935) = 1400.68, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.58, \text{RMSEA} = .04, 90\% \text{CI} [.033, .041], \text{SMSR} = .073, \text{CFI} = .91\). It was concluded that, with the exception of the four regression paths that were identified as noninvariant between Singaporeans and Australians (\text{FPR}\rightarrow\text{HP}; \text{FPR}\rightarrow\text{ANX}; \text{SEP-Guilt}\rightarrow\text{ANX}; \text{FPA}\rightarrow\text{ANX}), all other paths were operating similarly across Australians and Singaporeans, and that the model showed an adequate fit to the data that
Table 27

Goodness-of-fit statistics for Comparative Tests of Multigroup Invariance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Configural model (no equality constraints)</td>
<td>1368.79</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.039 (.033-.041)</td>
<td>.0725</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1B): All factor loadings, regression paths and error correlations constrained equal</td>
<td>1441.16</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.038 (.034-.042)</td>
<td>.0802</td>
<td>1B versus 1</td>
<td>72.37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: All factor loadings (except Item 5 on FPR and Item 26 on HP) constrained equal</td>
<td>1387.71</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.037 (.033-.041)</td>
<td>.0730</td>
<td>Model 2 vs. Model 1</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Model 2 + all error correlations constrained equal</td>
<td>1392.33</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.037 (.033-.041)</td>
<td>.0732</td>
<td>Model 3 vs. Model 1</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Model 3 + all paths constrained equal (except those previously identified as variant: FPR$\rightarrow$HP; FPR$\rightarrow$ANX; SEP-Guilt$\rightarrow$ANX; FPA$\rightarrow$ANX)</td>
<td>1400.68</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.037 (.033-.041)</td>
<td>.0732</td>
<td>Model 4 vs. Model 1</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supported the hypothesised relationships between the specific self-conscious emotions, filial piety and psychological distress.

**Testing for Cultural Differences in Parameter Estimates**

Follow-up analyses on the multigroup analysis of invariance on the structural model were conducted to determine how certain factor-loading parameters were not operating in a similar manner between Australians and Singaporeans. Comparisons between standardised parameter estimates for regression path coefficients were used to determine the level of significance with regard to path coefficients for Australians and Singaporeans (see Figure 3).

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.** Standardised parameter estimates of the multi-group analysis model relating filial piety, separation guilt and hubristic pride to depression and anxiety for Australians (Standardised parameter estimates for Singaporeans in parentheses; four regression paths identified as noninvariant between Australians and Singaporeans highlighted in yellow).

For both Singaporeans and Australians, separation guilt was found to independently contribute to both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. The standardised parameter estimates indicated that separation guilt was more strongly associated with authoritarian
filial piety than reciprocal filial piety for both nationalities. Additionally, separation guilt was found to negatively contribute to symptoms of anxiety for the Singaporean sample only. With the exception of authoritarian filial piety’s contribution to hubristic pride, Singaporeans generally demonstrated higher standardised parameter estimate values for the relationships between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and psychological distress.

Interestingly, cultural differences were noted in both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety’s independent contributions to symptoms of anxiety. For the Singaporean sample, both forms of filial piety were found to be negatively associated with symptoms of anxiety, although authoritarian filial piety was found to have a stronger negative association with symptoms of anxiety. In contrast, the Australian sample demonstrated much weaker relationships between filial piety and symptoms of anxiety. In addition, while authoritarian filial piety was found to independently contribute to hubristic pride across both nationalities, a stronger negative association was found between reciprocal filial piety and hubristic pride for Singaporeans, as compared to their Australian counterparts. For both nationalities, hubristic pride was found to independently contribute to symptoms of depression. The results indicate that both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety may have specific significance for individuals within a collectivistic culture, whereby filial piety may interact with self-conscious emotions, such as separation guilt and hubristic pride, to influence depressive and anxious symptoms.

Discussion

The present study aimed to assess whether filial piety may play a culture specific role in its interaction with separation guilt and hubristic pride, as well as symptoms of depression and anxiety. The present study sought to investigate how filial piety, both
reciprocal and authoritarian, may influence the relationships between separation guilt, hubristic pride and psychological distress for both Australians and Singaporeans. Indeed, this study was undertaken to meet the expressed need for models of self-conscious emotions that consider cultural differences (Wong & Tsai, 2007), given that current understandings of self-conscious emotions are largely skewed towards individualistic cultures.

Testing the Hypothesised Model of the Relationships among Separation Guilt, Filial Piety, Hubristic Pride and Psychological Distress

The SEM model designed to test the hypothesised theoretical model had an acceptable fit to the data and supported the predictive utility of the model. In terms of the relationships among separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and psychological distress, the present study confirmed that, across both Australian and Singaporean cultures, separation guilt makes independent contributions to both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. While, to my knowledge, there has not been any research on the relationship between separation guilt and filial piety, researchers have argued that separation guilt consists of an overbearing and overpowering sense of responsibility towards one’s family and loved ones (O’Connor et al., 1997). Furthermore, separation guilt has been characterised by an exaggerated belief that to separate, or differ, from one’s loved ones will cause the latter harm (Erreich, 2011; O’Connor et al., 1997). The concept of filial piety shares some similar ground with separation guilt, as it relates to important ideas about how children should treat their parents (Yeh & Bedford, 2003). Indeed, within the literature, there exists a commonality between separation guilt and filial piety – a sense of parental loyalty that may result in behaviour that is motivated by the need to protect and remain loyal to one’s parents (O’Connor et al., 1997; Weiss & Sampson, 1986).
Singaporeans, as representative of individualistic and collectivistic cultures, respectively, the present study’s model has shown that separation guilt makes independent contributions to both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety. Indeed, the maladaptive nature of separation guilt is highlighted in the stronger contributions of separation guilt to authoritarian filial piety, as compared to separation guilt’s contribution to reciprocal filial piety, for both nationalities.

*Authoritarian Filial Piety’s Contribution to Hubristic Pride*

Studies 1, 2, and 3 have shown that Singaporeans reported significantly greater levels of separation guilt than their Australian counterparts. Furthermore, Study 3 found that Singaporeans reported significantly stronger attitudes towards both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety. The present study found that for both nationalities, authoritarian filial piety contributed to hubristic pride. However, the model indicated that reciprocal filial piety was found to contribute negatively to hubristic pride for Singaporeans only. In general, the collectivistic valuation of filial piety has been widely documented in the literature (Yim et al., 2011). In contrast, individualistic Western cultures have been suggested to possess fewer philosophies of care that actively encourage sacrifice and care for older generations, with young people having been found to hold negative attitudes towards ageing and older people (Slotterback & David, 1996).

Even though the importance and relevance of filial piety has been highlighted in the present study, reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety may have culturally significant, yet differing, contributions towards the self-conscious emotion of hubristic pride. Indeed, researchers have argued that filial piety cannot be understood unless its dual nature is recognised and applied in both theory and research (Laidlaw et al., 2010; Yeh, 2003). Although the literature has documented the general valuation, as well as the positive
impact, of filial piety within collectivistic cultures, findings from the present study contribute to current understandings of the dual-conceptualisation of filial piety and its culturally-unique associations with self-conscious emotions. The present study has found that authoritarian filial piety may independently contribute to emotions of hubristic pride within the individual, which, in turn, may result in psychological distress for individuals from both collectivistic and individualistic cultures.

It is suggested that authoritarian filial piety’s notion of the ‘sacrifice’ of one’s own desires and submission to one’s parents’ wishes might lead both individualistic and collectivistic individuals to experience what is largely considered as the ‘positive’ self-conscious emotion of hubristic pride. Within the literature, hubristic pride has been conceptualised as a distinct facet of pride that is more loosely associated with actual accomplishments, and may involve a self-evaluative process that reflects a less authentic sense of self, such as distorted and self-aggrandised views of the self (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Hubristic pride has been associated with narcissism (Lewis, 2000), interpersonal problems, relationship conflict and various maladaptive behaviours (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Campbell, 1999; Wubben et al., 2012). The present study’s finding of authoritarian filial piety’s direct contribution to hubristic pride is a novel finding, and may, perhaps, reflect a unique form of compensation for the individual’s perceived lack of control, subjugation and sacrifice made for their parents at their own expense, as reflective of their attitude towards authoritarian filial piety.

Further, it is suggested that feeling hubristically proud might afford the individual with strong authoritarian filial attitudes a greater sense of perceived control. Indeed, the concept of sacrificing one’s own desires for their parents’ wishes in authoritarian filial piety may be counterproductive in its association with hubristic pride. The individual, who holds
strong attitudes towards authoritarian filial piety, may give up their own desires to fulfil the wishes of their parents, and in acts of pleasing their parents, may receive intrapersonal and interpersonal (social) rewards that work to reinforce their socially desirable behaviour. This may be related to greater levels of hubristic pride, as opposed to authentic pride, whereby the individual may internalise and attribute the value of their achievement directly onto their self-concept, especially because of their act of sacrifice. While the findings from Study 3 indicated that hubristic pride was related to stronger depressive and anxious symptoms for Singaporeans, findings from the present study indicate that when hubristic pride stems from authoritarian filial piety and separation guilt, hubristic pride is subsequently related to psychological distress, which is experienced by both Australian and Singaporean young adults.

Moreover, the present study found that, for young Singaporean adults, reciprocal filial piety may have the beneficial aspect of negatively contributing to hubristic pride, which may work towards preventing the occurrence of associated psychological distress. In addition to the beneficial aspects of reciprocal filial piety that have been identified in previous research (Yeh & Bedford, 2003), such as enhanced interpersonal relationships, the present study found that reciprocal filial piety may even prevent the experience of other negative self-conscious emotions, such as hubristic pride, which may contribute to future psychological distress. Reciprocal filial piety was also found to negatively contribute towards anxious symptoms for Singaporeans in the present study’s model. In line with prior research, these findings also support the pro-social and beneficial attributes of reciprocal filial piety, and establish that the two distinct facets of filial piety should be studied together when assessing filial piety’s association with self-conscious emotions and psychological distress.
Clinical Findings and Implications

The present study’s model found that separation guilt negatively contributed to symptoms of anxiety for Singaporeans only. In the existing literature, guilt, both adaptive and maladaptive, has been more strongly related to psychological symptoms of anxiety, as opposed to depressive symptoms (Orth et al., 2006). Furthermore, Studies 2 and 3 lend support to the association between separation guilt and anxious symptoms for both cultures. However, the present study’s model indicates that it may well be possible that filial piety, whether authoritarian or reciprocal in nature, assists in mediating the relationship between separation guilt and anxiety for young Singaporean adults. Again, this highlights the beneficial importance of filial piety within a collectivistic culture.

Indeed, for young Singaporean adults only, both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety were found to have direct and negative contributions towards symptoms of anxiety. While reciprocal filial piety’s negative contribution to anxious symptoms may be understood through the pro-social and beneficial aspects of reciprocal filial piety for the individual’s well-being (Laidlaw et al., 2010; Yeh, 2003), the present study’s finding of authoritarian filial piety’s negative contribution to anxious symptoms for Singaporeans appears to be a novel finding. Previous research has argued for the negative impact of authoritarian filial piety on the individual (Yeh & Bedford, 2003). For example, authoritarian filial piety has been associated with submission and suppression of one’s own desires at the expense of one’s parents’ wishes, as well as harshness and inhibition of self-expression (Ho, 1994; Yeh & Bedford, 2003). However, the model in the present study indicates that, for young Singaporeans, authoritarian filial piety has a directly negative contribution to symptoms of anxiety. It is suggested that the importance placed on the
family as a foundational cornerstone of collectivistic societies effectively works towards shifting the individual’s focus from an independent to an interdependent framework.

Although authoritarian filial piety may comprise complying with one’s parents’ wishes at the expense of the individual’s own desires, it may be possible that the collectivistic focus on interpersonal and familial harmony may assist in alleviating direct feelings of anxiousness for young Singaporean adults. Additionally, filial piety, whether in the authoritarian or reciprocal form, ultimately focuses on meeting one’s parents’ emotional and physical needs and wishes. This prosocial element of filial piety might be compounded by the motivation behind separation guilt to amend and repair broken social relationships and wrongdoings, which is suggested to collectively work towards achieving social and familial harmony and alleviating any experienced psychological distress in relation to the latter. As such, the negative contribution of authoritarian filial piety on symptoms of anxiety, for young Singaporean adults, further supports previous research and theories that argue for an interdependent conceptualisation of the self in collectivistic individuals.

For young Australian adults, the present study’s model indicates that both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety do not have any direct relations with symptoms of anxiety. The absence of direct contributions from authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety to anxious symptoms in young Australian adults may reflect the generally weaker emphasis on the active encouragement of sacrifice and care for older generations in individualistic cultures, such as Australia. Indeed, previous studies have found that younger individualistic adults have been found to hold negative attitudes towards ageing and older people (Schwartz et al., 2010; Slotterback & David, 1996). Furthermore, Study 3 has lent evidence to weaker attitudes of filial piety within the young Australian adult sample, as compared to their Singaporean counterparts. These generally weaker filial attitudes are also suggested to
contribute to the absence of direct contributions from filial piety to anxious symptoms for young Australian adults. However, as discussed above, the present study’s model has indicated that when authoritarian filial attitudes stem from the experience of separation guilt, young Australian adults experience hubristic pride, which subsequently contributes to psychological distress.

The development of the present study’s model is of theoretical and empirical significance, because self-conscious emotions, such as separation guilt and hubristic pride, have yet to be studied in relation to one another. In addition, filial piety has yet to be studied in relation to separation guilt or hubristic pride. The present study’s model has encapsulated the cross-cultural associations between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and symptoms of depression and anxiety. The model appears to be transferable and relevant to cross-cultural research of self-conscious emotions, with specific regard to the collectivistic cultures. Furthermore, the model is useful for clinical practice, as it allows clinicians to (a) gain an understanding of how culturally relevant variables, such as filial piety, may directly or indirectly impact upon psychological distress within the individual, especially within collectivistic cultures. (b) apply an understanding of the complexity of self-conscious emotions to psychological distress within their clinical practice, (c) evaluate their clinical practice interventions based on cross-cultural complexities of the interaction between specific self-conscious emotions, attitudes toward filial piety and psychological distress. In addition, the model in the present study especially highlights the importance of filial piety in a collectivistic culture, because authoritarian filial piety is associated with hubristic pride and symptoms of depression and anxiety. In contrast, reciprocal filial piety is negatively associated with hubristic pride. This implies that psychological interventions for mood disorders, where symptoms of depression or anxiety are relevant, may need to
consider the role of the collectivistic individual’s attitudes toward filial piety, as well as the possible presence of separation guilt and hubristic pride.

Limitations and Further Research

Notwithstanding the fact that the present study’s model successfully identified cultural differences in the associations between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and symptoms of depression and anxiety, further cross-cultural research should be performed to confirm the validity of the model. In follow-up studies, the target group could be enlarged to include older adults, to investigate for possible changes to the experience of separation guilt, hubristic pride and attitudes towards filial piety as the individual progresses through the lifespan. Additionally, due to the present study’s exploratory nature and the presence of nonnormality in the sample, findings should be cautiously interpreted.

Another limitation would be the well-known issue related to the administration of self-report measures – social desirability. What alleviates this concern in the present study is the fact that some of the means of the different subscales varied substantially, which may suggest that participants did not show a tendency to try to come across as individuals who did not experience negative emotions (self-conscious emotions or emotional distress). In addition, in my conceptualisation of the relations between separation guilt, hubristic pride, filial piety and psychological distress, it was not my intention to be comprehensive by investigating all the possible self-conscious emotions by adding in other emotions such as shame and adaptive guilt. Instead, my aim was to develop a model that was theoretically and empirically informed by prior research, as well as the results of Studies 1, 2 and 3.

While the present study is, to my knowledge, the first to explore indirect relationships between separation guilt and hubristic pride through culturally relevant variables such as filial piety, future studies should investigate possible and additional
interactions of other self-conscious emotions, and how culture-specific interactions may impact upon psychological distress. Lastly, caution should be exercised when discussing the directions of effects in the model, as cross-sectional data were used. To explore and uncover possible causal relationships, future research will require the application of a longitudinal design.
CHAPTER 7: GENERAL DISCUSSION

The cultural relevance of self-conscious emotions during the period of young adulthood was supported in all four studies, with each study adding a key contribution to the overall understanding of the emotions of shame, guilt and pride in Singaporean and Australian young adults. In Study 1, separation guilt emerged as a culturally relevant self-conscious emotion that distinguished young Singaporean adults from their Australian counterparts. Furthermore, Study 3 provided further quantitative evidence that Singaporean young adults reported greater separation guilt than Australians. In addition, the relationship between hubristic pride and psychological distress was found to be particularly relevant for Singaporeans, more so than their Australian counterparts.

Study 2 contributed to the literature qualitative data with regard to cultural differences in both the inward experience, as well as the outward expression of self-conscious emotions between Singaporeans and Australians, as representatives of collectivistic and individualistic cultures, respectively. Study 2 has assisted in attaining a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the experience and expression of particular self-conscious emotions within collectivistic and individualistic cultures. In general, young Singaporean adults were found to report more shame and hubristic pride, while their Australian counterparts were found to report more authentic pride. In particular, Study 2 found that, as compared to their Australian counterparts, Singaporeans reported experiencing more familial guilt, which is similar in its conceptualisation to separation guilt, which appeared to be influenced by attitudes towards filial piety.

This thread was further explored in Study 3, in which Singaporeans were found to report stronger attitudes towards both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety than Australians. In addition, Study 3 replicated Study 1’s finding of greater separation guilt in
young adult Singaporeans, as well as hubristic pride’s relation with psychological distress within the Singaporean sample. Finally, Study 4 examined the specific relations between separation guilt, hubristic pride, filial piety and psychological distress in a model for both Singaporeans and Australians. Attitudes towards filial piety were found to be particularly distinct to, and relevant for, Singaporeans. Specifically, although separation guilt independently contributed towards filial piety for both Australians and Singaporeans, both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety had unique cultural relations with hubristic pride, as well as with symptoms of depression and anxiety. A common thread that has emerged in the studies conducted was that shame was found to be strongly related to psychological distress for both Australians and Singaporeans.

An exploration of the relations between separation guilt, filial piety, hubristic pride and psychological distress provides a unique contribution to the literature. Findings indicate that attitudes towards one’s parents may play a critical role for young Singaporean adults’ experience of hubristic pride and psychological distress, more so than for their Australian counterparts. Depending on the nature of their attitudes towards their parents – reciprocal or authoritarian – young Singaporean adults may be deterred from, or may be subject to, the experience of hubristic pride and psychological distress. This is an interesting finding, as researchers have argued for the need to consider and apply the dual-nature of filial piety in research (Laidlaw et al., 2010; Yeh, 2003). This finding would imply that both reciprocal and authoritarian forms of filial piety are not mutually independent of each other. Taken together, despite differences in their respective relations with hubristic pride and psychological distress for Singaporeans, both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety appear to be distinctly different, and yet essential elements in encapsulating the concept of filial piety within a collectivistic Asian context.
Because the findings of each of the individual studies of this thesis have been summarised and discussed in earlier chapters, the following discussion focuses on the broader lessons from the combined results. Specifically, this discussion examines the general contributions that this thesis has made to our understanding of culturally distinct experiences of self-conscious emotions and their relation to psychological distress. In addition, the potential implications that the findings have for theory development in the area of self-conscious emotions will be explored. This thesis also has practical implications for clinical practice with regard to the experience and expression of self-conscious emotions and how such emotions may relate to symptoms of depression and anxiety. These practical implications highlight the importance of the findings of this thesis in informing clinical intervention and work with young adults.

Theoretical Implications

Separation Guilt and Filial Piety

This thesis has contributed to a more comprehensive understanding of separation guilt as a form of maladaptive guilt, which was examined in two different cultural settings. Results of the studies have answered the call by researchers for a better understanding of the differentiation among various forms of guilt across cultures, with specific regard to how they differ and why such differences might exist (Wong & Tsai, 2007). Specifically, separation guilt was found to exist as an important self-conscious emotion that operated differently between the Singaporean and Australian cultures, with young Singaporean adults reporting greater levels of separation guilt than young Australian adults. This may be explained by the nature of guilt itself. Guilt has been defined as an interpersonally driven emotion, which stems from the need to maintain positive attachments towards others (Baumeister et al., 1994; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Specifically, guilt – both adaptive and
maladaptive – has been suggested to derive from altruism, a fear of causing harm to others, and to be related to empathy and the maintenance of social attachments (O’Connor et al., 1999). Singaporeans’ greater separation guilt, as compared to their Australian counterparts, may be explained by the interpersonal nature of guilt, and the collectivistic emphasis on interpersonal relationships.

Importantly, young adults’ attitudes towards filial piety appear to be a key concept that may play an important role with regard to why separation guilt operates in a different pattern between Australians and Singaporeans. This thesis has illustrated that the difference in the experience of separation guilt may, in fact, be due to differences between individualistic and collectivistic conceptions of the self, whereby the collectivistic self, which has been proposed to value familial harmony and social relationships over the enhancement of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), may possess stronger attitudes towards remaining filial towards their parents. This is not to say that individualistic Australian young adults do not care for their parents. Rather, it may be that the collectivistic valuation of remaining filial towards one’s parents may explain stronger attitudes towards filial piety in the young Singaporean adult cohort. The contribution of separation guilt to the experience of filial piety, within a collectivistic culture such as Singapore, appears to be embedded within a much more complex interaction with hubristic pride. As demonstrated in this research, this is a unique contribution to the literature, as no other studies have examined the intricate relationships between various self-conscious emotions, such as guilt and pride, between cultures.

The concept of filial piety has long been strongly established and deeply embedded within the collectivistic Asian culture (Yim et al., 2011). In July 2013, China issued a decree making elderly parents now protected under the “Elderly Rights Law” (Meng &
Hunt, 2013), which allows elderly Chinese parents the right to file lawsuits against their children who fail to regularly visit them or contact them by phone. This new Chinese law that has harshly enforced the concept of filial piety appears to address recent research regarding the corrosion of Confucian virtues among China’s youth (Meng & Hunt, 2013). China’s new law that has legally enforced filial piety appears to emphasise the concept of authoritarian filial piety, through the forceful submission to role requirements that address compulsory compliance with the young adult’s parents’ wishes and desires due to parents’ seniority in physical and social terms (Yeh, 2003). Of greater relevance may be the behavioural and emotional consequences that young Chinese adults may experience as a consequence of being subject to the Elderly Rights Law. Indeed, the findings of this thesis are consistent with previous research that has demonstrated the negative intrapersonal psychological repercussions of authoritarian filial piety (Ho, 1994). Interestingly, although young Singaporean adults reported greater separation guilt and stronger attitudes towards both authoritarian and reciprocal filial piety, the current findings indicated a stronger relationship between authoritarian filial piety and anxiety for young Australian adults, as compared to young Singaporean adults. Furthermore, even reciprocal filial piety, which has been associated with better intergenerational relationships and lower levels of parent-child conflict (Lawrence et al., 1992; Yeh & Bedford, 2003), was positively related to symptoms of anxiety for young Australian adults, while it remained uncorrelated to psychological distress for young Singaporean adults. Additionally, separation guilt was positively correlated to symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress for young Australian adults, while it was observed to be only positively associated with anxious symptoms for young Singaporean adults.
A number of reasons for these findings were explored. First, Singaporeans’ stronger attitudes towards both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety may reflect the deeply embedded Confucian values of attending to one’s parents’ needs and desires. The period of young adulthood may be of particular relevance with regard to the experience of separation guilt and attitudes towards filial piety. Research has indicated that young adulthood is specifically marked by values that include self-responsibility, financial independence and making independent decisions (Arnett, 2004). In fact, the period of young adulthood has been suggested to possess the highest incidence of mental disorders of any age cohort (Rowling et al., 2005), with critical life transition periods resulting in young adult individuals perceiving themselves as vulnerable and lacking a general sense of confidence and control (Janoff-Bulman & Frantz, 1997). For young Singaporean adults, the personal and financial independence and self-responsibility that mark the period of young adulthood may signal to young adults from collectivistic cultures, such as Singapore, to commence reciprocating and meeting the emotional, physical and financial needs of their aging parents, thereby resulting in strong attitudes towards filial piety within the young Singaporean adult context. By contrast, Australia, as a predominantly individualistic culture, may place a greater importance on self-enhancement in an individually-focused manner, attributing less intensive emotional attachment towards interpersonal relationships (Sun et al., 2004; Triandis, 1995). The weaker attitudes towards filial piety in young Australian adults may indicate that Australians going through the period of young adulthood may place a greater emphasis on their independence and self-enhancement, rather than placing an importance on being filial to their parents. This is not to say that young Australian adults do not value their family. Young Australian adults may function within a culture that celebrates independence, individualism and self-enhancement, with
their families supporting and celebrating their sons and daughters’ progression towards independence and self-responsibility.

Another contribution of this thesis is a better understanding of how and why maladaptive guilt and filial piety may relate to psychological distress in a different manner within the Australian and Singaporean context. It appears that when young Australian adults reported experiencing strong separation guilt and attitudes towards filial piety, a positive relation was found with psychological distress. In contrast, Singaporeans showed generally weaker or non-significant relations. An explanation for this may lie in the manner in which self-concept is defined in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. While individualistic cultures have been found to consider the self as unit of life and a source of identity, it is important to note that both success and failure are attributed to one’s own individual ability (Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004). This sense of direct and sole responsibility for success and failure contrasts with the collectivistic identity that conceptualises the self as predominantly defined by its relationships with in-group others. This difference in the definition of self-concept between individualistic and collectivistic cultures might imply that when young Australian adults feel separation guilt and strong filial attitudes towards their parents, they may experience the negative repercussions of the pressure to meet expectations and amend parent-child conflict. Specifically, the negative repercussions may be felt in isolation, whereby young Australian adults may lack the social support with regard to coping with negative self-conscious emotions such as separation guilt. By contrast, despite experiencing stronger separation guilt and attitudes towards filial piety, young Singaporean adults may already have an existing social coping mechanism that may be providing them with psychosocial and interpersonal support to the young Singaporean
adult to buffer the negative repercussions of separation guilt and the expectations and pressures of authoritarian filial piety.

Essentially, the focus on social relationships and familial harmony within collectivistic cultures may assist the young Singaporean adult’s coping with separation guilt. Ironically, though, it appears that the source of the problem may be the source of the solution as well – while family and parental issues may have been the cause of separation guilt and authoritarian filial piety, the sources of support, through reciprocal filial piety and social supports, may contribute towards being part of the solution. Findings of this thesis support the conceptualisation of a dual-nature of filial piety, and affirm the crucial importance of social relationships within a collectivistic culture to better understand how self-conscious emotions are experienced within cultures.

Shame: A Destructive Self-Conscious Emotion

Another major self-conscious emotion examined in this thesis was the emotion of shame. Compared to Australians, Singaporeans were expected to report greater proneness towards experiencing shame, due to the collectivistic valuation of shame (Fung, 1999; Fung et al., 2003). Quantitative analyses found that young Singaporeans and Australian adults did not statistically differ in their levels of shame. While this finding was somewhat inconsistent with previous research that has suggested the virtuous nature of shame in collectivistic cultures (Fung et al., 2003; Wong & Tsai, 2007), a few explanations of this thesis’ findings are explored. First, the lack of quantitative evidence of a greater shame-proneness in young Singaporean adults does not imply that shame is not a focal emotion in collectivistic cultures, nor that it is not positively valued within the Singaporean context. In fact, it is suggested that negatively evaluating the self, which is a core component of shame, may have motivational significance within a Singaporean collectivistic culture.
Specifically, this motivational significance is proposed to deter collectivistic individuals from performing potentially shame-inducing actions. Although research has indicated that children of Chinese parents are subjected to shaming techniques so as to induce shame and to socialise them to be well-behaved (Fung et al., 2003), findings from this thesis suggest that it may be possible that by the time collectivistic children reach the period of young adulthood, they may have learnt shame deterrence, so as to avoid the negative intrapersonal repercussions of the emotion.

A second contribution that this thesis makes to our understanding of shame is the severe negative associations between shame and psychological well-being. Across both Australian and Singaporean cultures, shame was strongly associated with devastating consequences on the young adult’s psychological well-being and was strongly related to symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress. This finding is consistent with the extant literature, which has established the negative psychological impact of shame (Lewis, 1971; Tracy & Robins, 2004a), and contributes to the cross-cultural understanding of shame. An explanation for the negative cross-cultural impact of shame on psychological well-being lies in the very nature of shame in itself. Shame focuses on the individual’s self-concept, and contrasts with guilt’s focus on the wrongful act that was committed by the individual (Barrett, 1995; Tangney, 1990). As such, shame is proposed to operate in an intensely intrapersonal manner, where even strong collectivistic interpersonal relationships may not prove helpful for the shamed individual. Even though shame may be elicited by situations where the social self is at risk of being harmed (Gilbert, 1997; Scheff, 2003), the actual experience of shame may, indeed, be more devastating than that of adaptive or maladaptive guilt. While guilt involves a focus on an action to amend a wrongdoing, shame’s focus on the self is proposed to lead to a self-concept that is eventually eroded, rather than preserved,
over time. Indeed, shame-prone individuals have been found to withdraw and isolate themselves from social relationships (Young, 1991). Taking into account the shamed individual’s withdrawal from social connection and self-isolation, it makes sense that shame has powerful associations with psychological distress, both within individualistic and collectivistic cultures. The protective factor that collectivistic cultures may offer to coping with negative self-conscious emotions, as seen with guilt, do not appear to apply to shame. Indeed, shame emerges as a unique self-conscious emotion with potentially devastating repercussions for psychological well-being.

Pride

Both facets of pride - authentic and hubristic – were also examined in this thesis as major components of the self-conscious emotion of pride. In general, results from this thesis support the pro-social nature of authentic pride that has been demonstrated in the literature (Wubben et al., 2012). Indeed, findings from this thesis indicate that authentic pride appears to be negatively related to symptoms of depression for both young Australian and Singaporean adults. An important contribution that this thesis makes to our understanding of pride is the demonstration of cultural differences in the experience of hubristic pride in relation to psychological distress. In sum, the four studies have effectively provided qualitative and quantitative evidence that indicated hubristic pride’s association with psychological distress, more so for young Singaporean adults than their Australian counterparts. This is a unique finding, because hubristic and authentic pride and their relations to psychological distress have yet to be studied from a cross-cultural perspective. It appears that hubristic pride’s relation to psychological distress may have a unique and important relevance for young Singaporean adults.
A number of reasons for hubristic pride’s relationship with psychological distress were explored. First, the literature has suggested that hubristic pride has been strongly associated with personal excellence, motivating self-enhancing drive for social status, power, and adoration from others (Tracy et al., 2009). However, hubristic pride has been found to correlate with behaviours consistent with antisocial traits, such as hostility, selfishness and greed (Baumeister et al., 2000; Campbell et al., 2005; Tracy et al., 2009). Importantly, researchers have found that hubristically proud individuals report a proneness towards an exaggerated self-opinion, self-importance, and have suggested them to be socially uncomfortable, as well as to experience anxiety with regard to social relationships and insecurity about being liked by others (Tracy et al., 2009). It appears that although hubristic pride may result in a strong drive for personal excellence and self-enhancement, social relationships are, essentially, at great risk of being harmed. This potential damage is suggested to explain the strong relationship between hubristic pride and symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress in young Singaporean adults. Due to the collectivistic valuation of social harmony and interpersonal relationships, the intrapersonal experience of hubristic pride within the collectivistic individual may present as severely incongruous with a collectivistic society’s norms and values of social cohesion. Psychological distress may stem from the collectivistic individual’s inward knowledge of the dissonance between their hubristic pride and the valuation of social relationships. In contrast, the general absence of a relationship (or weaker relationship) between hubristic pride and psychological distress in young Australian adults is suggested to be the result of a matching of elements of hubristic pride and those of the values of an individualistic culture. Individualistic cultures have been characterised by their conception of an independent self that is unique and autonomous (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), with individuals perceiving personal autonomy values as
more important than concerns relating to social relationships (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 1997).

The individualistic society’s characteristics of autonomy, independence and self-enhancement are suggested to establish an acceptable social platform for the social acceptance of hubristic pride. Even though hubristic pride may be associated with hostility and anxiety with regard to social relationships, these behavioural and emotional consequences of hubristic pride may be less devastating for the individualistic young Australian adult. Interestingly, an individualistic culture, such as that of Australia’s, may be, in itself, a protective factor for psychological distress as a result of hubristic pride. The results of this thesis have contributed to a richer, and more culturally diverse, understanding of hubristic pride by expanding on existing knowledge on behavioural and social consequences to include a more cross-cultural and intrapersonal dimension that includes the hubristically proud individual’s mental well-being.

Hubristic pride, when contributed to by separation guilt and authoritarian filial piety, may also operate within complex relations with psychological distress for both Australians and Singaporeans. Findings of this thesis indicated that hubristic pride, when contributed to by separation guilt and authoritarian filial piety, has direct contributions towards the experience of psychological distress for both Australians and Singaporeans. This finding furthers the understanding of the complexity of self-conscious emotions by illuminating the relations between specific self-conscious emotions of separation guilt and hubristic pride, relevant cultural variables such as filial piety, and psychological distress. Taken together, the findings of all four studies suggest that young Australians do not generally relate feelings of hubristic pride with psychological distress, unless factors, such as familial guilt and having to submit to one’s parent’s wishes, which are less congruent
with the individualistic self-conceptualisation, are imposed upon them. Also highlighted were the protective factors of reciprocal filial piety, which appear to be relevant specifically for young Singaporean adults, as evidenced by its negative contributions towards hubristic pride and symptoms of anxiety. For both Australian and Singaporean individuals, the notion of having to sacrifice their own desires and submit to one’s parents’ wishes may result in feelings of hubristic pride, which might include self-aggrandised views of the self (Tracy & Robins, 2007a) that are suggested to compensate for their personal loss. Ironically, the experience of hubristic pride that follows authoritarian filial piety is then, subsequently, related to symptoms of depression and anxiety.

**Clinical Implications**

The findings of this thesis have practical implications for clinical interventions with young adults who present with symptoms of mood disorders, such as depressive and anxious symptoms that may be related to self-conscious emotions. All four studies in this thesis are valuable in informing how specific self-conscious emotions may potentially protect or harm an individual’s mental well-being. Additionally, this thesis has contributed to a much needed cultural understanding of variations in the experiences of self-conscious emotions across both the Australian and Singaporean young adult context, and results may be able to assist in the tailoring of therapeutic interventions for young adults from individualistic or collectivistic backgrounds.

Young adulthood, a life stage that is marked by transitions that involve life-changing decisions, has been identified by researchers as having the highest incidence of mental disorders of any age cohort (Rowling et al., 2005). The clinical implications of self-conscious emotions on mental well-being, during the period of young adulthood, are of immense relevance, given the impact and complexity of the relationships between various
self-conscious emotions and psychological distress. Across both Australian and Singaporean cultures, findings of this thesis suggest that shame may present itself as a devastating self-conscious emotion that can greatly impact on the individual’s experience of depressive, anxious or stressful symptoms. While both adaptive and maladaptive forms of guilt were found to relate more strongly to anxiety and stress than depression, shame was related to depression, anxiety and stress for both young Australian and Singaporean adults. This finding is consistent with the literature, which has documented a stronger relationship between shame and depressive symptoms, as compared to guilt and depressive symptoms (Kim et al., 2011).

The attributional pattern that is implied within the self-criticised and flawed shamed individual has been argued to be more maladaptive and self-destructive than guilt, with shame sharing strong associations with symptoms of depression (Tangney et al., 1995), eating disorders (Cleary, 1992), substance abuse and addictions (Young, 1991), as well as a myriad of psychological symptoms of distress (Kim et al., 2011). Indeed, shame appears to target an individual’s core self-concept, commanding the individual to assess the possibility of a faulty, worthless or flawed self. A core component of shame is the behavioural consequence of withdrawal from social relationships and self-isolation (Lewis, 1971). When working with young people who present with shame-proneness and depressive symptoms, and especially if the young adult client reports avoidance or withdrawal motives, it may be important for the clinician to explore and strengthen the young person’s social resources, and to encourage the maintenance of healthy and supportive social connections and interpersonal relationships. Additionally, clinicians may consider it useful to work with the young adult on shifting the inward focus of shame towards reparative
behaviour with the aim of amending broken social relationships and reducing withdrawal behaviour.

Shifting shame towards the reparative behaviour that is central to adaptive guilt may empower young adult clients by reducing the intensity of shame and psychological distress, and may allow for more efficient and effective therapeutic intervention. In addition, therapists should remain vigilant to the bidirectional relationship of shame within a therapeutic context via the process of transference (Herman, 2011), and, utilising a client-centred framework, equip young adult clients with skills to regulate shame (e.g. self-compassion; Gilbert, 2011) and transform shame towards more adaptive core self-beliefs and modified behaviour (Tangney & Dearing, 2011).

The current findings also have practical implications with regard to culturally unique emotional experiences linked to psychological distress. It is suggested that filial piety may play an important role as a factor that may interact with one or more self-conscious emotions to elicit psychological distress in young adults within both authoritarian and collectivistic cultures, whereby reciprocal filial piety appears to be a culturally unique protective factor, negatively contributing towards symptoms of anxiety and hubristic pride.

Clinicians working with young adults who possess a collectivistic orientation are encouraged to take into account cultural values and attitudes, such as those towards a dual concept of filial piety, to inform their formulation of the presenting problem and work towards incorporating intervention strategies that include their family members. It may be important to take into account the need to preserve the dual-faceted nature of filial piety within clinical work, where clinicians may find it useful to first assess for attitudes towards both reciprocal and authoritarian filial piety, and to subsequently work with the young adult and their family to increase their attitudes towards reciprocal filial piety, while reducing
authoritarian filial piety attitudes. Such tailoring of psychotherapy intervention may work
towards preventing or reducing levels of hubristic pride that are associated with
authoritarian filial piety, as well as any related symptoms of depression and anxiety in the
young adult. Within collectivistic societies, mental health campaigns may also benefit from
focusing on building and strengthening attitudes towards reciprocal filial piety and healthy
parent-child relationships for the young adult population.

Young Australian adults, as compared to their Singaporean counterparts,
demonstrated a stronger relationship between guilt – both adaptive and maladaptive – and
symptoms of anxiety. Guilt has been characterised by an outwardly directed attention to a
wrongfully committed act, which has negatively impacted on others (Leith & Baumeister,
1998). Clinicians working with young adults from individualistic cultures may find it useful
to tap into relationship-enhancing qualities that have been related to guilt (Tangney &
Dearing, 2002). For example, clinicians may tailor intervention to incorporate working on
empathy and perspective taking, which may assist the young adult with amending and
restoring broken social relationships that may have contributed to their feelings of guilt. In
addition, it may be helpful to encourage the building and maintaining of positive
interpersonal relationships that may be a protective factor for the young adult.

Methodological Factors

It is important to highlight methodological factors, with regard to the choice of
psychometric assessments, which might have influenced the strength of association of
shame, guilt and pride with psychological distress. In particular, researchers have suggested
that the application of generalised (e.g. adjective-based) versus contextual (e.g. TOSCA-3
scenarios) may be different for shame and guilt. Differences in the associations between
shame and depressive symptoms are not expected for generalised versus contextual
measurements, as shame is essentially defined by the condemnation of a globally faulty self (Lewis, 1971; Tangney & Dearing, 2002), with both types of measurements approaches effectively tapping into this important element of shame (Kim et al., 2011). However, generalised guilt measurements, such as Study 3’s adapted adjective-based Guilt subscale, have been argued to result in stronger links to depressive symptoms, as such measures require respondents to perform the shame-like task of evaluating the global self in a way that contradicts notions of guilt as involving specific wrongful behaviours that arise from specific contexts (Kim et al., 2011).

Indeed, findings from Study 3 have indicated that the generalised measure of guilt, which was the adapted adjective-based guilt subscale, demonstrated robust links with depression, while contextual measures of guilt – both adaptive and separation guilt – did not evidence similar associations. These findings may assist in informing the choice of clinical measurements of depressive symptoms within clinical practice and research. It has long been accepted, as seen in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fifth Edition (DSM-V; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), that guilt is a diagnostic criteria for depressive disorders, such as Major Depressive Disorder (MDD). Indeed, the DSM-V states that “inappropriate or excessive guilt” is a diagnostic criterion for MDD (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). As a result, many clinical self-report instruments that have been designed to measure depressive symptoms include guilt-related items. Among such measures are the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, Steer, & Brown, 1996) and the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (Hamilton, 1960). The findings of this thesis suggest that using contextual measures of guilt allows for a more accurate measurement of maladaptive guilt’s association with depressive symptoms. Specifically, the current findings indicate adaptive guilt’s weak relationship with depressive symptoms, and
maladaptive (survivor or separation) guilt’s more robust relationship with depressive symptoms. This pattern makes sense, because maladaptive guilt measures assess forms of guilt that are generally contextually bounded, but ultimately maladaptive and excessive in nature. For psychometric measurements that assess for depressive symptoms, clinicians should keep in mind that the presence of guilt items in self-report depression scales may result in an inflation of the relationship between guilt and depressive symptoms, as compared to scales which do not include guilt items.

**Limitations**

There are a number of limitations in this thesis that should be addressed. Firstly, in Study 1, it would have been ideal to compare Australians residing in Australia to Singaporeans residing in Singapore during the period of data collection. Instead, only 30.2% of the Singaporean sample in Study 1 resided in Singapore. With the majority of the Singaporean sample residing overseas during the period of data collection, there may have been an inflation of separation guilt scores for the Singaporean sample. It should be noted, however, that participants’ nationality was determined by the country that they identified as having lived most of their lives in. Additionally, this limitation was rectified in the subsequent studies. Study 2’s participants lived in their country of nationality, and Studies 3 and 4 attained a more accurate representation of Singaporeans residing in Singapore, with 74.3% of Singaporeans reporting that they lived in Singapore during the time of data collection. Another limitation related to sample issues was the inability to attain sufficient participants in each of the four age bands that young adulthood was separated into. While Study 1 attempted to investigate cultural differences in self-conscious emotions across ages, results of analyses required cautious interpretation due to the low number of participants within certain age bands.
Although this thesis was able to distinctly examine specific cultural differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions between Australians and Singaporeans, attaining data from a greater number of nationalities representative of different individualistic and collectivistic cultures may have assisted in drawing conclusions that could be more generalisable to the concepts of individualism and collectivism. However, directly comparing two specific nationalities is also a strength of this thesis, in its ability to attain a more accurate and specific cultural understanding of the experience of self-conscious emotions and its relation to psychological distress. Indeed, other studies that have examined cultural differences in self-conscious emotions have often compared various ethnic cultures (Asians vs. Caucasians; African-Americans vs. Caucasians) that reside within the same country (Meehan et al., 1996; Orth et al., 2010).

Another limitation to this thesis, with particular regard to Studies 1, 3 and 4, is the use of self-report measures for the purposes of quantitative analyses. The concern of social desirability may have been alleviated by the fact that some means of different subscales varied substantially, suggesting that participants did not exhibit an inclination towards coming across as individuals who did not experience negative self-conscious emotions or psychological distress. In addition, Study 2 was able to explore and attain a richer understanding of the cross-cultural experiences of shame, guilt and pride, beyond that of the ability of quantitative measures. This thesis’ application of correlational analyses in the investigation of the link between specific self-conscious emotions and symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, resulted in the inability to confirm causal implications. However, it should be noted that previous key studies that have examined the relations between self-conscious emotions and psychological distress have also used a correlational design (O’Connor et al., 1999). Additionally, Study 4 tested a latent variable model that
depicted the independent contributions of specific self-conscious emotions and filial piety on symptoms of depression and anxiety.

Additionally, results with respect to shame and guilt need to be interpreted cautiously, since analyses did not separately control for these two self-conscious emotions. The overlap between guilt and shame needs to be acknowledged, and future studies should consider their use of instruments, as well as research design (partiallying shame from guilt, and vice versa), to address shame-free guilt, as well as guilt-free shame (adaptive shame).

**Future Research**

While this thesis has contributed towards a richer understanding of cross-cultural differences in the experiences of self-conscious emotions, filial piety and psychological distress, it has, inevitably, raised questions for further research. While this thesis was able to validate the cultural significance of separation guilt within a collectivistic culture, future studies should look into further differentiating the various forms of shame, guilt and pride within different cultural settings. This thesis has also uniquely illustrated that the cultural differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions described by researchers (Wong & Tsai, 2007) are, in fact, due to differences between individualistic and collectivistic conceptions of the self, with attitudes towards filial piety playing a significant role in the relations between self-conscious emotions and psychological distress. This is a novel contribution to the literature, and future studies could further investigate the direction and role that the dual-concept of filial piety may play in relation to other self-conscious emotions, such as shame, and how they may collectively impact on the individual’s psychological well-being. Future studies may also consider extending the inclusion of filial piety attitudes to other non-Asian collectivistic cultures, such as the Spanish culture, to investigate if filial piety has unique contributions towards a Confucian-based Asian society,
or if it extends towards other non-Asian collectivistic cultures as well. In addition, future studies could incorporate other cultural factors, besides filial piety, so as to achieve a better understanding of the complex cultural variations in emotional experiences.

Although it was the intention of this thesis to investigate cross-cultural differences in the experience of self-conscious emotions within the specific life stage of young adulthood, future studies should extend the investigation of specific cross-cultural differences in the experience of separation guilt and hubristic pride to other life stages, such as adolescence, middle adulthood and late adulthood. This would assist in attaining a richer and more comprehensive understanding of how and why the experience of culturally relevant self-conscious emotions may change over the lifespan. Additionally, it may assist in the better understanding of the reasons behind young adulthood being a period of the highest incidence of mental disorders of any age cohort (Rowling et al., 2005).

Future research could extend the cultural findings of this study to include a clinical sample, so as to allow for a better understanding of how the cultural experience of self-conscious emotions may differ between clinical and non-clinical samples. Future research could include other measures of psychological distress and mental well-being. Both clinical practice and research would benefit from future studies that examine the valuation, eliciting events, and the behavioural and emotional consequences of hubristic pride in its relationship with psychological distress, especially within collectivistic cultures. Additionally, future research could evaluate the effectiveness of clinical interventions that specifically apply an understanding of cultural differences in self-conscious emotions’ relation to psychological distress.

Given the richness of information that Study 2 was able to glean from the use of a qualitative design, future research may consider utilising qualitative methods so as to lend
balance to the traditional quantitative investigation of self-conscious emotions, to attain a much richer understanding of the complex emotional experiences behind shame, guilt and pride across and within cultures. In particular, Study 2 found that while young Singaporean adults reported experiencing hubristic pride, this experience was very much an internally “hidden” experience that involved a discrepancy between the inward experience and the outward expression of hubristic pride. Future studies could qualitatively assess for discrepancies between the inward experience and the outward expression of specific self-conscious emotions, so as to better understand the impact of a culture’s valuation or devaluation of certain self-conscious emotions for the individual.

Concluding Remarks

In summary, this thesis has qualitatively and quantitatively investigated cross-cultural differences in the experiences of shame, adaptive and maladaptive guilt and hubristic and authentic pride. It has also contributed to the literature novel findings of how self-conscious emotions may relate differently to symptoms of depression and anxiety, depending on the collectivistic or individualistic orientation of the individual. In particular, young Singaporean adults reported experiencing greater separation guilt, and stronger attitudes towards filial piety, than their Australian counterparts. Of interest, hubristically proud young Singaporean adults were more likely than young Australian adults to experience psychological distress. However, young Australian adults appeared to suffer more psychological distress that was related to guilt. Filial piety appears to be an important collectivistic cultural factor that may influence the experience of self-conscious emotions and their impact on psychological well-being. The qualitative analyses of Study 2 assisted in contributing to the literature more in-depth information with regard to the complex
inward experience and outward expression of self-conscious emotions, as well as the relationship between separation guilt and filial piety.

In essence, this thesis has answered the call for a more in-depth, cross-cultural analysis of the experience of shame, guilt and pride, and has contributed to the current literature’s understanding of the complexities of self-conscious emotions. Finally, through the course of these analyses, the emotional experiences behind psychological distress for young adults were illuminated.
REFERENCES


American Psychiatric Association (2013). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorder (DSM 5), Arlington, VA.


doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_1


doi:10.1006/jesp.1999.1421


We invite you to participate in a research study that will investigate the experience of Self-conscious emotions in young adulthood. This study is part of a PhD and Honours Programme in Psychology, supervised by Dr. Suzanne Dziurawiec at Murdoch University.

Nature and Purpose of the Study

Self-conscious emotions (SCEs) are emotions that require self-awareness and self-representations, which then allow for self-evaluation. They play a central role in the motivating and regulating of an individual’s thoughts, feelings and behaviours. SCEs have received considerably less attention in the literature than the “basic emotions” such as joy, fear and sadness however interest in this area has grown in recent years. The present study’s focus on the period of young adulthood is believed to be the first to occur in the field of SCE research, and is a particularly relevant period for more fine-grained analyses of the developmental trajectories of SCEs. The young adulthood period filled with decision-making and major transitions presents itself to be a period of interest for study. For the purpose of the present study, shame, guilt and pride have been identified as the three main SCEs to be investigated.

The aim of the present study is to research upon these emotions specifically in young adults across cultures, such as Singapore and Australia and their relationship with well-being and health.

What the Study will Involve

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- Complete an anonymous online questionnaire.
- The submitted questionnaire material will be anonymous and confidential. You will not be identifiable, except for your age, gender and nationality.
- It is estimated that the questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The submitted questionnaire material will be stored in the supervisor’s office and will be disposed of after the required 5 year period to comply with University Policy. Although unlikely, it is possible that you may experience some level of anxiety or stress during the session as a result of some of the questions. You are free to withdraw at anytime during the session. If these feelings persist after the completion of the survey, you may wish to access support by contacting appropriate services such as Lifeline at 131114 (Australia) or Care Corner Counselling Services at 18003535800 (Singapore).

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal from the Study

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without discrimination or prejudice. All information is treated as confidential and no names or other details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. If you withdraw, all information you have provided will be destroyed.

If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the procedures you will be asked to undergo. Please make sure that you ask any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact either Georgina Tay on 0422614155, Eleanor Woodford on 0403 412 217, or our supervisor, Dr Suzanne Dziurawiec on 9360 2388.
Benefits of the Study
It is possible that there may be no direct benefit to you from participation in this study.

While there is no guarantee that you will personally benefit, the knowledge gained from your participation may help others in the future through the attainment of a richer understanding of the experience, as well as possible cultural differences, of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood.

As a small token of our appreciation, you have the opportunity to enter a draw to win a $50 iTunes voucher. If you choose to participate in the draw, we will need additional contact details from you, but these will be stored separately from your survey responses. A summary of the findings from this study will also be published on the Murdoch University Psychology webpage at the end of October 2011.

If you are willing to consent to participation in this study, please complete the Consent Form.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,
Georgina Tay &
Eleanor Woodford.

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval xxxx/xxx). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University's Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Dear Sir/Madam,

We invite you to participate in a research study that will investigate the experience of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood. This study is part of a PhD and Honours Programme in Psychology, supervised by Dr. Suzanne Dzurawiec at Murdoch University.

Nature and Purpose of the Study

Self-conscious emotions (SCEs) are emotions that require self-awareness and self-representations, which then allow for self-evaluation. They play a central role in the motivating and regulating of an individual’s thoughts, feelings and behaviour. SCEs have received considerably less attention in the literature than the “basic emotions” such as joy, fear and sadness however interest in this area has grown in recent years. The present study’s focus on the period of young adulthood is believed to be the first to occur in the field of SCE research, and is a particularly relevant period for more fine-grained analyses of the developmental trajectories of SCEs. The young adulthood period filled with decision-making and major transitions presents itself to be a period of interest for study. For the purpose of the present study, shame, guilt and pride have been identified as the three main SCEs to be investigated.

The aim of the present study is to research upon these emotions specifically in young adults across cultures, such as Singapore and Australia and their relationship with well-being and health.

What the Study will Involve

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

• Complete an anonymous online questionnaire.
• The submitted questionnaire will be anonymous and confidential. You will not be identifiable, except for your age, gender and nationality.
• It is estimated that the questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The submitted questionnaire material will be stored in the supervisor’s office and will be disposed of after the required 5 year period to comply with University Policy. Although unlikely, it is possible that you may experience some level of anxiety or stress during the session as a result of some of the questions. You are free to withdraw at anytime during the session. If these feelings persist after the completion of the survey, you may wish to access support by contacting appropriate services such as Lifeline at 131114 (Australia) or Care Corner Counselling Services at 18003539600 (Singapore).

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal from the Study

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without discrimination or prejudice. All information is treated as confidential and no names or other details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. If you withdraw, all information you have provided will be destroyed.

If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the procedures you will be asked to undergo. Please make sure that you ask any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact either Georgina Tay on 0422614155; Eleanor Woodford on 6003 412 217; or our supervisor, Dr. Suzanne Dzurawiec on 9360 3288.

Benefits of the Study

It is possible that there may be no direct benefit to you from participation in this study.

While there is no guarantee that you will personally benefit, the knowledge gained from your participation may help others in the future through the attainment of a richer understanding of the experience, as well as possible cultural differences, of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood.

As a small token of our appreciation, you have the opportunity to enter a draw to win a $50 iTunes voucher. If you choose to participate in the draw, we will need additional contact details from you, but these will be stored separately from your survey responses. A summary of the findings from this study will also be published on the Murdoch University Psychology webpage at the end of October 2011.

If you are willing to consent to participation in this study, please complete the Consent Form.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

Georgina Tay &
Eleanor Woodford.
1. I have read the information letter about the nature and scope of this survey. Any questions I have about the research process have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this research. By submitting the survey online, I give my consent for the results to be used in the research. I am aware that this survey is anonymous and no personal details are being collected or used. I know that I may change my mind, withdraw my consent, and stop participating at any time, and I acknowledge that once my survey has been submitted it may not be possible to withdraw my data. I understand that all information provided is treated as confidential by the researchers and will not be released to a third party unless required to do so by law. I understand that the findings of this study may be published and that no information which can specifically identify me will be published.

Yes ☐ No ☐

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 1 2 3 4 5
      not likely likely
   b) You would take the extra time to read the paper, 1 2 3 4 5
      not likely likely
   c) You would feel disappointed that it's raining, 1 2 3 4 5
      not likely likely
   d) You would wonder why you woke up so early, 1 2 3 4 5
      not likely likely

In the above example, please rate ALL of the answers by circling a number. For example, you may circle "5" for answer (a) because you might not want to wake up a friend very early on a Saturday morning - so it's not at all likely that you would do that. You may circle "5" for answer (b) because you almost always read the paper if you have time in the morning (very likely). You may circle "3" for answer (c) because for you it's about half and half.

Please do not skip any items - rate all responses.

---

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

   (a) You would think:
      "I'm inconsiderate,"
      Very Likely Likely Neutral Unlikely Very Unlikely
      5 3 1 0

   (b) You would think:
      "Well, they'll understand.
      "
      Very Likely Likely Neutral Unlikely Very Unlikely
      5 3 1 0

   (c) You'd think you should make it up to him as soon as possible.
      Very Likely Likely Neutral Unlikely Very Unlikely
      5 3 1 0

   (d) You would think:
      "My boss distracted me just before lunch."
      Very Likely Likely Neutral Unlikely Very Unlikely
      5 3 1 0

3. 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 company.

   a) You would think:
      "I should have been aware of what my best friend is feeling."
      Very Likely Likely Neutral Unlikely Very Unlikely
      5 3 1 0

   b) You would feel happy about your appearance and personality.
      Very Likely Likely Neutral Unlikely Very Unlikely
      5 3 1 0

   c) You would feel
made such a good impression.

d) You would think your best friend should pay attention to his/her spouse.

e) You would probably avoid eye-contact for a long time.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</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>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think about quitting.</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>✔️</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>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</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;I'm not afraid.&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>

7. 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></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;I guessed 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>

8. While playing around, you throw a ball and it hits your friend in the face.
9. a) You would feel inadequate that you can’t even throw a ball.  
   b) You would think maybe your friend needs more practice at catching.  
   c) You would think: “It was just an accident.”  
   d) You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. 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.  

   a) You would feel immature.  
   b) You would think: “I sure ran into some bad luck.”  
   c) You would return the favor as quickly as you could.  
   d) You would think: “I am a trustworthy person.”  
   e) You would be proud that you repaid your debts.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. 9. You are driving down the road, and you hit a small animal.  

   a) You would think: the animal shouldn’t have been on the road.  
   b) You would think: “I’m terrible.”  
   c) You would feel: “Well, it was an accident.”  
   d) You would feel bad you hadn’t been more alert driving down the road.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   a) You would think: “Well, it’s just a test.”  
   b) You would think: “The instructor doesn’t like me.”  
   c) You would think: “I should have studied harder.”  
   d) You would feel stupid.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. 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.  

   a) You would feel the boss is rather shortsighted.  
   b) You would feel alone and apart from your colleagues.  
   c) You would feel your hard work had paid off.  
   d) You would feel competent and proud of yourself.  
   e) You would feel you should not accept it.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;It was all in fun; it's harmless.&quot;</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel small... like a rat.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think that perhaps that friend should have been there to defend himself/herself.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would apologize and talk about that person's good points.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. 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>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</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>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel like you wanted to hide.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: &quot;I should have recognised the problem and done a better job.&quot;</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think: &quot;Well, nobody's perfect.&quot;</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. 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>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel selfish and you'd think you are basically lazy.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel you are forced into doing something you did not want to do.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: &quot;I should be more concerned about people who are less fortunate.&quot;</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would feel great that you had helped others.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) You would feel very satisfied with yourself.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. 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>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think, &quot;I am irresponsible and incompetent.&quot;</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</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>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would vow to be more careful next time.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would think your friend could just get a new dog.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. 16. You attend your co-worker's housewarming party and you spill red wine on their new cream-coloured carpet, but you think no one notices.
24. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my own coping abilities.

   | Very Likely | Likely | Neutral | Unlikely | Unlikely |
   ---|---|---|---|---|---|
   | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Mirror, mirror, on the wall - Who feels worst or best of them all?

We will now move onto the next segment of the questionnaire. For each sentence below, please indicate your response by selecting one out of these four responses: Not at all true, Hardly true, Moderately true and Exactly true.

18. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

19. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

20. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

21. I can confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

22. Thanks for my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

23. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

24. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my own coping abilities.
   - Not at all true
25. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.
- Not at all true
- Hardly true
- Moderately true
- Exactly true

26. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.
- Not at all true
- Hardly true
- Moderately true
- Exactly true

27. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.
- Not at all true
- Hardly true
- Moderately true
- Exactly true

Mirror, mirror, on the wall - Who feels worst or best of them all?

We'll now be asking you some questions that relate to your general health.

Mirror, mirror, on the wall - Who feels worst or best of them all?

28. Have you recently

been feeling perfectly well and in good health?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

been feeling in need of a good tonic?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

been feeling run down and out of sorts?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

felt that you are ill?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

been getting any pains in your head?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

been getting a feeling of tightness or pressure in your head?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

29. Have you recently

lost much sleep over worry?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

had difficulty in staying asleep once you are off?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

felt constantly under strain?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

been getting edgy and bad-tempered?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual

been getting scared and panicry for no good reason?
- Not at all
- No more than usual
- Rather more than usual
- Much more than usual
### Mirror, mirror, on the wall - Who feels worst or best of them all?

#### 30. Have you recently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>No more than usual</th>
<th>Rather more than usual</th>
<th>Much more than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>been managing to keep yourself busy and occupied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been taking longer over the things you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt on the whole you were doing things well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been satisfied with the way you’ve carried out your task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt that you were playing a useful part in things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt capable of making decisions about things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been able to enjoy normal day-to-day activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 31. Have you recently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>No more than usual</th>
<th>Rather more than usual</th>
<th>Much more than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>been thinking yourself as a worthless person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt that life is entirely hopeless?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt that life isn’t worth living?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought of the possibility that you might make away with yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found at times you couldn’t do anything because your nerves were too bad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found yourself wishing you were dead and away from it all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found that the idea of taking your own life kept coming into your mind?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Please do not spend too much time on each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very untrue of me OR strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not true of me OR disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes true and sometimes not true OR undecided</th>
<th>True of me OR agree</th>
<th>Very true of me OR strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It makes me uncomfortable to have critical thoughts about my parents.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to see my parents' flaws.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel bad when I disagree with my parent's ideas or values, even if I keep it to myself.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I could be more like my parents.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that bad things may happen to my family if I do not stay in close contact with them.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes me anxious to be away from home for too long.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable if I don't do things in the same way my parents did.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to do things the way my parents did them.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very reluctant to express an opinion that is different from the opinion held by family or friends.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't mind saying negative things about my parents.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no difficulty rejecting my family's values.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad I am not like my parents.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel terrible if I did not love my parents.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One's parents should always come first.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel guilty about not liking my parents.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Below are a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. 
Read each item and then indicate the extent to which you generally feel this way (i.e., how you feel on the average) using the scale shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilled</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smug</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like I am Achieving</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceited</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egotistical</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompous</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like I have self-worth</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobish</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We'll now be asking you some questions relating to how you have been feeling over the past week.

34. Please read each statement and indicate how much the statement applied to you over the past week. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not apply to me at all</th>
<th>Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time</th>
<th>Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of the time</th>
<th>Applied to me very much, or most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found it hard to wind down.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was aware of dryness of my mouth.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g., excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion).</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tended to over-react to situations.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced trembling (e.g., in the hands).</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I had nothing to look forward to.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found myself getting agitated.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it difficult to relax.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt down-hearted and blue.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I was close to panic.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I wasn't worth much as a person.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I was rather touchy.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g., sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat).</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt scared without any good reason.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that life was meaningless.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORED**

**Mirror, mirror, on the wall - Who feels worst or best of them all?**

35. Now on to the last set of questions on how you view yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very untrue of me OR strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not true of me OR disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes true and sometimes not true OR undecided</th>
<th>True of me OR agree</th>
<th>Very true of me OR strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I conceal or minimize my successes.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes me very uncomfortable to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to fully enjoy my successes because I fear something bad is just around the corner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people's misfortunes do not affect me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel I don't deserve the happiness I've achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy having other people envy me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel responsible at social gatherings for people who are not able to enter into conversations with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to retain my good humor even after seeing beggars or homeless people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't feel sorry for people who are less fortunate or successful than I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am uncomfortable talking about my achievements in social situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable if other people envy me for what I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does not disturb me to see very poor people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In social situations, I like to talk about my accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes me very uncomfortable if I am more successful at something than are my friends or family members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable when I feel better than other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am relieved when my spouse, my siblings, my parents, or my children are successful or confident, or when they achieve recognition or honors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't be happy when a friend or relative is suffering a disappointment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is often hard for me to enjoy things that I have been looking forward to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to get what I want because I feel there will be a price to pay that I did not anticipate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to get somewhat depressed after important accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get a little extra money I feel tempted to share it with a poor friend or relative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a friend or relative suffers a misfortune I imagine how I would feel if I suffered a similar misfortune.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very strongly DISAGREE</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get so upset when I am nervous that I cannot think clearly.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable that I can control how anxious I am feeling.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If people were to find out how angry I sometimes feel, the consequences might be pretty bad.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid I could go into a depression that would wipe me out.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get nervous, I think I am going to go crazy.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to stop myself from becoming overly anxious.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid I might try to hurt myself if I become too depressed.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It scares me when I am nervous.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being nervous isn't much fun, but I can handle it.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is nothing I can do to stop feeling nervous once it has started.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I start feeling &quot;down&quot;, I think I might let the sadness go too far.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I get nervous, I think that my feelings might get out of hand.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get really unhappy, I worry that I will stay that way.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid that I will talk nonsense or talk funny when I am nervous.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression is scary to me - I am afraid that I could get depressed and never recover.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't really mind feeling nervous; I know it will go away.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid that letting myself feel really angry about something could cause me to totally lose it.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. The following statements describe how people sometimes feel. For each statement, please indicate how often you feel the way described by choosing one of the four options provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that you are &quot;in tune&quot; with the people around you?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that you lack companionship?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that there is no one you can turn to?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel alone?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel part of a group of friends?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that you have a lot in common with the people around you?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that you are no longer close to anyone?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that your interests and ideas are not shared by those around you?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel outgoing and friendly?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel close to people?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel left out?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that your relationships with others are not meaningful?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that no one really knows you well?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel isolated from others?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel you can find companionship when you want it?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that there are people who really understand you?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel shy?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that people are around you but not with you?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that there are people you can talk to?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel that there are people you can turn to?</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, please provide us with some general information about yourself.
38. Age:  

39. Gender:  
   ○ Male  
   ○ Female  

40. What is your nationality?  
   ○ Australian  
   ○ Singaporean  
   ○ Other, please specify  

41. What is your current relationship status?  
   ○ Single  
   ○ In a relationship  
   ○ Married/De facto  
   ○ Separated/Divorced  
   ○ Widowed  

42. Do you have any children?  
   ○ Yes  
   ○ No  

43. Where is your current country of residence?  
   ○ Australia  
   ○ Singapore  
   ○ Other, please specify  

44. How long have you been living there?  
   ○ < 3 months  
   ○ 3 months to < 1 year  
   ○ 1 year to < 5 years  
   ○ > 5 years  
   ○ Never lived anywhere else  

45. With whom do you reside?  
   ○ Alone  
   ○ University accommodation  
   ○ Shared housing  
   ○ Immediate/Extended family  
   ○ Friends  

46. If you are currently a student, are you  
   ○ Part-time student  
   ○ Full-time student  

47. If you are currently a student, are you  
   ○ an international student  
   ○ a domestic student  

48. If you are not a student, are you currently  
   ○ Working part-time  
   ○ Working full-time  
   ○ Unemployed  

49. If you are employed, what is your average annual income?  
   ○ <$10,000  
   ○ <$20,000  
   ○ <$30,000  
   ○ <$40,000  
   ○ <$50,000  
   ○ $51,000-$70,000  
   ○ $71,000-$90,000  
   ○ $91,000-$110,000  
   ○ $111,000-$130,000  
   ○ $131,000-$150,000  
   ○ $151,000-$170,000  
   ○ $171,000-$190,000  
   ○ $191,000-$210,000  
   ○ $211,000-$230,000  
   ○ $231,000-$250,000  
   ○ $251,000-$270,000  
   ○ $271,000-$290,000  
   ○ $291,000-$310,000  
   ○ $311,000-$330,000  
   ○ $331,000-$350,000  
   ○ $351,000-$370,000  
   ○ $371,000-$390,000  
   ○ $391,000-$410,000  
   ○ $411,000-$430,000  
   ○ $431,000-$450,000  
   ○ $451,000-$470,000  
   ○ $471,000-$490,000  
   ○ $491,000-$510,000  
   ○ $511,000-$530,000  
   ○ $531,000-$550,000  
   ○ $551,000-$570,000  
   ○ $571,000-$590,000  
   ○ $591,000-$610,000  
   ○ $611,000-$630,000  
   ○ $631,000-$650,000  
   ○ $651,000-$670,000  
   ○ $671,000-$690,000  
   ○ $691,000-$710,000  
   ○ $711,000-$730,000  
   ○ $731,000-$750,000  
   ○ $751,000-$770,000  
   ○ $771,000-$790,000  
   ○ $791,000-$810,000  
   ○ $811,000-$830,000  
   ○ $831,000-$850,000  
   ○ $851,000-$870,000  
   ○ $871,000-$890,000  
   ○ $891,000-$910,000  
   ○ $911,000-$930,000  
   ○ $931,000-$950,000  
   ○ $951,000-$970,000  
   ○ $971,000-$990,000  
   ○ $991,000-$1,000,000  
   ○ >$1,000,000  
   ○ Prefer not to disclose  
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> $70,000

50. Do you consider yourself to be financially independent?
   - Yes
   - No
Dear

We invite you to participate in a research study that will investigate the experience of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood. This study is part of a PhD in Psychology, supervised by Dr. Suzanne Dziuraucie at Murdoch University.

Nature and Purpose of the Study
Self-conscious emotions (SCEs) are emotions that require self-awareness and self-representations, which then allow for self-evaluation. Our understandings of these emotions, such as pride, shame, guilt, envy and embarrassment, develop after early childhood and may change into adolescence and adulthood. In this study we are particularly interested in whether self-conscious emotions vary across gender and culture in early adulthood.

What the Study will Involve
If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- Participate in an individual semi-structured interview session that will ask you to describe your emotional responses to eight hypothetical situations that people might encounter in their day-to-day lives.
- The interview session will be recorded on a voice recorder. No identifying information will be recorded and the recording itself will be destroyed once the interview has been transcribed verbatim. You will be given the opportunity to edit the transcript approximately two weeks after the date of the interview. The researcher will contact you by email or mobile phone (depending on your preference) to advise you that the transcript is available for your viewing and possible editing. Arrangements will then be made for you to view the transcript at your convenience.
- It is estimated that the interview session will take approximately 30 minutes.

Although unlikely, it is possible that you may experience some level of anxiety or stress during the interview. While you are free to withdraw at any time during the session, if these feelings persist after the completion of the session, arrangements will be made for you to access support from appropriate services.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal from the Study
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without discrimination or prejudice. All information is treated as confidential and no names or other details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. If you withdraw, all information you have provided will be destroyed.

You will have access to feedback when the study is completed (expected date October 2011), and will be available through the Murdoch University Psychology web page (http://www.psychology.murdoch.edu.au/researchresults/research_results.html).

If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the procedures you will be asked to undergo. Please make sure that you ask any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate.
Benefits of the Study
It is possible that there may be no direct benefit to you from participation in this study.

While there is no guarantee that you will personally benefit, the knowledge gained from your participation may help others in the future through the attainment of a richer understanding of the experience, as well as possible cultural differences, of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood.

If you are willing to consent to participation in this study, please **complete the Consent Form.** If you have any questions about this project please feel free to contact either myself, Eleanor Woodford on 0403 412 217, or my supervisor, Dr Suzanne Dziurawiec on 9360 2388.

My supervisor and I are happy to discuss with you any concerns you may have about this study.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely

---

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval xxxx/xxx). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University’s Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Consent Form

The Trajectory of Self-Conscious Emotions in Young Adulthood

Participant

I have read the participant information sheet, which explains the nature of the research and the possible risks. The information has been explained to me and all my questions have been satisfactorily answered. I have been given a copy of the Information sheet to keep.

I am happy to be interviewed, and for the interview to be audio recorded as part of this research. I understand that I do not have to answer particular questions if I do not want to and that I can withdraw at any time without consequences to myself.

I agree that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published provided my name or any identifying data is not used. I have also been informed that I may not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study.

I understand that all information provided by me is treated as confidential and will not be released by the researcher to a third party unless required to do so by law.

__________________________
Signature of Participant

__________________________
Date

Investigator

I have fully explained to ______________________ the nature and purpose of the research, the procedures to be employed, and the possible risks involved. I have provided the participant with a copy of the Information Sheet.

__________________________
Signature of Investigator

__________________________
Date

__________________________
Print Name

__________________________
Position
Interviewer: I am going to be reading out to you a series of situations that people are likely to encounter in day-to-day life. As I read out each scenario to you, try to imagine yourself in that situation. Then comment on, and share about how you would feel and how you might react, paying attention to how you would feel on the inside. You may feel free to bring up more than one feeling, or more than one reaction that each given scenario.

Scenario 1:
Interviewer: You borrowed your best friend's car for the day. While reversing, the car grazed against a pillar and, upon inspection, you notice fresh scratches on the car. How would you feel? (Answer)
1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
 a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
 b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way
 c. Shame vs. guilt: Would you be focusing on how terrible you were feeling about it (shame), or would you be feeling that you should apologise to your friend (guilt)?
   i. Why?
 d. Internal/external shame: Would you be feeling more upset over the fact that you have disappointed yourself (internal), or that your friend would think you were careless (external)?

Scenario 2:
Interviewer: You are a student who achieves good grades consistently. You feel that you studied really hard and spent many months preparing for your final exams. However, when you got your grades back, you find out that you did not do as well as you had expected. How would you feel? (Answer)
1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
 a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
 b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way.
 c. Shame vs. guilt: Would you be feeling that your achieved grades probably meant that you were not as good as you wished you could be (shame), or would you also be feeling that you should perhaps find out what went wrong (guilt)?
   i. Why?
 d. Internal vs. external shame: Would you be feeling upset because of how you may have let yourself down (internal), or would you be feeling upset because of how others might think you're not as smart as they think you are (external)?

Scenario 3:
Interviewer: You said that you would visit your parents over the weekend. It is Sunday night, and you realised that you have completely forgotten about visiting them. Your mother calls you up and sounds sad and disappointed. How would you feel?
1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way
c. Shame vs. guilt: Would you be focusing on how badly you were feeling about it (shame), or would you possibly also be wanting to apologise to them and be thinking of ways to make it up to them (guilt)?
   i. Why?
d. Internal vs. external shame: Would you be feeling upset because of how you feel you may have disappointed your parents {internal}, or would you be feeling upset because of what your parents might be thinking of you {e.g. unfilial daughter/son} {external}?
e. Possible cultural significance: {emphasis that participant’s response with regard to how much their shame/guilt is related to family}

Scenario 4:
Interviewer: At lunch, you spill your drink on your friend’s new dress and she is visibly upset. How would you feel?
1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
   a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
   b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way
c. Shame vs. guilt: Would you be focusing on how badly you were feeling about it at that moment in time {shame}, or would you possibly also be feeling that you should have been more careful {guilt}?
   i. Why?
d. Internal vs. external shame: Would you be feeling upset at yourself for being clumsy {internal}, or would you be feeling upset at what your friend might be thinking of you {e.g. that you are clumsy, that you might have done it on purpose} {external}

Scenario 5:
Interviewer: Your boss gets visibly upset with you for making a mistake at work and yells at you. Colleagues approach you later in the day to ask about what had happened and if you were feeling all right. How would you feel?
1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
   a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
   b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way
c. Shame vs. guilt: Would you be focusing on how badly you were feeling about what had happened {shame}, or would you possibly also be feeling that you should have been more careful of making the mistake {guilt}?
   d. Internal vs. external shame: Would you be feeling upset at yourself for making the mistake and getting yelled at {internal}, or would you be feeling upset about what your boss and/or colleagues might be thinking about you {external}?

Scenario 6:
Interviewer: Your tutor singles out your essay as an excellent example and decides to read it out in the tutorial as a model essay. How would you feel?

1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
   a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
   b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way? What would be making you feel that way?
   c. Authentic vs. hubristic pride: Would you more likely be feeling proud about how you did a good job (authentic pride), or would you be feeling proud of yourself because it showed that you were a good student (hubristic pride)?
   d. (If brought up by participant) Shame vs. guilt: Would you be feeling awkward and avoiding eye contact while the tutor is reading the essay out loud (shame)? Or would you be feeling unsettled inside because of how you feel that you should be more aware of how other students might be feeling (guilt)

Scenario 7:
Interviewer: While out on a weekend, a couple of friends comment on how you look nice in what you are wearing. How would you feel?

1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
   a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
   b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way
   c. Authentic vs. hubristic pride: Would you more likely be feeling happy about how good you looked (hubristic pride), or would you be feeling more happy about the fact that what you were wearing looked nice on you (authentic pride)?
   d. (If brought up by participant) Shame vs. guilt: Would you be feeling awkward on the inside and decide to keep to yourself (shame)? Or would you be feeling unsettled inside because of how you feel that you should be more aware of how your other friends might have been feeling (guilt)

Scenario 8:
Interviewer: Your brother and you both desperately want to get into a specific and prestigious course at university. You feel that you worked very hard for the exams. The results for admissions are out, and you have just found out that your brother has gotten in, while you have not. How would you feel?

1) Script to encourage expansion of answers:
   a. Could you tell me a bit more about what it might be like for you?
   b. Why is it that you would be feeling that way
   c. Shame vs. guilt: Would you be feeling sad or disappointed because of feelings of incompetence (shame)? Or would you be thinking about how you did try your best, but it was just not good enough (guilt)?
   d. (Possible cultural significance) Authentic vs. hubristic pride: Do you think that you might be feeling proud that you had a brother who made it into a prestigious course at university (hubristic pride)? Or would you be feeling proud of your brother because
worked really hard and deserved to get into the course (authentic pride)?
Dear Sir/Mdm,

We invite you to participate in a research study that will investigate the experience of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood. This study is part of a PhD in Psychology, supervised by Dr. Suzanne Dzurawiec at Murdoch University.

Nature and Purpose of the Study

Self-conscious emotions (SCEs) are emotions that require self-awareness and self-representations, which then allow for self-evaluation. They play a central role in the motivating and regulating of an individual's thoughts, feelings and behaviours. SCEs have received considerably less attention in the literature than the "basic emotions" such as joy, fear and sadness. Given that young adulthood is a period that is filled with decision-making and major life transitions, SCEs might play an important role for the individual during this period.

The aim of the present study is to study self-conscious emotions specifically in young adults across cultures, such as Singapore and Australia, and their relationship with well-being and health.

What the Study will Involve

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

* Complete an anonymous online questionnaire.
* The submitted questionnaire material will be anonymous and confidential. You will not be identifiable, except for your age, gender and nationality.
* It is estimated that the questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The submitted questionnaire material will be stored in the supervisor's office and will be disposed of after the required 5 year period to comply with University Policy. Although unlikely, it is possible that you may experience some level of anxiety or stress during the session as a result of some of the questions. You are free to withdraw at any time during the session. If these feelings persist after the completion of the survey, you may wish to access support by contacting appropriate services such as Lifeline at 131114 (Australia) or Care Corner Counselling Services at 18003535800 (Singapore).

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal from the Study

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without discrimination or prejudice. All information is treated as confidential and no names or other details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. If you withdraw, all information you have provided will be destroyed.
If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the procedures you will be asked to undergo. Please make sure that you ask any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact either Eleanor Woodford on 0403 412 217, or my supervisor, Dr Suzanne Dziurawiec on 9360 2388.

Benefits of the Study

It is possible that there may be no direct benefit to you from participation in this study.

While there is no guarantee that you will personally benefit, the knowledge gained from your participation may help others in the future through the attainment of a richer understanding of the experience, as well as possible cultural differences, of self-conscious emotions in young adulthood.

As a token of our appreciation, you have the opportunity to enter a draw to win a $500AUD Apple Store credit voucher. If you are a Psychology student from Murdoch University, you can choose to either receive 1 hour of subject pool credit, or enter the draw to win the $500AUD Apple Store credit voucher. If you choose to participate in the $500AUD Apple Store credit voucher draw, we will need additional contact details from you, but these will be stored separately from your survey responses. A summary of the findings from this study will also be published on the Murdoch University Psychology webpage at the end of December 2012.

If you are willing to consent to participation in this study, please click “Yes” on the Consent Form below.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,
Eleanor Woodford.

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2012/033). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University’s Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 (for overseas studies, +61 8 9360 6677) or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
1. I have read the Information letter about the nature and scope of this survey. Any questions I have about the research process have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this research. By submitting the survey online, I give my consent for the results to be used in the research. I am aware that this survey is anonymous and no personal details are being collected or used. I know that I may change my mind, withdraw my consent, and stop participating at any time; and I acknowledge that once my survey has been submitted it may not be possible to withdraw my data. I understand that all information provided is treated as confidential by the researchers and will not be released to a third party unless required to do so by law. I understand that the findings of this study may be published and that no information which can specifically identify me will be published. Having been made aware of what is involved with this study, I am willing to take part in this online survey.

☐ Yes ☐ No

---

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.

Please do not skip any items - rate all responses in the scenarios that follow.
Shame, Guilt and Pride - Test
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2. You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o'clock, you realise you stood him up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) You would think: "I'm inconsiderate."
(b) You would think: "They'll understand."
(c) You'd think you should make it up to him as soon as possible.
(d) You would think: "My boss distracted me just before lunch."

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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."

4. 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 company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) You would think: "I should have been aware of what my best friend is feeling."

b) You would feel happy about your appearance and personality.

c) You would feel pleased to have made such a good impression.

d) You would think your best friend should pay attention to his/her spouse.

e) You would probably avoid eye-contact for a long time.

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

   a) You would feel incompetent.
   b) You would think: "There are never enough hours in the day."
   c) You would feel: "I deserve to be reprimanded for mismanaging the project."
   d) You would think: "What's done is done."

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

   Very Unlikely Unlikely Neutral Likely Very Likely
a) You would think the company did not like the co-worker.

b) You would think: "Life is not fair."

c) You would keep quiet and avoid the co-worker.

d) You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation.

7. 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>Very Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a) You would think: "I guess I'm more persuasive than I thought."

   b) You would regret that you put it off.

c) You would feel like a coward.

d) You would think: "I did a good job."

e) You would think you shouldn't have made calls you feel pressured into.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a) You would feel inadequate that you can't even throw a
b) You would think maybe your friend needs more practice at catching.

c) You would think: "It was just an accident."

d) You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better.

9. 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></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. You are driving down the road, and you hit a small animal. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think the animal shouldn't have been on the road.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;I'm terrible.&quot;</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel: &quot;It was an accident.&quot;</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You'd feel bad you hadn't been more alert driving down the road.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. You walk out of an exam thinking you did extremely well. Then you find out you did poorly. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;It's just a test.&quot;</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would think: &quot;The instructor doesn't like me.&quot;</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think: &quot;I should have studied harder.&quot;</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would feel stupid.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. 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>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel the boss is rather shortsighted.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel alone and apart from</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
your colleagues.
c) You would feel your hard work had paid off.
d) You would feel competent and proud of yourself.
e) You would feel you should not accept it.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think: &quot;It was all in fun; it's harmless.&quot;</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>

14. 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>Very Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</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>
</tbody>
</table>
c) You would think: "I should have recognised the problem and done a better job."

d) You would think: "Nobody's perfect."

15. 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>Very</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel selfish and you'd think you are basically lazy.</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>b) You would feel you are forced into doing something you did not want to do.</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>c) You would think: &quot;I should be more concerned about people who are less fortunate.&quot;</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>d) You would feel great that you had helped others.</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>e) You would feel very satisfied with yourself.</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>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</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>
18. You promised to visit your parents over the weekend. Sunday night arrives, and you realise that you have forgotten about visiting them. Your mother calls you up and she sounds sad and disappointed.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel inadequately at carrying out a promise you made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would regret that you forgot about it, and would try to make up for it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would think about your parents’ loneliness, and feel horrible for letting your mother down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would sincerely apologise and reschedule, and would spend some extra time talking to your mother on the phone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. It is the weekend, and you have made plans with some friends. You find out from a phone call from your mother that your father is unwell and has to see the doctor. You decide on sticking to the plans you have already made with your friends.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel like a horrible person for picking your friends over your father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) You would regret not choosing your father over your friends. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. You have been working for half a year after graduating from university. Your older sister tells you that you should be giving your parents some money every month so that they can live more comfortably.

a) You would feel terrible on the inside for being selfish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) You would feel bad for not thinking of it earlier, but you don't quite agree with your sister's point of view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) You would feel as though you have not lived up to your parents' expectations, and would feel obliged to giving them money every month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) You would agree with your sister and feel that you owe it to your parents to help them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
live more comfortably, and would start giving your parents money every month.

21. Your sister informs you that she is short of money. She has recently moved out, and she says that she is finding it difficult trying to make ends meet. She asks you for some money, but you are unable to help her financially.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would feel pathetic for not being able to help a family member out in times of need.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would try to help her as soon as you were more financially stable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You would feel bad for your sister, and would make an effort to find out how she is, and other ways that you could help her out.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) You would feel that your sister should not be burdening you with her personal financial problems.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Your brother and you both want to get into the same prestigious course at university. After working very hard for the exams, you find out that your brother has gotten in, while you have not.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. You find out that your brother has been caught for shop-lifting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) You would think that your brother would most probably be feeling guilty and embarrassed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You would feel as if you should have somehow helped to prevent such an occurrence from happening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You feel sad for your brother and your family, and you would try your best to help your brother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) You cannot help but feel embarrassed and ashamed on the inside, and that you cannot face your brother for a while.
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We'll now be asking you some questions that relate to how you view yourself. You can select one out of four responses for each sentence.
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24. Have you recently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much less than usual</th>
<th>Less than usual</th>
<th>More than usual</th>
<th>More so than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been managing to keep yourself busy and occupied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been taking longer over the things you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt on the whole you were doing things well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please answer the questions to the best of your ability. You can select one out of five responses for each sentence.

25. Please do not spend too much time on each question.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It makes me uncomfortable to have critical thoughts about my parents.</th>
<th>Very untrue of me OR strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not true of me OR disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes true and sometimes not true OR undecided</th>
<th>True of me OR agree</th>
<th>Very true of me OR strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel bad when I disagree with my parent's ideas or values, even if I keep it to myself.</th>
<th>Very untrue of me OR strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not true of me OR disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes true and sometimes not true OR undecided</th>
<th>True of me OR agree</th>
<th>Very true of me OR strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I wish I could be more like my parents.</th>
<th>Very untrue of me OR strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not true of me OR disagree</th>
<th>Sometimes true and sometimes not true OR undecided</th>
<th>True of me OR agree</th>
<th>Very true of me OR strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel that bad things may happen to my family if I do not stay in close contact with them.
It makes me anxious to be away from home for too long.
I feel uncomfortable if I don’t do things in the same way my parents did.
I prefer to do things the way my parents did them.
I am very reluctant to express an opinion that is different from the opinion held by family or friends.
I have no difficulty rejecting my family’s values.
I am glad I am not like my parents.
One’s parents should always come first.
I feel guilty about not liking my parents.
26. Below are a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then indicate the extent to which you generally feel this way (i.e., how you feel on the average) using the scale shown below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blamed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devalued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discredited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgraced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egotistical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humiliated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regretful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remorseful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snobbish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuck-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforgivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We'll now be asking you some questions relating to how you have been feeling OVER THE PAST WEEK.

27. Please read each statement and indicate how much the statement applied to you OVER THE PAST WEEK. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not apply to me at all</th>
<th>Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time</th>
<th>Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of time</th>
<th>Applied to me very much, or most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found it hard to wind down.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was aware of dryness of my mouth.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced breathing difficulty (eg, excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion).</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tended to over-react to situations.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced trembling (eg, in the hands).</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Please continue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I felt that I had nothing to look forward to.</th>
<th>Did not apply to me at all</th>
<th>Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time</th>
<th>Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of the time</th>
<th>Applied to me very much, or most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found myself getting agitated.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it difficult to relax</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt down-hearted and blue.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I was close to panic.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I wasn't worth much as a person.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I was rather touchy.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g. sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt scared without any good reason.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that life was meaningless.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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29. Now on to some questions on how you view yourself. Please select one of the seven options for each sentence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I get so upset when I am nervous that I cannot think clearly.</th>
<th>Very strongly DISAGREE</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Very strongly AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable that I can control how anxious I am feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If people were to find out how angry I sometimes feel, the consequences might be pretty bad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid I could go into a depression that would wipe me out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get nervous, I think I am going to go crazy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to stop myself from becoming overly anxious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid I might try to hurt myself if I become too depressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It scares me when I am nervous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Please continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is nothing I can do to stop feeling nervous once it has started.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I start feeling down, I think I might let the sadness go too far. Once I get nervous, I think that my feelings might get out of hand.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get really unhappy, I worry that I will stay that way. I am afraid that I will talk nonsense or talk funny when I am nervous. Depression is scary to me - I am afraid that I could get depressed and never recover. I don’t really mind feeling nervous; I</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
know it will
go away.
I am afraid
that letting
myself feel
really angry
about
something
could cause
me to
totally lose
it.
When I am
nervous, I
am afraid I
will act
stupid.

31. People have differing opinions about their parents. The following statements relate to the way people treat their parents. Please read each statement carefully and rate its IMPORTANCE according to your own feelings by choosing one of the six options provided. As your ratings are based on your own personal opinions, there is no standard answer for any of these statements. If there is a big difference in your interaction with your father and with your mother, please choose the parent with the most influence on you as the main target in answering all items. How important is it to you to:*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
<th>Quite Unimportant</th>
<th>Slightly Unimportant</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Quite Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be concerned about my parents' health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take my parents' suggestions even when I do not agree with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk frequently with my parents to understand their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thoughts and feelings.
Let my income be handled by my parents before marriage.
Be concerned about my parents’ general well-being.
Disregard promises to friends in order to obey my parents.
Be concerned about my parents, as well as understand them.
Give up my aspirations to meet my parents’ expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
<th>Quite Unimportant</th>
<th>Slightly Unimportant</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Quite Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support my parents' livelihood to make their lives more comfortable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do whatever my parents ask right | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
away.
Be grateful to my parents for raising me.
Avoid getting married to someone my parents dislike.
Hurry home upon the death of my parents, regardless of how far away I am.
Have at least one son for the succession of the family name.
Take the initiative to assist my parents when they are busy.
Live with my parents, or parents-in-law, when married.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Lastly, please provide us with some general information about yourself.

33. Age: The value must be between 1 and 100, inclusive.
34. Gender:
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

35. In what country were you born?*
   ○ Australia
   ○ Other, please specify
   ○ Singapore

36. In what country have you lived most of your life?*
   ○ Australia
   ○ Other, please specify
   ○ Singapore

37. Where is your current country of residence?*
   ○ Australia
   ○ Singapore
   ○ Other, please specify

38. How long have you been living there?*
   ○ < 3 months
   ○ 3 months to < 1 year
   ○ 1 year to < 5 years
   ○ > 5 years
   ○ Never lived anywhere else

39. In what country was your father born?*
   ○ Australia
   ○ Singapore
   ○ Other, please specify

40. In what country was your mother born?*
   ○ Australia
   ○ Singapore
   ○ Other, please specify

41. Do you have any siblings?*
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

42. With whom do you reside?*
43. Did you attend a public or private school?*
   ○ Public
   ○ Private
   ○ Other, please specify

44. Do you have a religion?*
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

45. What is your current relationship status?*
   ○ Single
   ○ In a relationship
   ○ Married/ De facto
   ○ Separated/Divorced
   ○ Widowed

46. Do you have any children?*
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

47. Please complete this question if you are currently a student.
   ○ Local Student (Full-time)
   ○ Local Student (Part-time)
   ○ International Student

48. Please complete this question if you are currently employed
   ○ Working part-time
   ○ Working full-time

49. Do you consider yourself to be financially independent?*
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
This is the end of the survey. Thank you for your interest and participation in this study!

You now have the opportunity to take part in a prize draw with a chance to win a $500 Apple Store Credit Voucher. If you would like to take part in this prize draw, please provide us with your contact details. Please be informed that your contact details will be stored separately from your responses in this survey. Your contact details will be destroyed at the end of the study.