

THESIS

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN SHAME AND GUILT BETWEEN AMERICAN AND
CHINESE PRESCHOOLERS

Submitted by

Dongying Zhang

Department of Human Development and Family Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Science

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2011

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Karen C. Barrett

Erika S. Lunkenheimer

George A. Morgan

Copyright by Dongying Zhang 2011

All Rights Reserved.

ABSTRACT

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN SHAME AND GUILT BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE PRESCHOOLERS

The emotions of guilt and shame play a significant role in socialization. Many cross-national studies about shame in American and Chinese cultures use college students as their subjects. Little attention has been given to the investigation of differences in shame behaviors between American and Chinese young children, and even less to differences in guilt behaviors between these two populations. The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of similarities and differences in shame and guilt of preschoolers in these two countries. In this study, we hypothesized that children raised in Chinese families would show higher levels of shame-related behavior than those raised in American families; and that in both Chinese and American cultures, girls would show higher levels of shame-related behavior than boys. No directional predictions regarding guilt were made given the paucity of empirical literature on this topic. Thirty two three to three and a half-year-old children from the United States and thirty four children from China participated in this study. Results indicated that there were cross-national differences in both observed and parentally reported shame behaviors and in parentally reported guilt behaviors between Chinese and American samples, but no evidence of gender effects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank many people to make this thesis possible.

I thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Karen Barrett, for providing me guidance, encouragement, and inspiration during my study. I would like to thank the other members of my committee, Drs. George Morgan and Erika Lunkenheimer, whose comments and suggestions were very helpful to this thesis. I also thank the professors of all classes I attended during my graduate study.

Further thanks go to my student colleagues for providing me a stimulating and fun environment. I thank Jun Wang for translating the questionnaires from Chinese to English, and coding. I am especially grateful to Ryan Yanke, Laura Hanh, and Geri Tien for interesting discussions and warm friendship.

Finally, I would like to thank God for His love and guidance.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Method	15
Chapter 3 Results	23
Chapter 4 Discussion	39
References	45

Chapter 1

Introduction

The present study examined differences between Chinese and American three year olds in observed and parentally reported shame and guilt behaviors. As will be described shortly, these emotions are particularly interesting ones to examine in relation to differences between Chinese and American children because they are both dependent on socialization for their development and active influences on the socialization process. These emotions are of particular interest, also, because they are expected to differ in more collectivistic cultures such as China as compared to more individualistic cultures such as the United States. Before describing the study, I will review relevant theoretical and empirical literature on emotion, shame, guilt, and cultural differences pertinent to the development of these emotions.

Emotions

Because there are many theories and definitions of emotion, before talking about two specific emotions, shame and guilt, and the reason for predicting cultural differences in these emotions, one must first decide how one wishes to conceptualize and define those emotions. Emotions have been studied thoroughly from numerous perspectives. Historically, researchers defined emotions as attitudes (e.g., Bull, 1951), labeled states of autonomic arousal (e.g., Schachter & Singer, 1962), affective reactions proceeding and/or lacking perceptual and cognitive processing (e.g., Zajonc, 1980), cognitive appraisals of social events (e.g., Lazarus, 1991), or mechanisms that control shifts in goal states or motivations to act (e.g., Lang, 1995).

From the perspective of structuralists, emotions are viewed as “discrete, coherent constellations of physiological, subjective, and expressive activities” (Thompson, 1993, p. 374). It is claimed that each distinct emotion has its unique relationship to particular patterns of behavioral expression and cognitive and subjective experience. These unique relationships develop over time (Bornstein, 2003).

From another perspective, functionalists define emotions as “processes of establishing, maintaining, or disrupting the relations between the person and the internal or external environment, when such relations are significant to the individual” (Campos, Campos, & Barrett, 1989, p. 395). Specific emotions are defined by the three functions they serve in the ongoing person-environment interaction—their internal regulatory function (how they influence the person’s thoughts, feelings, and sensations); their social regulatory function (how they affect others); and their behavior regulatory function (how they affect the person’s behavior in relation to relevant aspects of the social and nonsocial environment). The functionalist view of emotional development indicates that changes in person-environment interactions will cause changes in ongoing emotion processes, and, over time, in emotional development. Over the path of development, emotion can be reorganized by any social event. The socialization process plays an important role in the development of all aspects of emotion (Barrett, 1998).

Harre (1986) introduced the Social Constructionist viewpoint to the study of emotions, and viewed emotion as a concrete event that involves social contexts. He also insisted that emotions should be investigated with attention to the local moral

orders, which are important to the existence of those emotions in the cognitive repertoire of the community.

Most emotions are related to social life, and inherently interpersonal. Emotions play a pivotal role in managing relationships with other persons, defining the self, maintaining the self's worth or dignity, and organizing appropriate action in many social situations (Kitayama et al., 1995), because emotional experiences and social relationships depend on each other. Many studies have revealed that the nature of the self and the specific management of social relationships are highly cross-culturally variable (e.g., Bruner, 1990; Triandis, 1989), which indicates there are culturally diverse emotions.

It is commonly accepted that every culture has a different emotion vocabulary from others. Harre (1986) noted that "the philosophical analysis of emotions concepts carried by local vocabularies is supposed to reveal the deep grammatical rules by which we express the conventions for their use". He then provided a summary for modes of cultural variation between emotion systems: (1) an emotion approved in one culture is condemned in another; (2) an emotion encouraged by one culture is suppressed by another; (3) an emotion has a strong form in one culture and a weak form in another; (4) historical changes occur in the emotion systems of a continuous culture; and (5) quasi-emotions related to the physical conditions of life exist in one culture but not others. Thus, cultural beliefs and practices may be expected to reinforce and strengthen some emotions and ignore or weaken others. Individuals' responses may reflect, at least in part, their beliefs about the meaning of

emotional experiences, expressions, and behaviors, based on their experiences in their culture.

Theories of Shame and Guilt

Some conceptualizations do not clearly distinguish guilt from shame (e.g., Zahn-Waxler & Kochanska, 1990). However, much research suggests that these emotions can be meaningfully distinguished (e.g., Tangney, 1998; Olthof, Ferguson, Bloemers, & Deij, 2004, and that doing so may have important implications for developmental psychopathology (e.g., Tangney, Burggraf, & Wagner, 1995; Tangney & Salovey, 2010)) and for understanding cultural differences in emotion (e.g., Barrett, Shin, Paik, & Ferguson, 2007; Shin & Barrett, 2008). Shame involves a painful experience associated with a negative evaluation of the self; which promotes a desire to hide, disappear, and avoid facing others who might evaluate the person (Feiring et al., 1996; Lewis, 1992; Tangney et al., 1995). In contrast, guilt is an experience aroused when one feels responsible for actions that are contrary to one's commitment to social relationships and norms (Shott, 1979). H. B. Lewis (1971) pointed out a fundamental difference between shame and guilt, i.e. the role of the self in these experiences, and wrote, "The experience of shame is directly about the self, which is the focus of evaluation. In guilt, the self is not the central object of negative evaluation, but rather the thing done or undone is the focus". Because guilt focuses on negative acts or behaviors for which one feels responsible it is likely to promote behaviors that repair or undo those negative acts or repair one's relationship with the person who was harmed by them. In contrast, shame arises when one perceives

oneself to be viewed negatively by others. Thus, it is not surprising that is associated with behaviors functioning to distance oneself from or hide oneself from others (Barrett, 1995). Shame-prone individuals are more likely to be engaged in avoidance and withdrawal and inward anger than are guilt-prone individuals (Lutwak, Panish, Ferrari, & Razzino, 2001; Tangney & Fischer, 1995).

Shame and guilt are closely tied to socialization. Both involve evaluation based on societal standards. In shame, the person feels like he or she has fallen short of the standards or has a sense of being bad or unworthy in the eyes of others; in guilt, the person feels responsible for violating internalized behavioral, interpersonal, or moral standards. The emotions of shame and guilt are thought to be mechanisms of social control (Creighton, 1988), maintenance of personal identity (Hultberg, 1988), reflection of our concern for others, and ways of helping an individual to conform to the group's standards of morality, by causing norm violation to arouse negative feelings or self-punishment (Lebra, 1988). Thus, shame and guilt are mechanisms of socialization. However, not only do these emotions serve as mechanisms of socialization, the development of shame and guilt is dependent upon socialization. Barrett (1995) claimed that socialization "is an important source of information about rules, standards, self, and so on; more importantly, it is primarily responsible for endowing those standards with significance, and making adherence to those standards an important goal for the individual."

Family, as the first and primary social group for children, provides a context in which children are exposed to the standards for moral and social behaviors, which

gradually become the basis of feeling guilt and shame. Family interactions have an influence on how children understand themselves as individuals and define themselves in relation to others (Barrett, 1995).

Development of Shame and Guilt

Most theories of the development of social emotions, such as shame or guilt, hypothesize that to experience self-emotions children must be capable, at some level, of at least three types of cognitions: 1) standards, rules, and goals; 2) how one's own behavior relates to these standards; and 3) a sense of self (e.g., Barrett, 1995; Lewis, 2003). When experiencing shame, an individual's focal concern is perceived negative evaluation of the self (Lewis, 1971). Similarly, guilt involves the awareness that one's own action has resulted in harm to or wrongdoing against someone. From the time they are born, infants are taught the standards, rules, and goals of their culture, and there is evidence that they have internalized many of these standards and rules by the middle to end of the second year of life (Lewis, 1992).

In the second year, young children start to manifest behaviorally awareness of their misbehaviors, or substandard performance, in that they show evidence of aversive arousal, negative emotions, or tension after such events (Barrett, 1998). There is behavioral evidence of guilt and embarrassment by 17 months, and evidence in a wider variety of contexts by 36 months (Barrett, 2005). Barrett, Zahn-Waxler, and Cole (1993) and Kochanska et al. (2002) observed shame-related and guilt-related behavioral responses in two year old children after mishaps like those used in this study, and Barrett (2005) observed guilty and embarrassed behavioral reactions to the

same paradigm in 17-month olds. Moreover, a number of studies found that three to four-year-old children display shame in response to failure on easy tasks (e.g., Alessandri & Lewis, 1996; Lewis & Ramsay, 2002). Thus, substantial theoretical and empirical evidence suggests that shame-related and guilt-related responses should be possible by three years of age, which will be the age studied in the present study.

American Shame/Guilt vs. Chinese Shame/Guilt

Although empirical research is sparse, especially research with young children, many theorists predict that the concept and functions of shame and guilt should be significantly different between cultures, and, in particular, between East Asian and US cultures. Benedict (1946) viewed U.S. culture as “guilt culture”, and Japanese culture (similar to Chinese culture) as “shame culture”. Fung (1999), in one of the few studies of shame in Chinese children, found that shaming was used by Chinese families as a way to teach their children what is right or wrong. Moreover, according to parental report, Chinese children understand the concept of shame at an earlier age than do children in the United States. Shaver et al. (1992) found that 95% of Chinese mothers reported that their children understood shame by age three, while only a small number of American mothers thought their 3 year old could understand shame.

Both of these findings could be explained by cultural differences between China and the U.S. in the way the self is construed, and the implication of those differences for the cultures’ views of shame (and, to some extent, guilt). Kitayama et al. (1995) stated that “Chinese culture believes in the inherent connectedness among different

individuals, emphasizing the tasks of interdependence over those of independence.

The major normative task of the self, then, is to maintain the interdependence among individuals – or more specifically, to adjust to and fit into important relationships, to occupy one’s proper place, to engage in appropriate actions, and to promote relevant others' goals.” In China, a good child is often characterized as group-oriented and cooperative (Wu, 1996), and children are taught to pursue group-related goals (Yu, 1996). One should try to meet one’s social obligations; otherwise, one brings dishonor to the group and experiences shame (Mascolo et al., 2003).

Lewis (1985) noted that when people experience shame, they are more sensitive and pay more attention to others’ perspectives than when they experience guilt; thus, it seems that shame would be very important to a person whose self is defined in terms of its interrelations with others. In contrast, American culture has been found to be more individualistic (Triandis, 1989). In the United States, the tasks of independence are more important than those of interdependence. American morality is based primarily on individuals’ rights, justice, and equality (Kohlberg, 1981). The individual is a self-contained entity and embraces the liberty to fulfill his/her own goals. Guilt is an emotion that is less likely to make one mindful of others’ potential negative reactions to one’s misdeed and more likely to attune one to the need to agentically take responsibility for the wrongdoing and to make reparation for it (Barrett, 1995).

In addition to these differences between Chinese and American cultures in views of the independence versus interdependence of the self, differences in views of

self-esteem versus humility in relation to others are relevant to understanding the cultural attitudes toward shame in China and the U.S. Chinese culture is dominated by social and moral thoughts of Confucianism. Confucianism considers individual development as a lifelong process of self-cultivation and self-perfection, and defines self-perfection through its impact on harmonious social relations among people (e.g., Tu, 1979; Lee, 1996). Li (2004) stated that “Confucianism conceptualizes shame as an emotion as well as a human capacity that directs the person inward for self-examination and motivates the person toward socially and morally desirable change.” In China, shame is not just an emotion, but also a moral and virtuous sensibility (Hwang, 1987; Zhai, 1995). Shame is valued and fostered in China. Moreover, there is evidence that there are many more distinctions in types of shame in the Chinese language than in English, suggesting that shame is emphasized and therefore “hypercognized” in that culture relative to American culture (see Shaver, Wu, & Schwartz, 1992).

In contrast, shame is devalued as a harmful, toxic, and “ugly” emotion in the U.S. (e.g., Tangney, 1998). Americans emphasize the importance of high self-esteem. Studies in the U.S. found that experiencing guilt results in higher self-esteem and increases in empathy and perspective taking (Tangney, 1998). In contrast, prominent U.S. researchers define shame in terms of a global, stable sense that the self is bad (Lewis, 1996). Americans typically believe that in order to succeed, individuals must have confidence in their capability and develop positive self-esteem. In their opinion, shame can damage self-esteem because it is perceived as arising from an

uncontrollable flaw in the self (Lewis, 1996). Because of the importance of self-esteem and the significant social value of achievement, American parents praise their children's successes and protect them from shame (Mascolo et al., 2003). It was found that in the U.S., high levels of shame have been linked to mental illness (H. B. Lewis, 1987; Tracy & Robin, 2004) and physiological stress (Dickerson, Gruenewald, & Kemeny, 2004).

The study of Chiang (1992) found that American mothers reported their toddlers had more guilt, relative to shame at home than did Taiwanese, and Taiwanese children showed more shame-relevant behaviors after the mishap than did Americans. These results support the theoretical analysis previously presented.

However, it is important to note that some researchers believe shame-related experiences may be similar in all cultures, citing evidence that American adults are as capable as Chinese of understanding the distinctions among the many varieties of shame in the Chinese language (Frank et al., 2000). Nevertheless, others would argue that *ability* to make cognitive distinctions among types of shame does not mean that in everyday life, these emotions are emphasized and valued to the same degree in the two cultures; they would suggest that language differences likely reflect differences in how they are cognized, valued, emphasized, or discouraged in the two cultures (Levy, 1973).

Unfortunately, there is more theory than research regarding these differences. Although it is apparent that there should be differences between these emotions in China and U.S., there are few relevant cross-cultural empirical studies with young

children to examine the differences, especially differences in guilt between Chinese and American preschoolers.

Gender Differences

Much attention has been paid to gender differences in self-conscious/social emotion as well as gender differences in achievement motivation and attribution. H. B. Lewis (1971) observed clinically that women were more prone to shame than men, and men were more prone to guilt than women. Contrary to Lewis' clinical observations, considerable evidence shows that female adults self-report more shame and guilt than do male adults (e.g., Tangney, 1990). However, it is possible that these self-reports are affected by a larger gender bias in American culture that is more permissive of females' acknowledgment and expression of negative emotions in comparison to males (with the occasional exception of anger), especially outside of the clinical setting. It seems possible that behavioral data from young children would be less affected by such self-report biases.

Kochanska and her colleagues' study (2002) demonstrated that 33 and 45 months old girls displayed more social emotions than boys. However, although they labeled their measure of emotional reaction to the mishap "guilt", it involved gaze aversion, bodily tension, and general distress, which were previously considered as behaviors of shame in young children in other studies (e.g., Barrett, 2005; Barrett, Zahn-Waxler, & Cole, 1993; Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger, & Weiss, 1989). Moreover, a number of studies of young children have found that girls showed more shame- or embarrassment-related behavior than did boys (e.g., Alessandri & Lewis, 1993;

Barrett, Zahn-Waxler, & Cole, 1993; Lewis & Ramsay, 2002; Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger, & Weiss, 1989). However, others failed to find significant differences between males and females (e.g., Barrett, 2005; Walter & LaFreniere, 2007). Moreover, to my knowledge the only study of guilt in toddlers (apart from the aforementioned study by Kochanska and her colleagues) created groups of guilt versus shame-prone children, rather than looking separately at guilt. In that study, boys were more likely to show the guilt-prone pattern than were girls (Barrett et al., 1993).

Gender differences in shame and guilt behaviors and in parentally reported shame and guilt were investigated further in the present study.

Research Questions

The first two research questions addressed whether or not the child's "breaking" the experimenter's toy was associated with a change in behavior and whether these effects of the mishap paradigm differed between nationality and gender groups:

1. Do shame behaviors increase from before a mishap until after a mishap for both Chinese and American 3-year-olds, do Chinese children increase more than Americans, and do girls increase more than boys?
2. Do 3-year-old children raised in Chinese families show higher levels of shame-related behavior after a mishap than those raised in American families?

The remaining four questions addressed cross-national and gender differences in the full set of observed and reported shame and guilt measures obtained in the study,

since only shame behaviors could be measured before the mishap:

3. Do Chinese parents of 3-year-old children report higher levels of shame-related behavior in their children than American parents of 3-year-old children?
4. Do children raised in American families show different levels of guilt-related behavior after a mishap from those raised in Chinese families?
5. Do American parents of 3-year-old children report different levels of guilt-related behavior in their children from Chinese parents of 3-year-old children?
6. Do shame-related behavior and guilt-related behavior differ by gender?

Hypotheses

Again, the first two hypotheses involve directional predictions for the effects of the mishap on behavior (manipulation check), and the remaining hypotheses focus on differences between groups in all shame and guilt variables.

1. There will be an increase in shame behaviors from before a mishap until after a mishap in both Chinese and American 3-year-olds, Chinese children will increase greater than Americans, and girls will increase greater than boys.
2. Three-year-old children raised in Chinese families will show higher levels of shame-related behavior after a mishap than those raised in American families.
3. Chinese parents of three-year-old children will report higher levels of shame-related behavior in their children than will American parents.
4. In both Chinese and American samples, girls will show higher levels of

shame-related behavior after a mishap than boys.

5. In both Chinese and American samples, girls will show higher levels of shame-related behavior than boys, according to parental report.

Chapter 2

Method

Participants

Two groups of 3- 3.5 years old children were involved in this study ($M = 41.10$ months, $SD = 6.63$).

In the first group, 32 (15 boys and 17 girls) children and their parents were predominantly European American, and English was their first language. They were all born and raised in the United States. Participants were recruited from birth announcements in newspapers in a medium-sized city in the Rocky Mountain area. In the second group, 34 (15 boys and 19 girls) children and their parents were Chinese, and Chinese was their first language. Children and their parents in this group were all born and raised in China. Most of these children were only children, as most children in China are only children; however, we obtained a sample of 9 children who had at least one sibling. Chinese preschoolers were recruited through two Child Care Centers in a medium-size city in southeastern China.

Although average age was similar for the two groups ($M = 42.14$ months and $M = 40.14$ months) for American and Chinese samples, respectively, a t -test indicated that there was a significant difference in age between these two groups, $t(56) = 5.94$, $p < .001$. Therefore, all MANOVAs first were performed with age as a covariate. There were no significant effects of age in any of these analyses, so in order to increase power, age was omitted from the analyses actually reported in this study.

Families in the two countries were comparable in Socioeconomic Status (SES),

and were mostly well-educated middle class families. SES was computed for both samples based on whichever parent had the highest level job, using the method of Ganzeboom, Graaf, and Treiman (1992), which has been validated across a variety of countries. For the American sample, the average SES level was $M = 62.84$, $SD = 12.80$, minimum and maximum = 34 and 88. In the Chinese sample, average SES level was $M = 64.03$, $SD = 11.19$, minimum and maximum = 53 and 88. A t -test indicated no significant difference between samples in SES, $t(59) = -.388$, $p = .70$, so SES was not included as a covariate in analyses reported here.

Measures

In this study, we used two questionnaires, *My Child* – shame version, and *My Child* – guilt version, which were answered by children’s parents to measure parents’ perception of children’s shame and guilt behaviors in both groups. Children’s responses to a mishap that they appear to cause were coded by two trained coders from the videotapes (details will be discussed in the procedure section).

For this study, all questionnaires were translated into Chinese and then back-translated into English by a different translator, after which the translations were reconciled and finalized between the two translators.

My Child. In this study, one modified version (Barrett & Ferguson, 2006) of the original “*My Child*” (Kochanska, 1992) was used to capture parentally reported child shame and another to measure parentally reported child guilt. The results of preliminary research on these measures show that the subscales have acceptable to high internal consistency reliability in the American sample, with a minimum alpha

of .758 and maximum of .849, and are related systematically to relevant measures in the American sample, as well as in a Korean sample (Barrett, Shin, Paik & Ferguson, 2007).

My Child – shame version has 52 items comprised of 7 subscales. Parents report on how much each item characterizes their children's behavior using a Likert scale, ranging from 1, "Never, not at all characteristic of my child" to 7, "Always, very characteristic of my child". Scale 1, negative reaction to failure, e.g., "Is quite distressed by criticism after having failed." Scale 2, concern over good feelings with parents, e.g., "After having fallen short, asks repeatedly if parent still loves him/her." Scale 3, ruminative shame, e.g., "Keeps on talking about how stupid s/he looked when s/he did something wrong." Scale 4, excusing/rationalizing, e.g., "Child blames own misbehavior on others or on situation." Scale 5, shame behaviors, e.g., "Avoids eye contact if s/he has fallen short of parental expectations." Scale 6, perfectionism, e.g., "Seems to feel like s/he must always succeed on tasks s/he attempts." Scale 7, sensitivity to others' evaluation, e.g., "Withdraws into self after criticism."

My Child – guilt version has 50 items comprised of 5 subscales. Parents report on how much each item characterizes their children's behavior using a Likert scale, ranging from 1, "extremely untrue, not at all characteristic of my child" to 7, "extremely true, very characteristic of my child". Scale 1, adaptive guilt, e.g., "Says 'sorry' when s/he does something bad, without being reminded." Scale 2, does bad but feels bad, e.g., "Looks like s/he feels remorseful after doing something wrong." Scale 3, anxious guilt, e.g., "Continues to feel guilty about a mishap or wrongdoing,

even when forgiven.” Scale 4, empathic, prosocial response to another’s distress, e.g., “Will try to comfort/reassure another in distress.” Scale 5, confession, e.g., “Seems to feel he/she MUST tell someone about it when s/he does something wrong.”

Procedure

This study lasted 30-45 minutes for each child, and occurred in a familiar playroom, with a familiar adult present but occupied with other work. For the Chinese sample, the study took place in a private room at the child care center during children’s regular times of attendance. For the American sample, the study took place in a similar playroom, but one located at a university. The whole play procedure was videotaped in both samples.

First, parents signed informed consent forms that indicated all procedures that children would experience. In order for children to be comfortable during the experiment, a parent of each child or a familiar adult teacher from the child care center was present throughout the study. For both samples, a parent completed the following questionnaires: two parental-report measures of social emotions (the *My Child*-revised, Shame scales and Guilt scales). Note that all children in China were accompanied by their teacher, because most parents in China did not feel they could take time off work to participate in the study. However, all teachers were familiar to the children, and both teachers and parents were asked not to become involved in the mishap task, so their only role was to provide children with the comfort of a familiar adult’s presence during the task.

All staged events took place in the context of a long play session. Children

engaged in play with a female experimenter, followed by free play with their mother or familiar teacher, followed by a self-regulation task that will not be examined for the present study, and then the task used for this study, the mishap task.

Mishap task. After leaving the room for the self-regulation task, the experimenter returned with a clown rag doll and introduced the rag doll, saying it was her favorite doll, showing many things that can be done with the toy, and telling the child to take good care of it while she was gone. Then, she left the room, taking the toy for the self-regulation task with her and leaving the child (with the busy adult) to play with the rag doll. The adult knew that the doll had been modified so that its arm/leg would fall off in the course of play. The experimenter waited for 2 minutes after the child noticed that the arm/leg was off, and then returned to the room. First she just looked at the arm/leg without saying anything. Then, she pointed out the mishap to the child, asking the child what the child thought happened to the doll. Then, she explained to the child that the doll was already broken and that the child did not break it, and that it could be fixed so that it would be "as good as new". The experimenter engaged the child in free play, closely monitoring the child to make sure that the child was not upset.

Coding Procedures

Two coders who were fluent in Chinese and highly skilled in English were trained to code practice tapes for the Chinese sample until they reached at least 80% reliability. American coders were trained to code practice tapes for the American sample until they reached at least 80% reliability. After achieving the criterion

reliability, each member of each pair of coders independently coded some of the remaining tapes, but with at least ¼ of each sample being coded independently by both coders for reliability purposes. Reliability on this sub-sample was assessed using Cohen's kappa. Most reliabilities were high, with only one for each sample being below .80, but in the marginally acceptable or acceptable range for kappa (see Table 1).

Behavioral Variables from Videotaped Situations.

Mishap task. Behaviors coded for this paradigm are listed in Table 1, along with continuous variables derived from the coded behaviors.

Gaze aversion was coded only if the child first made eye contact with the adult, and then looked away at no particular object or person, with unfocused, "glazed over" eyes. Looks at the floor, ceiling, or furniture were not considered meaningful unless the child was engaging in some instrumental action toward those objects (e.g., sitting in or picking up the chair), or there was some object on them toward which the child was looking (e.g., a toy on the floor). Withdrawal from the experimenter was coded only if the child first focused attention on the experimenter, and then backed up, turned away from, cringed backwards from, or otherwise physically distanced him/herself from the experimenter. Both of these variables were coded only when E was in the room. Other withdrawal behaviors included placing clown under or behind something or far away from him/herself, indicating lack of knowledge about mishap or denying responsibility for the mishap when E asks how things went (after the mishap had occurred), or trying or asking to leave the room. Nervous behaviors

were coded when children touched body part or clothing, or engaged in self-soothing behaviors such as sucking on tongue, finger, or other object, twiddling hair, etc..

Both of these variables were coded before and after the mishap.

Table 1

Behavioral Variables, operational definitions, and reliability

Variable	Operational Definition	Kappa-US	Kappa-CN
Repairing the leg/arm	Tries to fix leg/arm, or asks E or mother to fix leg/arm.	.86	.94
“Telling” E about the leg/arm	Pointedly shows disembodied leg/arm to E and/or verbalizes to E that it is broken.	.85	.95
Gaze aversion from E	Looks to E’s face, then immediately looks away from her face toward no meaningful object or person.	.86	.85
Bodily avoidance of E	Backs up while looking at E; or moves away from E, toward no meaningful object nor person, after focusing on E.	.96	1.00
Other withdrawal behaviors	Withdrawal behaviors <i>excluding</i> gaze aversion and bodily avoidance, such as denying responsibility, or trying to leave the room	.65	.88
Nervous behaviors	Self soothing behaviors, such as touching clothes/body, tonguing.	.85	.73

Note: Kappa-US was the kappa reliability of American coders; Kappa-CN was the kappa reliability of Chinese coders.

Table 2

Derived Variables Utilized as Behavioral Outcome Measures

Variable	Definition
<u>Guilt-relevant Variables</u>	
Latency to repair	Seconds from child noticing leg/arm off until child tries to repair leg/arm.
Latency to tell E	Seconds from time E returns after the leg/arm falls off until the child tells or shows E about it.
<u>Shame-relevant Variables</u>	
Rate of gaze aversions of E after mishap	Number of gaze aversions from E after E returned following the mishap.
Rate of behavioral avoiding E after mishap	Number of behavioral avoidances of E after E returned following the mishap.
Rate of other withdrawal behaviors	Total number of all withdrawal behaviors excluding gaze aversion and bodily withdrawal from E
Rate of nervous behaviors	Total number of all meaningless touch, self-soothing, tonguing

Note: Noticing leg/arm was defined as looking at disembodied leg/arm, telling or showing someone about the mishap, or repairing the leg/arm (whichever came first). Shame-relevant variables also were assessed before E left prior to the mishap to assess whether there was an increase in these behaviors following the mishap

Chapter 3

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Internal consistency of parent report subscales. Because the *My Child* measures and subscales had never been used with Chinese children, alphas were calculated to assess internal consistency in the present samples. Initial internal consistency analyses revealed that, for the Chinese sample, alphas for the shame subscales were acceptable to high (.669 - .809), and the alphas for the two samples combined were all above .70 (.777 - .817), so the decision was made to use the shame subscales without making changes in them. In contrast, the guilt subscales were less reliable for the Chinese sample (.544 - .852). The following subscales had low reliabilities for the Chinese sample: empathy (.567) and confession (.544). For these two subscales, examination of item-total correlations revealed 4 items on the empathy subscale and 2 items on the confession subscale that had correlations below .30, so these items were deleted, and alphas were recalculated. Results of these new analyses indicated that all of the subscales of *My Child* – Shame and Guilt versions had acceptable to good internal consistency reliability (α ranged from .660 to .865, with only one being < .70) for the two samples combined. Acceptable to good internal consistency reliability was found in the Chinese sample (α ranged from .624 to .852, with only one being < .70 for one of the shame subscales and one being < .70 for one of the guilt subscales).

Intercorrelations among subscales. All of the *My Child* Shame subscales were strongly and significantly correlated (see Table 3). Discriminant analysis (DA) with

nationality as the dependent variable and the *My Child* shame subscales as predictors was performed to check for problematic multicollinearity among the variables given these high correlations. The DA did not reject any variables, indicating there was sufficient independent variance in each variable, and there was not a problem with multicollinearity. Due to the high correlations, however, all subscales of *My Child* – shame version were combined as a single measure, “*My Child* Shame Scale” when they were related to behavioral variables. *My Child* Guilt subscales were moderately to highly correlated (see Table 4). However, the correlation between adaptive guilt and anxious guilt was low; this was true for the American and combined samples. In addition, Confession was not correlated with the other subscales. Therefore, all subscales of *My Child* – Guilt were analyzed separately.

Table 3

Intercorrelations between Shame Subscales of the My Child - Shame

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Negative reactions to failure	--	.62**	.64**	.51**	.74**	.36**	.66**
2. Concern over good feelings		--	.69**	.40**	.58**	.56**	.58**
3. Ruminative shame			--	.46**	.71**	.64**	.72**
4. Rationalizing				--	.64**	.52**	.60**
5. Shame behaviors					--	.58**	.83**
6. Perfectionism						--	.57**
7. Sensitivity to others' evaluation							--

** $p < .01$

Table 4

Intercorrelations between Guilt Subscales of the My Child - Guilt

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Adaptive guilt	--	.51**	.37**	.64**	.38**
2. Does bad and feels bad		--	.70**	.62**	-.02
3. Anxious/Neurotic guilt			--	.42**	.08
4. Empathy/prosocial				--	.06
5. Confession					--

** $p < .01$

Intercorrelations among child behavioral variables in the paradigms

Table 5 demonstrates the correlations between shame-related behaviors after the mishap and the parent-report shame-related behaviors for the entire sample. Other withdrawal behaviors was moderately correlated with both gaze aversion from E after mishap ($r = .27, p < .05$) and bodily withdrawal from E after mishap ($r = .26, p < .05$). There was little correlation between shame-related behaviors after mishap and the aggregated parent-report shame scale.

Table 5
Intercorrelations of Children's Shame-related Behaviors After the Mishap and as Reported by Parents (Entire Sample)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Gaze aversion from E	--	.11	.27*	-.04	.10
2. Withdrawal from E		--	.26*	.17	.13
3. Other withdrawal behaviors			--	.20	-.04
4. Nervous behaviors #				--	-.19
5. My Child Shame Scale					--

* $p < .05$

In Table 6, the correlation between shame-related behaviors after the mishap and the parent-report shame-related behaviors is shown above the diagonal for the American sample and below the diagonal for the Chinese sample. For the American sample, Gaze aversion from E after mishap was significantly and highly correlated with other withdrawal behaviors after mishap using Cohen's effect size criteria. Bodily withdrawal from E after the mishap was significantly correlated with other withdrawal behaviors, and was correlated highly and significantly with the number of their nervous behaviors after mishap using Cohen's criteria. For the Chinese sample, in contrast,

there were no significant correlations among the five shame-related behaviors after mishap, and almost no correlation between any shame-related behavior after the mishap and parent-report shame behaviors.

Table 6

Intercorrelations of Children's Shame-related Behaviors After the Mishap and as Reported by Parents (American/Chinese Sample)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Gaze aversion from E	--	-.09	.66**	.26	-.06
2. Withdrawal from E	.09	--	.38*	.53**	.02
3. Other withdrawal behaviors	.09	.14	--	.57**	-.27
4. Nervous behaviors #	-.08	.03	.09	--	-.14
5. My Child Shame scale	-.04	.14	-.08	-.04	--

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 7 shows the intercorrelations for the entire sample between guilt-related behaviors after the mishap and parent-report guilty behaviors. Latency to tell/show E after E returns was correlated with latency to repair after notice leg/arms, $r = .28$, $p < .05$. Latency to tell/show E after E returns was also correlated with parent-report Adaptive guilt, Does bad but feels bad, and Anxious guilt. Note that the negative correlations are consistent with predictions because longer latency implies a less intense guilt experience.

Table 7

Intercorrelations of Children's Guilt-related Behaviors After the Mishap and as Reported by Parents (Entire Samples)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Latency to tell E	--	.28*	-.30*	-.45**	-.30*	-.14	-.20
2. Latency to repair		--	-.08	.09	.16	.11	-.22
3. Adaptive guilt			--	.51**	.37**	.64**	.38**
4. Does bad but feels bad				--	.70**	.62**	-.02
5. Guilt anxious neurotic					--	.42**	.08
6. Empathy/prosocial						--	.06
7. Confession							--

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

In the American sample, latency to tell/show E after E returns was significantly correlated with latency to repair after notice arm/leg (See Table 8 above the diagonal). There was a significant correlation between confession from parent-report guilt behaviors and latency to repair. No intercorrelation between latency to tell/show E after E returns and latency to repair after notice arm/leg was found for the Chinese sample (see Table 8 under the diagonal). However, all parent-report guilt subscales except confession were significantly correlated with latency to tell/show E after E returns. The more parentally reported guilty behaviors were considered characteristic of their children, the more quickly Chinese children told E about the broken arm/leg.

Table 8

Intercorrelations of Children's Guilt-related Behaviors After the Mishap and as Reported by Parents (American/Chinese Sample)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Latency to tell E	--	.41*	-.11	-.31	-.07	.33	-.17
2. Latency to repair	.16	--	-.34	.11	.30	.09	-.47**
3. Adaptive guilt	-.50*	.05	--	.43*	.28	.62	.22
4. Does bad but feels bad	-.56**	.07	.62**	--	.64**	.51**	-.11
5. Anxious/neurotic guilt	-.53**	.18	.77**	.84**	--	.36**	-.04
6. Empathy/prosocial	-.42*	.04	.59**	.74**	.70**	--	-.04
7. Confession	-.24	-.01	.44*	.04	.28	.54	--

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Notes: above diagonal shows the correlation for American Sample, under the diagonal shows the correlation for Chinese Sample

Intercorrelations between children's shame-related behaviors and guilt-related behaviors were low. For the entire sample, latency to tell/show E after E returns was correlated with latency to repair. Other withdrawal behaviors after the mishap was moderately intercorrelated with gaze aversion from E, and with bodily withdrawal from E (see Table 9). All of these findings were consistent with interpretation of the

guilt and shame behaviors as distinct patterns of response. For the American sample only, guilt-related behaviors were intercorrelated, $r = .41$, $p < .05$, and most shame-related behaviors were highly correlated (See Table 10 above the diagonal). The more withdrawal behaviors from E were displayed after the mishap, the more nervous behaviors were displayed after the mishap. The shame-related behaviors were not correlated with the guilt-related behaviors for the American sample. Similarly, for the Chinese sample only (below the diagonal), there were negligible and non-significant correlations between the shame-related behaviors and guilt-related behaviors. Therefore, shame-related behaviors and guilt-related behaviors were analyzed separately.

Table 9

Intercorrelations of Children's Shame and Guilt-related Behaviors After the Mishap (Entire Sample)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Latency to tell/show E	--	.28*	.22	.05	.00	.12
2. Latency to repair		--	-.12	-.10	-.24	.03
3. Gaze aversion from E			--	.11	.27*	-.04
4. Bodily withdrawal from E				--	.26*	.17
5. Other withdrawal behaviors					--	.20
6. Nervous behaviors						--

* $p < .05$

Table 10

Intercorrelations of Children's Shame and Guilt-related Behaviors After the Mishap (American/Chinese Sample)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Latency to tell/show E	--	.41*	-.14	.16	.03	.13
2. Latency to repair	.16	--	-.08	-.17	-.30	-.03
3. Gaze aversion from E	.33	-.11	--	-.09	.66**	.26
4. Bodily withdrawal from E	-.02	-.001	.09	--	.38*	.53**
5. Other withdrawal behaviors	-.05	-.13	.09	.14	--	.57**
6. Nervous behaviors	.15	.01	-.08	.03	.09	--

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Notes: above diagonal shows the correlation for American Sample, under the diagonal

shows the correlation for Chinese Sample

Principal Analyses

The following analyses addressed the hypotheses, with the first two checking effectiveness of the mishap paradigm, and the remaining assessing differences between groups in all variables:

1. There will be an increase in shame behaviors from before a mishap until after a mishap in both Chinese and American 3-year-olds.
2. The increase in shame behaviors from before a mishap until after a mishap will be greater for Chinese 3-year-olds than for American 3-year olds.
3. The increase in shame behaviors from before a mishap until after a mishap will be greater for girls than for boys in both Chinese and American samples.

Change associated with the mishap. A mixed model multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess if there was a difference in shame-related behaviors before versus after the mishap, in American children versus Chinese children. It was not possible to assess guilt-related behaviors prior to the mishap because these involved telling about or fixing the broken doll, which could only occur after the doll broke. The results of the MANOVA revealed that the linear combination of all shame-related behaviors increased significantly after the mishap, as predicted, $F(4, 56) = 8.23, p < .001$. There were significant multivariate main effects for nationality as well, $F(4, 56) = 5.71, p = .001$. The interaction between time and nationality was significant as well, $F(4, 56) = 2.71, p < .05$.

Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations before and after the mishap for both Americans and Chinese. Table 11 displays that the univariate effect of time

(change before the mishap and after the mishap) is significant for all shame-related behaviors. As the table suggests, results of the univariate follow-up tests also revealed that for the number of nervous behaviors, there was a significant interaction of time with nationality, indicating that the incidence of nervous behaviors in American children increased after the mishap much more than was true for Chinese children, qualifying the main effect of time for this variable. The main effect of nationality is significant for gaze aversion from E and other withdrawal, and shows a trend toward significance for bodily withdrawal from E. Note that the effect sizes were medium to large for significant effects, using Cohen's criteria (see *etas* in Table 12).

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Shame Behavior before/after Mishap as a Function of Nationality

Group	n	WHB	WHB	WHB	WHB	WHB	WHB	SCB	SCB
		Gb	Ga	Eb	Ea	XXb	XXa	M#b	M#a
		<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
		(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)
Nation									
US	29	.03	.55	.00	.14	.03	.72	3.00	7.20
		(.19)	(1.18)	(.00)	(.44)	(.19)	(1.31)	(2.63)	(5.45)
CN	25	.12	1.88	.12	.36	1.08	1.68	4.36	5.08
		(.33)	(3.18)	(.33)	(.76)	(1.96)	(1.38)	(3.58)	(3.80)

Notes: US = American, CN = Chinese, WHB_{Gb} = gaze aversion from E before mishap, WHB_{Ga} = gaze aversion from E after mishap, WHB_{Eb} = bodily withdrawal from E before mishap, WHB_{Ea} = bodily withdrawal from E after mishap, WHB_{XXb} = other withdrawal behaviors before mishap, WHB_{XXa} = other withdrawal behaviors after mishap, SCB_{M#b} = the number of nervous behaviors before mishap, SCB_{M#a} = the number of nervous behaviors after mishap, aveSCB_{Mb} = average duration of nervous behaviors before mishap, aveSCB_{Ma} = average duration of nervous behaviors after mishap

Table 12

Effects of Time and Nationality on the Children' Shame Behavior

Source	Dependent Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	η	<i>p</i>
Pre-Post	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	6.25	.31	< .05
	Gaze aversion from E	1	14.36	.44	< .001
	Other withdrawal	1	11.23	.40	.001
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	16.60	.47	< .001
Nationality	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	4.39	.26	< .05
	Gaze aversion from E	1	5.02	.28	< .05
	Other withdrawal	1	12.11	.41	.001
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	.55	.09	.462
Pre-Post X Nationality	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	.86	.26	.358
	Gaze aversion from E	1	4.21	.08	< .05
	Other withdrawal	1	.26	.03	.615
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	5.49	.36	< .05

A mixed model MANOVA was conducted to assess if there was a difference in shame-related behaviors before versus after mishap in boys versus girls. MANOVA results indicated again that the linear combination of all shame-related behaviors increased significantly after the mishap, $F(4, 56) = 7.96, p < .001$. However, no significant difference was found between boys and girls, $F(4, 56) = 1.24, p = .304$; nor was the interaction between gender and nationality significant, $F(4, 56) = .66, p = .624$. Table 14 shows the univariate effects of time and gender on the shame behaviors. There was a trend toward significance for the main effect of gender on “other withdrawal behaviors”, $F(1, 59) = 3.70, p = .059$, but no main effects of gender or interactions of gender and nationality were significant (see Table 14).

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Shame Behavior before/after Mishap as a Function of Gender

		WHB	WHB	WHB	WHB	WHB	WHB	SCB	SCB
		<u>Gb</u>	<u>Ga</u>	<u>Eb</u>	<u>Ea</u>	<u>XXb</u>	<u>XXa</u>	<u>M#b</u>	<u>M#a</u>
Group	n	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
		(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)	(<i>SD</i>)
Gender									
Boys	24	.13	1.38	.04	.33	.88	1.42	4.04	5.50
		(.34)	(3.20)	(.20)	(.76)	(2.01)	(1.61)	(3.53)	(3.53)
Girls	30	.03	1.00	.07	.17	.23	.97	3.30	6.80
		(.18)	(1.53)	(.25)	(.46)	(.57)	(1.22)	(2.83)	(5.67)

Notes: WHBGb = gaze aversion from E before mishap, WHBGa = gaze aversion from E after mishap, WHBEb = bodily withdrawal from E before mishap, WHBEa = bodily withdrawal from E after mishap, WHBXXb = other withdrawal behaviors before mishap, WHBXXa = other withdrawal behaviors after mishap, SCBM#b = the number of nervous behaviors before mishap, SCBM#a = the number of nervous behaviors after mishap

Table 14

Effects of Time and Gender on the Children' Shame Behavior

Source	Dependent Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	η	<i>p</i>
Pre-Post	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	6.45	.31	< .05
	Gaze aversion from E	1	13.42	.44	.001
	Other withdrawal	1	10.97	.40	.01
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	13.96	.47	< .001
Gender	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	.05	.03	.823
	Gaze aversion from E	1	.03	.03	.860
	Other withdrawal	1	3.70	.24	.059
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	.31	.07	.578
Pre-Post X Gender	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	.23	.06	.631
	Gaze aversion from E	1	.004	.15	.950
	Other withdrawal	1	.31	.05	.861
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	2.17	.21	.146

The remaining analyses addressed the following hypotheses:

1. Three-year-old children raised in Chinese families will show higher levels of shame-related behavior after a mishap than those raised in American families.
2. Chinese parents of three-year-old children will report higher levels of shame-related behavior in their children than will American parents.

3. In both Chinese and American samples, girls will show higher levels of shame-related behavior after a mishap than boys.
4. In both Chinese and American samples, girls will show higher levels of shame-related behavior and guilt-related behavior than boys, according to parental report.

Shame behaviors. Another MANOVA was conducted to examine if there was a difference in shame-related behaviors after the mishap in Chinese versus American boys versus girls. Given the small sample size, it was decided only to look at the post-mishap behavior for this analysis, to limit the number of factors to two. There were no significant multivariate effects for the main effects of gender nor interaction of gender and nationality, $F(4, 54) = 1.05$ and $F(4, 54) = .80$, respectively, $p > .10$. There were significant multivariate effects for nationality on the shame behaviors, $F(4, 54) = 4.78$, $p = .002$.

Table 15 shows descriptive data for children's shame behavior after a mishap as a function of nationality and gender. The means display that both Chinese boys and girls showed more shame behaviors than American boys and girls, except for the number of nervous behaviors. As Table 16 indicates, univariate effects of nationality on bodily withdrawal from E after the mishap $F(1, 57) = 4.42$, $p < .05$, and on other withdrawal behaviors after the mishap, $F(1, 57) = 8.72$, $p < .01$ were significant, but the effects for Gaze aversion from E and Nervous behaviors were not significant. Effect sizes (η^2 s) for significant effects were small to medium using Cohen's criteria.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations for Children's Shame behaviors after a mishap as a Function of Nationality and Gender

		WHBGa	WHBEa	WHBXXa	SCBM#a
	N	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
American					
Boys	13	.62 (1.45)	.08 (.28)	.62 (1.66)	5.85 (3.80)
Girls	17	.59 (1.00)	.18 (.59)	.76 (1.40)	7.82 (6.52)
Total	30	.60 (1.19)	.13 (.43)	.70 (1.29)	6.97 (5.52)
Chinese					
Boys	14	2.00 (2.96)	.50 (.94)	2.5 (2.21)	4.36 (3.43)
Girls	17	2.00 (2.89)	.29 (.59)	1.29 (1.40)	5.24 (5.34)
Total	31	2.00 (3.36)	.39 (.76)	1.84 (1.88)	4.84 (4.53)

Notes: WHBGa = gaze aversion from E after mishap, WHBEa = bodily withdrawal from E after mishap, WHBXXa = other withdrawal behaviors after mishap, SCBM#a = the number of nervous behaviors after mishap

Table 16

Effects of Nationality and Gender on Children's Shame Behaviors

	Dependent Variable	df	F	η	p
Gender	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	.00	.00	.984
	Gaze aversion from E	1	.11	.04	.744
	Other withdrawal	1	1.67	.17	.201
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	1.19	.14	.279
Nationality	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	4.42	.27	<.05
	Gaze aversion from E	1	2.79	.22	.100
	Other withdrawal	1	8.72	.36	<.01
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	2.43	.20	.124
Gender X Nationality	Bodily Withdrawal from E	1	.00	.00	.984
	Gaze aversion from E	1	.89	.12	.349
	Other withdrawal	1	1.75	.21	.103
	Number of nervous behaviors	1	.18	.05	.676

Parental report of shame behaviors. A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to examine if there was a difference in parent-report shame-related behaviors in Chinese versus American boys versus girls. As expected, MANOVA results revealed that Chinese parents reported higher shame behaviors than American parents for both boys and girls, $F(7, 48) = 8.12, p < .001$. Neither significant gender differences nor interactions of nationality and gender were found for parentally

reported shame, based on multivariate tests, $F(7, 48) = .48$, and $F(7, 48) = 1.09$, $p > .10$.

Table 17 shows descriptive data for parent-report of children's shame behavior as a function of nationality and gender. Table 18 reveals significant nationality differences for all parent-report shame subscales, except ruminative shame, which showed only a trend toward significance, $F(1, 54) = 3.50$, $p = .067$. Etas for significant effects were moderately small to large using Cohen's criteria.

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for Parent-report of Children's Shame behaviors as a Function of Nationality and Gender

		NR	Concn	Rumi	Ration	Shameb	Perfect	Sense	Shame s
N		M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
		(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)	(SD)
US									
Boys	15	2.66 (1.03)	2.43 (1.25)	1.62 (.88)	2.32 (.96)	2.71 (.91)	2.72 (1.04)	2.82 (1.01)	2.47 (.89)
Girls	17	2.39 (.85)	1.94 (.69)	1.55 (.42)	2.71 (1.36)	2.58 (.94)	2.85 (1.31)	2.72 (.86)	2.39 (.73)
Total	32	2.51 (.93)	2.17 (1.00)	1.58 (.67)	2.53 (1.19)	2.64 (.91)	2.79 (1.18)	2.77 (.92)	2.43 (.80)
CN									
Boys	11	3.25 (.89)	3.37 (1.16)	1.97 (.60)	3.69 (1.23)	3.53 (.75)	3.76 (1.26)	4.34 (.90)	3.42 (.64)
Girls	15	2.94 (1.28)	3.87 (1.36)	1.95 (.98)	3.26 (1.05)	3.09 (1.17)	3.72 (1.28)	4.13 (2.03)	3.28 (1.02)
Total	26	3.07 (1.21)	3.66 (1.28)	1.96 (.83)	3.44 (1.13)	3.27 (1.02)	3.73 (1.25)	4.22 (1.62)	3.34 (.87)

Note: US = American, CN = Chinese, NR = negative reaction to failure, Concn = concern over good feelings with parents, Rumi = ruminative shame, ration = excusing/rationalizing, Shameb = shame behaviors, perfect = perfectionism, Sens = sensitivity to others' evaluation, Shames = *My Child Shame Scale*.

Table 18

Effects of Nationality and Gender on Parent-report of Children's Shame Behaviors

	Dependent Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	η	<i>p</i>
Gender	Negative reactions to failure	1	1.61	.14	.286
	Concern over good feelings	1	.00	.00	.989
	Ruminative shame	1	.05	.03	.831
	Rationalizing	1	.01	.00	.942
	Shame behaviors	1	1.24	.15	.271
	Perfectionism	1	.02	.00	.901
	Sensitivity to others' evaluation	1	.21	.06	.647
	Shame scale	1	.24	.06	.630
Nationality	Negative reactions to failure	1	4.38	.27	< .05
	Concern over good feelings	1	22.84	.54	< .001
	Ruminative shame	1	3.50	.25	.067
	Rationalizing	1	9.67	.39	< .01
	Shame behaviors	1	6.67	.33	< .05
	Perfectionism	1	8.53	.37	< .01
	Sensitivity to others' evaluation	1	17.82	.50	< .001
	Shame scale	1	16.77	.49	< .001
Gender X Nationality	Negative reactions to failure	1	.01	.00	.939
	Concern over good feelings	1	2.66	.22	.109
	Ruminative shame	1	.01	.00	.916
	Rationalizing	1	1.74	.18	.193
	Shame behaviors	1	.34	.08	.562
	Perfectionism	1	.07	.03	.800
	Sensitivity to others' evaluation	1	.03	.00	.871
	Shame scale	1	.02	.00	.895

Guilt behaviors. A MANOVA examined whether or not children who differ in nationality and gender differed on the guilt behaviors after the mishap (latency to repair the toy and latency to tell E about the broken toy). There were no multivariate effects of nationality, gender, nor nationality X gender on the guilt behaviors after the mishap, $F(2, 55) = 1.23$, $F(2, 55) = 1.54$, and $F(2, 55) = .99$, respectively, $p > .10$.

Table 19 shows descriptive data for children's guilt behaviors as a function of nationality and gender. Because multivariate tests were not significant, univariate results are presented only to assist readers in understanding the pattern of results.

Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations for Children's Guilt Behaviors after the mishap as a Function of Nationality and Gender

	N	Latency to repair leg/arm	Latency to tell E about leg/arm
		M (SD)	M (SD)
American			
Boys	13	99.82 (120.23)	100.44 (124.23)
Girls	17	30.89 (71.14)	85.68 (124.38)
Total	30	60.76 (99.91)	92.07 (122.38)
Chinese			
Boys	14	39.05 (70.27)	110.74 (146.49)
Girls	16	30.29 (74.66)	97.51 (141.05)
Total	30	34.38 (71.53)	103.68 (141.26)

Table 20

Effects of Nationality and Gender on Children's Guilt Behaviors after the Mishap

	Dependent Variable	df	F	η	p
Gender	Latency to repair after notice	1	3.12	.23	.083
	Latency to tell E after returns	1	.16	.05	.690
Nationality	Latency to repair after notice	1	1.95	.18	.169
	Latency to tell E after returns	1	.10	.04	.752
Gender X Nationality	Latency to repair after notice	1	1.87	.18	.177
	Latency to tell E after returns	1	.000	.00	.983

Parent-reported guilt behaviors. Multivariate tests showed that the effects of nationality on parent-report guilt behaviors were significant, $F(5, 50) = 8.56, p < .001$, but there were no effects of gender on parent-report behaviors, $F(5, 50) = .77, p > .10$, nor the interaction between gender and nationality, $F(5, 50) = 1.53, p = .197$. Table 21 shows descriptive data for parent-report children guilt behaviors as a function of nationality and gender. Table 22 presents the univariate results for the parent-report guilt behaviors. Effects of gender will not be discussed given the non-significant multivariate effect of gender. Two significant univariate effects of nationality were found. American parents reported more adaptive guilt than Chinese $F(1, 54) = 6.42, p < .05$, but Chinese parents reported more anxious guilt than Americans, $F(1, 54) = 12.51, p < .01$.

Table 21

Means and Standard Deviations for Parent-report of Children's Guilt Behaviors as a Function of Nationality and Gender

		Adaptive guilt	Does bad feels bad	Anxious/ neurotic Guilt	Empathy/ Prosocial	Confession
	N	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M(SD)	M (SD)
American						
Boys	15	4.77 (1.10)	4.72 (.95)	3.31 (1.17)	5.40 (1.08)	4.80 (1.19)
Girls	17	5.14 (.85)	4.65 (1.07)	2.89 (.92)	5.99 (.61)	4.87 (1.04)
Total	32	4.97 (.93)	4.68 (1.00)	3.09 (1.05)	5.71 (.90)	4.84 (1.09)
Chinese						
Boys	11	4.59 (.98)	4.79 (.88)	4.12 (1.34)	5.26 (.93)	4.39 (1.25)
Girls	15	3.97 (1.21)	4.56 (1.45)	3.97 (1.54)	5.08 (1.48)	4.45 (1.74)
Total	26	4.24 (1.14)	4.65 (1.23)	4.03 (1.43)	5.15 (1.26)	4.42 (1.52)

Table 22

Effects of Nationality and Gender on Parent-report of Children's Guilt Behaviors

	Dependent Variable	df	F	η	p
Gender	Adaptive guilt	1	.23	.06	.637
	Does bad but feels bad	1	.32	.07	.616
	Guilt anxious/neurotic	1	1.13	.11	.399
	Empathy/prosocial	1	.58	.09	.480
	Confession	1	.06	.03	.853
Nationality	Adaptive guilt	1	6.42	.32	< .05
	Does bad but feels bad	1	.00	.00	.959
	Guilt anxious/neurotic	1	12.51	.36	< .01
	Empathy/prosocial	1	3.95	.24	.068
	Confession	1	2.44	.16	.244
Gender X Nationality	Adaptive guilt	1	3.43	.24	.074
	Does bad but feels bad	1	.09	.03	.788
	Guilt anxious/neurotic	1	.24	.05	.696
	Empathy/prosocial	1	2.08	.18	.182
	Confession	1	.00	.00	.995

Chapter 4

Discussion

The present study was designed to examine cross-national and gender differences in three-year-old Chinese and American children's shame- and guilt-related behaviors. It was expected that this study would reveal that Chinese preschoolers would show more shame-related behaviors under appropriate circumstances (the mishap task) as well as by parental report, in comparison to American preschoolers. While American culture encourages autonomy to protect and nurture children's exploration, Chinese culture encourages the use of shame as a positively oriented teaching tool targeting the development of relational sensitivity and social responsibility. Therefore, Chinese preschoolers were expected to be more shame prone than American preschoolers. It was also expected that females in both countries would show more shame-related behaviors than would males. Differences between nationalities and genders also were examined for guilt; however, no directional predictions were made for the guilt behaviors, given the paucity of relevant research. First, the effectiveness of the intervention in inducing shame behaviors was assessed by comparing shame behaviors before versus after the mishap. It was not possible to examine change in the guilt behaviors before and after the mishap, since these behaviors involved fixing or telling the experimenter about the broken toy, which, of course, was not possible before the toy broke. As expected, shame-related behaviors of both American and Chinese children increased significantly after the mishap, except that Chinese children did not show significant change in the number of

nervous behaviors before and after the mishap.

One possible explanation for this finding is that nervous behaviors, as their name suggests, are associated with a general state of negative arousal, rather than specifically being associated with shame. It is possible that more Chinese children than American children have a more generalized anxious or inhibited style, and that this was manifested both before and after the mishap. It has long been observed that Chinese children show more shyness and inhibition in comparison to Western children (e.g., Chen, 2000; Lan, Legare, Ponitz, Li, & Morrison, 2011; Rubin, et al., 2006), although recently it has been noted that only some shy/inhibited Chinese children are anxious (Xu, Farver, Yu, & Zhang, 2009). Still, the inhibition of many Chinese children is associated with anxiety, and it seems possible that the nervous behaviors may have reflected this generalized response in addition to or instead of a response to the mishap in the Chinese sample.

Another possibility is that Chinese children showed nervous behaviors before the mishap and throughout the session because they were less comfortable with the situation. Although the familiar teacher was present during the session, her presence may have provided less reassurance for the Chinese children in comparison to the mother, who was present for the American children. There were many aspects of the session that had the ability to arouse nervousness; the experimenter was novel, they were being taken away from their normal classroom, during the child care day, and so on. If the teacher provided less assurance than the mother, then the Chinese children may have been somewhat nervous for the whole procedure, rather than specifically

nervous in response to the mishap. Nevertheless, Chinese children did not show more nervous behaviors overall than did American children, which is not consistent with this hypothesis. More importantly for the purposes of interpretation of this study's cross-national findings, most of the shame behaviors were responsive to the mishap situation in the Chinese sample, and the parental report findings, which also were significant, could not be affected by the presence of the teacher rather than the parent. Thus, the principal results, which involved these other measures, still seem reflective of cross-national differences that go beyond any greater nervousness of the Chinese sample in the mishap paradigm.

The results from this study support many of our hypotheses. Chinese children showed higher levels of shame-related behaviors after the mishap than American children, except that Chinese children did not show a higher frequency of nervous behaviors after the mishap than American children. As alluded to earlier, it may be that some Chinese children's nervous behaviors may have reflected a more generalized anxiety response that did not change in response to the mishap. A few of the Chinese children, but none of the American children, had one episode of nervous behavior that lasted the entire session, which is consistent with this interpretation. Moreover, given that the number of nervous behaviors was counted, this would have resulted in just one episode being counted for these children, despite their being nervous the whole session, and this may have led to a misleadingly low estimate of number of nervous behaviors for the Chinese group, given the small sample size.

Still, most of the shame behaviors were more frequent in Chinese than American

children; moreover, Chinese parents also reported more shame-related behaviors than American parents. These results agree with most theories and studies, which were mentioned in the introduction.

No significant nationality difference was found in this study for the guilt-related behaviors. However, Chinese parents reported higher level of anxious guilt than Americans, and American parents reported higher level of adaptive guilt than Chinese parents. These results suggest that the guilt behaviors in the mishap paradigm may have reflected somewhat different underlying types of guilt in the American versus Chinese samples. As mentioned, more Chinese children than American children have a more generalized anxious style. The parental reports supported this opinion. However, further study of this possibility is needed, with an increased sample size to increase the power.

In contrast to the findings' overall support for predictions regarding nationality, predictions regarding gender were not supported. In fact, no significant multivariate gender differences nor interactions of gender and nationality were found in the present study for the shame-related or guilt-related behaviors after the mishap or parent-report shame-related or guilt-related behaviors. There was a trend-toward gender difference for latency to repair the doll because American boys were significantly slower to repair the doll than girls, but this difference was not found for Chinese boys and girls. The possibility that this trend reflected a real difference should be investigated in a study with a larger sample size.

One set of findings that was puzzling but did not seem to affect overall results

was the low intercorrelations among both shame behaviors and guilt behaviors in the Chinese sample. It is not clear why these measures were intercorrelated at such a low level for this sample, despite the fact that most shame behaviors changed as a function of the mishap and were significantly higher in the Chinese sample than the American sample and that these findings were consistent with findings for parentally reported shame behaviors. More research is needed to investigate the correlates and sequelae of these measures in Chinese and American samples to better understand the reason for these low correlations.

Unfortunately, this study did not include measures of cultural practices nor of parenting behaviors; thus it is not possible to draw conclusions about potential cultural differences in socialization that may have contributed to the cross-national differences that were observed. Parenting style patterns (e.g., authoritarian or indulgent) have been found to contribute to individuals' socioemotional development (Chao, 2001). It is particularly important to study socialization and parenting in China today, because child-rearing in China has been more and more influenced by western culture and by the one-child policy. For the typical one-child family in China, parents tend to indulge children much more than they did in traditional Chinese Confucian parenting style. In addition, Western influence is being felt, such as in such the more frequent use of encouragement and positive feedback in comparison to traditional Confucian-based parenting. It is important to know how parenting style patterns affect the development of children's socioemotional expression in today's China, as well as how these compare to parenting styles in the

U.S. A longitudinal study, which relates socioemotional development in the mishap and other paradigms to parenting styles in China and the U.S., would be particularly valuable. In conclusion, this study provides evidence of cross-national differences in observed and reported shame behaviors and parentally reported guilt behaviors in Chinese versus American three-year olds. However, much more research, with larger samples, socialization measures, and a longitudinal design is needed.

References

- Alessandri, S. M., & Lewis, M. (1993). Parental evaluation and its relation to shame and pride in young children. *Sex Roles*, 29, 335-343.
- Alessandri, S. M. & Lewis, M. (1996). Differences in pride and shame in maltreated and nonmaltreated preschoolers. *Child Development*, 67, 1857-1869.
- Barrett, K. C. (1995). A functionalist approach to shame and guilt. In J. P. Tangney, & K.W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 343-367). New York: Guilford.
- Barrett, K.C. (1998). A functionalist perspective to the development of emotion. In M. F. Mascolo & S. Griffin (Eds.), *What develops in emotional development?* (pp. 109-133) New York: Plenum.
- Barrett, K. C. (2005). The origins of social emotions and self-regulation in toddlerhood: new evidence. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19, 953-979.
- Barrett, K. C. & Ferguson, T. J. (2006). *Guilt & Shame in Toddlers: behavioral responses & a new parental report instrument*. Poster presented at conference on Human Development, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Barrett, K. C., Shin, J.S.*, Paik, J.H., & Ferguson, T.J. (2007, March). *A new parental report measure of guilt and shame in American and Korean preschoolers*. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development biennial meeting, Boston.
- Barrett, K. C., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Cole, P. M. (1993). Avoiders versus Amenders-implications for the investigation of guilt and shame during toddlerhood? *Cognition and Emotion*, 7, 481-505.
- Benedict, R. (1946). *The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bornstein, R. F. (2003). Psychodynamic models of personality. In T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Eds.). *Personality and Social Psychology* (pp. 117-134). Vol. 5 in I. b. Weiner (Editor-in-Chief), *Handbook of Psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bull, N. (1951). The attitude theory of emotion. *Nervous and Mental Disease Monographs*, 81. New York.
- Campos, J. J., Campos, R. G., & Barrett, k. C. (1989). Emergent themes in the study of emotional development and emotional regulation. *Developmental Psychology*,

25, 394-402.

Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European American. *Child Development*, 72, 1832-1843.

Chen, X. (2000). Growing up in a collectivistic culture: Socialization and socioemotional development in Chinese children. In A.L. Comunian & U.P. Gielen (Eds.), *International perspectives on human development* (pp. 331-353). Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.

Chiang, T. (1993). The social emotions: Shame and guilt during toddlerhood: Comparisons between Taiwanese and American toddlers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(8-B), 4390.

Creighton, M. (1988). Revisiting shame and guilt cultures: A forty-year pilgrimage. *Ethos*, 18, 279-307.

Dickerson, S. Gruenewald, T., & Kemeny, M. (2004). When the social self is threatened: shame, physiology, and health. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 1191-1216.

Feiring, C., Taska, L., & Lewis, M. (1996). A process model for understanding adaptation to sexual abuse: The role of shame in defining stigmatization. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20, 767-782.

Frank H, Harvey O, Verdun K. 2000. American responses to five categories of shame in Chinese culture: a preliminary cross-cultural construct validation. *Pers Individual Differences* 28:887-896.

Fung, H. (1999). Becoming a moral child: The socialization of shame among young Chinese children. *Ethos*, 27, 180-209.

Ganzeboom, H. B. G, Graaf, P. M. D., & Treiman, D. J. (1992). A Standard International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status. *Social Science Research*, 21, 1-56.

Harre, R. (1986). An outline of the social constructionist viewpoint. In R. Harre, *The social construction of emotions*. NY: Basil Blackwell.

Hultberg, P. (1988). Shame - a hidden emotion. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 33, 109-126.

Hwang, K. K. (1987). Face and favor: The Chinese power game. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 944-974.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Matsumoto, H. (1995). Culture, self, and emotion: a

- cultural perspective on “self-conscious” emotions. In Tangney, J. P. & Fischer, K. W. (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 439 – 464). New York: Guilford.
- Kochanska, G. (1992). Children's interpersonal influence with mothers and peers. *Developmental Psychology* 28, 491–499.
- Kochanska, G., Gross, J. N., Lin, M.-H., & Nichols, K.E. (2002). Guilt in young children: Development, determinants, and relations with a broader system of standards. *Child Development*, 73, 461-482.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice: *I. Essays on moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Lan, X., Legare C. H., Ponitz, C. C., Li, S., & Morrison, F. J. (2011). Investigating the links between the subcomponents of executive function and academic achievement: A cross-cultural analysis of Chinese and American preschoolers. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 108,677-692.
- Lang, P. J. (1995). The emotion probe. *American Psychologist*, 50, 372-385.
- Lazarus, R. (1991). Psychological stress in the workplace. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6, 1-13.
- Lee, W. O. (1996). The cultural context for Chinese learners: conceptions of learning in the Confucian tradition. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner* (pp. 45-67). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- Lebra, L. (1988). Comprehensive justice and moral investment among Japanese, Chinese, and Koreans. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 157, 278-291.
- Levy, R. I. (1973). *Tahitians: Mind and experience in the Society Islands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International universities Press.
- Lewis, H. B. (1985). Depression vs. paranoia: Why are there sex differences in mental illness? *Journal of Personality*, 53, 150-178.
- Lewis, H. B. (1987). The role of shame in depression over the life span. In H. B. Lewis (Ed.), *The role of shame in symptom formation* (pp. 29-50). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lewis, M. (1992). *Shame: The exposed self*. New York: Free Press.

- Lewis, M. (1996). *Shame*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lewis, M., Sullivan, M. W., Stanger, C., & Weiss, M. (1989). Self development and self-conscious emotions. *Child Development*, 60, 146-156.
- Lewis, M., & Ramsay, D. (2002). Cortisol response to embarrassment and shame. *Child Development*, 73, 1034-1045.
- Lewis, M. (2003). The role of the self in shame. *Social Research*, 70, 1181-1204.
- Li, J. (2004). Parental expectations of Chinese immigrants: A folk theory about children's school achievement. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 7(2), 167-183.
- Lutwak, N., Panish, J. B., Ferrari, J. R., & Razzino, B. E. (2001). Shame and guilt and their relationship to positive expectations and anger expressiveness. *Adolescence*, 36, 641-653.
- Mascolo, M. F., Fischer, K. W., & Li, J. (2003). Dynamic development of component systems of emotions: Pride, Shame, and Guilt in China and the United States. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective science* (pp. 375-408). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Olthof, T.; Ferguson, T. J.; Bloemers, E.; Deij, M. (2004). Morality- and identity-related antecedents of children's guilt and shame attributions in events involving physical illness. *Cognition and Emotion*, 18, 383-404.
- Rubin, K.H., Hemphill, S. A., Chen, X., Hastings, P., Sanson, A., Coco, A. L., Zappulla, C., Chung, O., Park, S., Doh, H. S., Chen, H., Sun, L., Yoon, C., & Cui, L. (2006). A cross-cultural study of behavioral inhibition in toddlers: East-West-North-South, *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30, 219, DOI: 10.1177/0165025406066723
- Schachter, s., & Singer, J. E. (1962). Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional states. *Psychological Review*, 69, 379-399.
- Shaver. P. R., Wu, S., & Schwartz. J. C. (1992). Cross-cultural similarities and differences in emotion and its representation: A prototype approach. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 175-212). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shin, J. S.*, & Barrett, K. C. (2008, April). *Cultural differences in social emotions and problem behaviors between American and Korean preschoolers*. Poster presented at the biennial Conference on Human Development, Indianapolis.
- Shott, S. (1979). Emotion and social life: a symbolic interactionist analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (6): 1317-1334.

- Stipek, D. (1998). Differences between Americans and Chinese in the circumstances evoking pride, shame, and guilt. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 29, 616-629.
- Tangney, J. P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 102–111.
- Tangney, J. P. (1998). How does guilt differ from shame? In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 1-17). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Burggraf, S. A., & Wagner, P. E. (1995). Shame-proneness, guilt-proneness, and psychological symptoms. In J. P. Tangney & K.W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 343–367). New York: Guilford.
- Tangney, J. P. & Fischer, K. W. (Eds.). (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: The Psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tagney, J.P. & Salovey, P. (2010). Emotions of the imperiled ego: Shame, guilt, jealousy, and envy. In J.E Maddux & J.P. Tangney (Eds.). *Social psychological foundations of clinical psychology*. pp. 245-271. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Thompson, R. A. (1993) Socioemotional development: Enduring issues and new challenges. *Developmental Review*, 13, 372-402.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103-125.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological review*, 96, 506-520.
- Tu, W. M. (1979). *Humanity and self-cultivation: Essays in Confucian thought*. Berkeley, CA: Assian Humanities Press.
- Walter, J.L. & LaFreniere, P.J. (2007). Preschoolers' avoidance in a mishap paradigm: Implications for emotional adjustment, guilt, and shame. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 9 1 111-130
- Wu, D. (1996). Chinese childhood socialization. In M. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 143 – 154). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Yu, A. B. (1996). Ultimate life concerns, self, and Chinese achievement motivation. In M. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 227 – 246). Hong

Kong: Oxford University Press.

Xu, Y., Farver, J. A. M., Yu, L., Zhang, Z. (2009). Three types of shyness in Chinese children and the relation to effortful control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6), 1061-1073.

Zahn-Waxler, C., & Kochanska, G. (1990). The origins of guilt. In R.A. Thompson (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 6. Socioemotional development* (pp. 183-258). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Zajonc, R. B. (1980) Feelings and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist*, 35, 151-175.

Zhai, X. W. (1995). *The Chinese concept of face*. [in Chinese]. Taipei, Taiwan: Gui Guan.

Appendix I

Parent Consent to Participate in a Project Colorado State University

TITLE OF STUDY: *CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN SHAME AND GUILT BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE PRESCHOOLERS*

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: *Karen Barrett, e-mail: karen.barrett@colostate.edu*

CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: *Dongying Zhang, e-mail: dzhang@rams.colostate.edu*

WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH? *Young children must learn the rules of society and the difference between right and wrong. We are interested in how emotions influence this process and in how this differs between China, the United States, and Korea. You are being asked to provide consent for your child to take part in this study. You are also being asked to provide information about your child's emotions and behaviors, which will help us in seeing whether the things we are doing are useful.*

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY? *The study is being done by Karen Barrett, professor of Human Development and Family Studies at Colorado State University. The co-investigator is Dongying Zhang, a graduate student in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies at Colorado State University.*

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY? *This study is to know how toddlers and preschoolers learn to evaluate their actions – how they learn what they should and should not do. Our objective is to understand differences between children's reactions to these types of situations.*

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

This study will take place in the three year old classroom at the child's Day Care Center. This study will last for about 45 minutes.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO? *You will be asked to complete questionnaires about your child's emotional development. It should take you about 15-30 minutes to fill out the questionnaires. You will be asked to provide consent for your child to participate in this study. Your child will play with the researcher with a variety of toys. Most will just involve free play, but while your child is playing with a rag-doll toy, its arm will fall off. After your child has reacted, we will tell him/her that it was not his/her fault and that*

we can fix it. During another part of the play session, we will ask your child not to play with a particular toy because it is for another child. An adult who is very familiar to your child will be present in the room throughout the whole session, but s/he will be occupied with paperwork. The session will be videotaped for later review by the study team. Videos will only be viewed by the study team unless you are separately asked if it is OK to use it for teaching or other purpose.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY I SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You should not take part in this study if you do not want your child to participate in it. Participation is voluntary, and you can stop the study at any time.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

There is minimal risk of psychological distress, however significant distress has not been observed across 2 decades of research in the U.S. and Asia with this paradigm. This procedure has been widely used and found to be safe and effective in examining the target events.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

No direct benefits to the participants are expected, but we hope that your child will enjoy the play time with the experimenter and you, and that parent will learn about your child's abilities to regulate their behavior and to learn society's rules.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY? *Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.*

WHAT WILL IT COST ME TO PARTICIPATE? *It will cost you nothing to participate in this study.*

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT I GIVE?

We will keep private all research records that identify you, to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. You will not be identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. For example, your name will be kept separate from your research records and these two things will be stored in different places under lock and key.

CAN MY TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY? *If your child begins to cry or feel uncomfortable, the study's procedures would be discontinued.*

WILL I RECEIVE ANY COMPENSATION FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

Every participant will receive a small toy as compensation for your time and effort in this study.

WHAT HAPPENS IF I AM INJURED BECAUSE OF THE RESEARCH? *The Colorado Governmental Immunity Act determines and may limit Colorado State University's legal responsibility if an injury happens because of this study. Claims against the University must be filed within 180 days of the injury.*

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions about the study, you can contact the investigator, Karen C. Barrett at 1-970-491-7382 or karen.barrett@colostate.edu. We will give you a copy of this consent form to take with you.

WHAT ELSE DO I NEED TO KNOW? *Your signature acknowledges that you have read the information stated and willingly sign this consent form. Your signature also acknowledges that you have received, on the date signed, a copy of this document containing 3 pages.*

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Name of person providing information to participant Date

Signature of Research Staff

PARENTAL SIGNATURE FOR MINOR

As parent or guardian I authorize _____ (print name) to become a participant for the described research. The nature and general purpose of the project have been satisfactorily explained to me by _____ and I am satisfied that proper precautions will be observed.

Minor's date of birth

Parent/Guardian name (printed)

Parent/Guardian signature Date

参与科罗拉多州州立大学一个项目的 父母同意书

课题:

主要研究者: 凯伦. 贝雷特 电子邮件: karen.barrett@colostate.edu

配合研究者: 张冬颖 电子邮件: dzhang@rams.colostate.edu

我为什么被邀请参加这个研究?

小孩应该懂得社会的规范, 以及什么是对什么是错。我们对情感对这个过程的影响以及在中国, 美国, 韩国在这方面有何不同很感兴趣。在此我们希望你能同意你的小孩来参与这个实验。你需要提供你的小孩的情感及行为的信息, 这些信息可以帮助我们分析我们所做的是否有用。

谁在做这个研究?

这研究是由凯伦. 贝雷特负责, 她是科罗拉多州州立大学个体发展及家庭研究的教授。配合研究者是张冬颖, 该系的一个硕士研究生。

这个研究的目的是什么?

这个研究主要是要知道幼儿到学龄前儿童是如何评价自己的行为, 他们是怎么学习什么应该做, 什么不应该做。我们的目的是知道小孩对这些情形的反应有何不同。

这个研究在哪儿进行, 需要多长时间?

这个实验将在你的小孩的幼儿园里的一个三岁小孩的教室里进行, 整个实验过程大约需要四十五分钟。

我需要做什么呢?

你需要完成几份有关你的小孩的情感发展的问卷。回答这些问卷大概需要 15—30 分钟。你需要同意你的小孩来参与这个实验。你的小孩会与实验者一起玩一些不同的玩具。多数是自由时间, 但期间你的小孩会被要求不能玩其中一个玩具, 因为这个玩具是为其他小孩准备的, 还有你的小孩会玩一个布娃娃, 它的手臂会掉下来。当小孩已经对这个实验做出反应后, 我们会告诉他 / 她这不是他 / 她的错, 我们可

以把它修补好的。一个小孩熟悉的人，如父母，爷爷奶奶，或老师或老师助理会陪伴着整个实验过程，但他 / 她将会做“其它的事”而不参与小孩的活动。整个过程将会被录下来，以便后来研究分析。录像只有该研究小组的成员看到，除非单独问你是否愿意将此录像提供为教学用途或其它目的。

我有没有理由说不应该参加这个研究？

如果你不想让你的小孩参加这个实验，你就不需要参加。所有的参与都是自愿的，如果你已经同意参加了，也可以随时退出。

有什么危害与不适吗？

此实验会有非常微小的心理不适，然后经过这二十几年在美国及亚洲的研究并没有发现有明显的不适。这个实验过程已被广泛试用并证明是安全的，而且对于我们的实验目的是有效的。

参与这个研究有何好处？

对于参与者没有什么直接的好处。但我们希望你的小孩在这个过程中能感到开心，父母也将知道小孩对控制自己行为的能力及学会社会的规范。

我是不是必须参与这个研究？

你的参与是自愿的。如果你决定参与这个研究，你可以随时收回你对小孩的同意书，也可以随时停止参与，而不会有任何的处罚或失去任何好处。

参与这个研究，我得花多少钱？

参与这个实验，你不需要花任何钱。

谁会看到我所提供的信息？

我们会按照法律所规定的把你的研究数据保密。你的信息将会与其他参与此研究的人的数据合在一起，我们把我们收集的数据合在一起后再写报告。你将不会从这些材料中被认出。我们会发表我们的研究结果，但我们会对你的名字及其它个人隐私么保密。我们将尽各种可能来保护你的信息，而不会被此研究小组成员外的人得到你的信息及你所提供的信息。比如，你的名字跟你的研究记录将会分开储存。

我可以提前结束参与这个研究吗？

如果你的小孩哭了或有不适感，这个实验过程将会被终止。

我会因参与这个实验而得到什么回报吗？

每个参加此研究的小孩都可以得到一个小玩具作为回报，以此感谢你的参与。

如果我因这个研究受到伤害，要怎么办？

科罗拉多州政府豁免法案规定，并且可能限制科罗拉多州州立大学对因这研究引起的伤害的法律责任。对于学校索赔必须在受到伤害的 180 天内提交。

如果我有问题，怎么办？

在你决定是否接受这个研究的邀请前，请提出你所有的疑问。如果你以后有有关这个问题，你可以联系研究者：凯伦·贝雷特，电话号码：1-970-491-7382，或电子邮件：karen.barrett@colostate.edu。我们会给你一份这个同意书的复印件。

还有哪些是需知的？

你的签字表示你已经读过这份文件，并自愿在这同意书上签字。你的签字也表明你在所签的日期时已经收到一份这个同意书的签字。整份同意书共三页。

同意参加此研究的人的签字：_____ 日期：_____

同意参加此研究的人的姓名（打印体）：_____

提供信息给参与人的姓名：_____ 日期：_____

研究者签字：_____

父母为小孩代签

作为父母或监护人，我授权_____（打印体）参与以上所描述的研究。此项目的性质及目的已经由_____向我解释清楚，我满意所要使用的预防措施。

小孩的出生日期：_____

父母或监护人姓名（打印体）：_____

父母或监护人签字：_____ 日期：_____

Appendix II

My Child (Form T, Short)

Age of Child Described: ____ (years) and ____ (months); This Child's Sex: M or F

Your Relationship to Child: ____ (Mom, Dad, whether biological, step, or adoptive)

Your Age: ____ Today's Date: ____ (dd/mm/yy)

You will see descriptions of children's behaviors or reactions in typical daily situations. Some refer to children's reactions when they are involved in something they "shouldn't be." We refer to these situations as the child having done something "wrong." Some of the behaviors or reactions are very common for children in this age range. Other behaviors/reactions may be less common.

Please tell us how true each description is of your child's *actual* behaviors or reactions in these situations. You tell us this, by circling only one of the numbers underneath each description. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability and memory of the child's *actual* behavior or reactions. You circle a:

1, when the description is: **Extremely untrue** of your child; s/he would be extremely unlikely to react in this way in this situation. The behavior is not at all characteristic of him/her.

2, when the description is: **Quite untrue** of your child; s/he would be very unlikely to react in this way in this situation.

3, when the description is: **Slightly untrue** of your child; s/he would be rather unlikely to react this way in this situation.

4, when the description: **May be true OR May be untrue** of your child's reaction in this situation.

5, when the description is: **Slightly true** of your child; s/he would be rather likely to react in this way in this situation.

6, when the description is: **Quite true** of your child; s/he would be very likely to react in this way in this situation.

7, when the description is: **Extremely true** of your child; s/he would be extremely likely to react in this way in this situation; the behavior is very characteristic of him/her.

Please circle NA (not applicable) **only if you cannot remember your child ever being in this situation.** For example, if the description asks about your child's reactions to T.V. shows, but your child never watches TV, then you would circle the answer NA. However, almost all of the situations are typical for all children, so most parents will rarely need to circle NA. Also: You probably will think that some of the questions are "repeats." Please try, though, to answer every question independently, without looking back to previous answers.

Please remember to circle the answer NA only when your child is never involved in this type of situation. In our experience, parents hardly ever feel the need to circle NA, since most situations actually do occur with most children in the age ranges we are examining.

1. After having done something wrong, asks to be forgiven. **(Scale 2)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

2. Draws parent's attention to mishap or damage s/he caused (for example, "I broke something"). **(Scale 3)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

3. Seems strongly affected by the emotions of characters in a movie or book

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

4. Will say "sorry" to a playmate or sibling when appropriate, even if no one tells him/her to do so. **(Scale 1)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

5. When s/he has done something s/he is not supposed to do, later checks with parent to see if parent is still angry. **(Scale 2)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

6. Keeps coming back to the idea of "doing a bad thing" or "feeling so bad about what s/he did" after doing something "naughty". **(Scale 2)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

7. It is hard to make him/her feel sorry about doing something wrong. **(Scale 1; Reverse this)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

8. Seems to feel he/she MUST tell someone about it when s/he does something wrong. **(Scale 3)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

9. When s/he has hurt another kid, s/he will try to make up for it by offering to give something to or do something for the other child. **(No scale)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

10. Is unresponsive when someone cries. **(Scale 7; Reverse this)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

11. Is unconcerned about fixing spills or damages that s/he caused (for example, may suggest that the spill will dry by itself). **(Scale 1; Reverse this)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

12. Feels good when good things happen to movie or book characters. **(Scale 7)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

13. If asked to do some boring job (for example, clean up a messy room), s/he completes the task without being told to do so again. **(Scale 6)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

14. Wants parents' reassurance that "It's OK" after s/he did something wrong. **(Scale 4)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

15. Eager to make up for doing something "naughty". **(Scale 4)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely						Extremely	
untrue						true	

16. Feels remorseful when reminded about past mischief or wrongdoing. **(No Scale)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Extremely
untrue | Extremely
true |
|---------------------|-------------------|
17. Even favorite sweets can be left in the room with him/her when s/he knows she is not supposed to eat them, because s/he will not eat them. **(Scale 6)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
18. Feels sorry for other people who are hurt, sick, or unhappy. **(Scale 7)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
19. After breaking something, s/he seems unconcerned about fixing the damage. **(Scale 1; Reverse this)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
20. Keeps information about damage or difficulties that s/he has caused to him/herself. **(Scale 3; Reverse this)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
21. Will say “sorry” after having done something wrong, without anyone telling him/her to do so. **(Scale 1)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
22. Seems relieved when given a chance to repair a damage s/he has caused. **(Scale 1)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
23. Will try to comfort/reassure another in distress. **(Scale 7)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |
24. Becomes extra nice toward parent after doing something wrong. **(Scale 4)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely
untrue | | | | | | Extremely
true | |

25. Feels responsible when anything goes wrong. **(Scale 2)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

26. Has to be reminded to say “sorry” when s/he has done something wrong. **(No Scale)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

27. Can tell how others are feeling. **(Scale 7)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

28. Clearly hesitates before doing something forbidden, even when s/he thinks no one is watching. **(Scale 6)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

29. Is unconcerned about being forgiven after doing something “naughty.” **(Scale 1; Reverse)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

30. Continues to feel guilty about a mishap or wrongdoing, even when forgiven. **(Scale 2)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

31. Looks remorseful or guilty when caught in the middle of a forbidden activity. **(Scale 4)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

32. Will try a prohibited but attractive activity as soon as no one is looking. **(Scale 6; Reverse)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue						Extremely true	

33. Enjoys teasing or annoying pets. (**Scale 7; Reverse**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

34. If s/he has broken something, hides information/evidence about it. (**Scale 3; Reverse**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

35. After having “been naughty”, seems to want reassurance that parent is not angry with him/her. (**Scale 2**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

36. Seems guilt-free about mishaps or accidents s/he has caused, for example, lying or breaking something. (**Scale 1; Reverse**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

37. Needs to be specifically asked to apologize or s/he will not do so. (**Scale 1; Reverse**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

38. Will stop her/himself in the middle of doing something that has previously been forbidden even if no one tells him/her to stop this time. (**Scale 6**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

39. Asks, “What’s wrong?” when seeing someone in distress. (**Scale 7**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

40. Confesses to doing something “naughty” even if unlikely to be caught. (**Scale 3**)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue					Extremely true		

41. Looks like s/he feels remorseful after doing something wrong. (**Scale 4**)

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
42. Appears anxious or agitated after having done something wrong. **(Scale 4)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
43. Acts like s/he deserves punishment for doing something s/he shouldn't have. **(Scale 2)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
44. When s/he has caused some damage (for example, dropped or broken an object), will try and put the pieces together, clean up, etc. **(Scale 1)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
45. Once something has been forbidden, s/he will avoid the misbehavior in the future. **(Scale 6)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
46. Is unemotional when watching a sad show. **(Scale 7)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
47. Acts upset when s/he sees a hurt animal. **(Scale 7)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
48. Says "sorry" when s/he does something bad, without being reminded. **(Scale 1)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |
49. When s/he does something wrong, seems to feel relieved when forgiven. **(Scale 1)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Extremely | | | | | | Extremely | |
| untrue | | | | | | true | |

50. Lets parent know about his/her wrongdoing even before parent discovers the "evidence." (Scale 3)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Extremely untrue				Extremely true			

My Child - Guilt version (Short Version) = 50 items comprised of 7 subscales

I have inserted next to each of the 50 items which scale it is *meant* to reflect and also indicated which items you should reverse score.

Scale 1. Adaptive Guilt

Scale 2. Anxious Guilt

Scale 3. Confession

Scale 4. Does Bad, but Feels Bad

Scale 5.

Scale 6. Internalized conduct

Scale 7. Empathic, prosocial response to another's distress

我的小孩（表 T, 短, 2003 年 8 月）

我的小孩（表 T, 短）

儿童年龄：___岁___个月，性别：男 女

填写者与儿童关系：_____（母亲，父亲，无论亲生，继养或领养）

填写者年龄：___ 填写日期：_____（日 / 月 / 年）

你将看到一些小孩对于典型的日常情形的行为或反应的描述。以下一些问题是指小孩做某些“不应该”做的事后的反应。我们描述小孩做错事的情形。这其中的一些行为或反应在这个年龄段的小孩是非常普遍的。另外一些行为/反应可能就比较少见。

请告诉我们每个描述对于你的小孩在这些情形中的实际行为或反应的正确性。你通过圈出每一个描述下面的其中一个数字来告诉我们。请尽你的能力和对小孩的这些实际行为或反应记忆回答所有的问题。如果你圈的是：

- 1, 当描述是：对你的孩子来说**非常不正确**；也就是说他 / 她在这种情形下 99% 不会作出这样的反应。这种行为完全不是他 / 她的性格。
- 2, 当描述是：对你的孩子来说**很不正确**；也就是说他 / 她在这种情形下 80% 不会作出这样的反应。
- 3, 当描述是：对你的孩子来说**有点不正确**；也就是说他 / 她在这种情形下 60% 不会作出这样的反应。
- 4, 当描述是：对你的小孩来说在这种情形下作出的反应**可能正确或可能不正确**。
- 5, 当描述是：对你的小孩来说**有点正确**；也就是说他 / 她在这种情形下 60% 会作出这样的反应。
- 6, 当描述是：对你的小孩来说**很正确**；也就是说他 / 她在这种情形下 80% 会作出这样的反应。
- 7, 当描述是：对你的小孩来说**非常正确**；也就是说他 / 她在这种情形下 99% 会作出这样的反应；这种行为非常符合他 / 她的特性。

请只有**在你的小孩从来没有经历过这种情形时**才圈上**不符合**。举个例子，如果描述问到你的小孩对于电视节目的反应，而你的小孩从来没看过电视，那么你就圈上

答案**不符合**。然而，几乎所有的这些情形对所有的小孩来说都是非常典型的，所以几乎没有父母需要圈**不符合**。注：你可能会认为有些问题是“重复”的。请尽力单独回答每一个问题，不要回头看前面的答案。

请记住**只有**在你的小孩从来没有遇到这种情形才是圈**不符合**这个答案。从我们的经验来看，父母几乎不认为需要圈**不符合**，因为对于我们测试的这个年龄段的小孩来说绝大多数的情形的确是发生过的。

1. 做错事后，请求原谅。(2)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

2. 吸引父母的注意力到他 / 她做的坏事或搞的破坏（比如，“我打破东西了”）。

(3)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

3. 好像很容易受电影或书里的角色的情绪影响。

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

4. 如果觉得应该说“对不起”，他 / 她将跟玩伴或兄弟姐妹说“对不起”，即使没人叫他 / 她这么做。(1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

5. 当他 / 她做了不应该做的事后，会查看父母是不是还在生气。(2)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

6. 惹麻烦以后，会一起想着“做错事了”或“为他 / 她所做的事感到难过”。(2)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

7. 当做错事时，很难让他 / 她感到惭愧。(1, 取反)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
非常不正确						非常正确	

8. 当他 / 她做错事时，好象觉得必须告诉某人。(3)

非常不正确

非常正确

18. 为那些受伤的，生病的，不高兴的人感到难过。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

19. 打破东西后，他 / 她不想去修补。(1，取反)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

20. 不会告诉别人关于他/她自己引起的损害和困难的信息。(3，取反)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

21. 做错事后不要人告诉他 / 她要说“对不起”，他 / 她都会说。(1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

22. 若给他 / 她机会来修复所造成的损伤，他 / 她会心情放松。(1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

23. 会试着安慰身体或心里不舒服的人。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

24. 做错事后对父母会特别的好。(4)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

25. 对于任何认为是错的事，即使不是他/她做的，都觉得应该负责任。(2)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

26. 做错事时不得不得提醒他 / 她道歉。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

27. 能分辨出别人此时的感受。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

28. 做不该做的事之前会一直犹豫不决，即使他 / 她知道没人看到。(6)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

非常不正确

非常正确

49. 当他 / 她做错事被原谅后，心情会放松。(1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

50. 让父母知道他 / 她做错事了，即使父母还没发现“证据”之前。(3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合

非常不正确

非常正确

我的小孩——内疚版（短版）= 50 个问题包括七个次衡量尺度

我已经在每一个问题都加入它是设计于反应哪个衡量尺度，也指明哪个问题需要取反向成绩。

1. 适应性内疚
2. 焦虑性内疚
3. 坦白
4. 做错了，但也感到难过
- 5.
6. 本能的行为
7. 对于别人的痛苦有移情作用，亲社会反应

Appendix III

My Child Shame - Short Version

52 Items comprised of 7 scales

- Scale 1. Distress to failure
- Scale 2. Concern over good feelings with parents
- Scale 3. Ruminative shame
- Scale 4. Excusing/rationalizing
- Scale 5. Shame behaviors
- Scale 6. Perfectionism
- Scale 7. Sensitivity to others' evaluation

I have listed below at end of each item the scale to which item belongs and whether item needs to be reversed.

Again, Scale 1 is an omnibus scale and gets at some of behaviors used to define shame in the literature. It really overlaps with Scale 5 in which we tried to be very explicit about the types of shame behaviors typically seen in very young children.

1. Bends over backwards to be liked by others. **(Scale 7; reverse)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

2. Excuses bad performance by saying task was “dumb,” “too hard,” etc. **(Scale 4)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

3. Is quite distressed by criticism after having failed. **(Scale 1)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

4. Keeps on saying, “I’m bad,” “I stink,” or similar after doing something wrong. **(Scale 3)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

5. Can’t seem to look you in the eye after failing or doing something morally wrong. **(Scale 5)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

6. It is easy to make him/her feel silly or like everyone is looking at him/her (self-conscious). **(Scale 7)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

7. When s/he fails on a task, seems to need a lot of reassurance that s/he is a worthwhile boy/girl. **(Scale 2)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

8. Becomes quiet, and/or has trouble speaking after doing something wrong or failing. **(Scale 1)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

9. Keeps on talking about how stupid s/he looked when s/he did something wrong. **(Scale 3)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|-----------|---|---|--------|---|----|
| 10. | Outstanding performance isn't important to him/her. (Scale 6; reverse) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 11. | Is angered by others' telling him/her that s/he was "naughty". (Scale 7) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 12. | Avoids people after doing something "naughty" or failing. (Scale 5) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 13. | Worries a lot that others think s/he is terrible after misbehavior. (Scale 3) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 14. | "Droops" head down after having failed. (Scale 1) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 15. | Avoids talking about it when s/he does something wrong or fails. (Scale 1) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 16. | Tries to act especially "smart" in front of the parent after having failed at a task. (Scale 2) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 17. | Avoids eye contact if s/he has fallen short of parental expectations. (Scale 5) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 18. | Seems to feel like s/he must always succeed on tasks s/he attempts. (Scale 6) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 19. | Is quick to feel disapproved of. (Scale 7) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |
| 20. | Keeps on putting himself/herself down after failing or misbehaving. (Scale 3) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | | |

21. After s/he misbehaves, s/he seems to want reassurance that the parent doesn't think s/he's a bad kid. **(Scale 2)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
22. Keeps talking about what a bad person s/he is. **(Scale 3)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
23. After failure or inappropriate behavior, laughs or giggles as though embarrassed. **(Scale 5)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
24. Gets angry when others disapprove of his/her behavior. **(Scale 7)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
25. After doing something wrong, seems to want to "disappear." **(Scale 5)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
26. Child blames own misbehavior on others or on situation. **(Scale 4)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
27. Says over and over again that s/he is "so dumb" or "stupid" after making a mistake. **(Scale 3)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
28. Child blames own poor performance on others or on situation. **(Scale 4)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
29. Seems to feel bashful or embarrassed. **(Scale 7)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
30. Can't stand the idea of not meeting his/her goals. **(Scale 6)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----------|---|---|--------|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Never | | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
31. After having failed or done "something naughty," tries to distract attention away from event. **(Scale 5)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

- | | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
|-----|--|---|-----------|---|---|--------|------|
| 32. | After having fallen short, asks repeatedly if parent still loves him/her. (Scale 2) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 33. | Acts defeated and dejected after having done something wrong or failing. (Scale 1) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 34. | Avoids trying to do something again if s/he failed on it even once. (Scale 3) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 35. | Hangs his/her head and looks down after “being naughty.” (Scale 5) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 36. | Has a perfectionistic attitude. (Scale 6) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 37. | Withdraws into self after criticism. (Scale 7) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 38. | Tries to “disappear”, avoids contact after falling short of expectations. (Scale 1) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 39. | After not measuring up, s/he wants assurance that the parent still think s/he is a good boy/girl. (Scale 2) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 40. | Makes excuses for falling short or not measuring up to expectations. (Scale 4) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 41. | Has definite ideas about the kind of person s/he should be and should not be. (Scale 6) | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 NA |
| | Never | | Sometimes | | | Always | |
| 42. | Worries about what other people think of him/her. (Scale 7) | | | | | | |

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

43. Attempts to do better than s/he has done before by trying harder and harder.

(Scale 6)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

44. Gets angry when others notice or comment about his/her failure or “naughty” behavior. **(Scale 7)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

45. After having fallen short, seems to shrink into nothingness. **(Scale 5)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

46. Tends to gloss over own failure or bad behavior by making excuses. **(Scale 4)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

47. Sets standards for his/her performance and feels s/he MUST meet these. **(Scale 6)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

48. Avoids being around people who have seen him/her fail at something. **(Scale 1)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

49. Looks really “down” when she doesn’t accomplish a goal s/he set, even if that goal was too difficult for someone his/her age. **(Scale 6)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

50. After misbehavior or failure, looks down and avoids eye contact. **(Scale 1)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

51. Blushes after having failed or when caught after having done something wrong. **(Scale 1)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

52. Hides face or eyes after doing something wrong or falling short. **(Scale 5)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
Never			Sometimes			Always	

我的小孩的羞愧 —— 短版

52 个问题包括 7 个衡量尺度

1. 对于失败感到痛苦
2. 关心父母的好感受
3. 反刍型羞愧
4. 借口/为使合理作解释
5. 羞愧的行为
6. 完美主义者
7. 对他人的评价很敏感

我已经在每个问题后都标出此问题属于哪个衡量尺度，以及哪些问题需要取反。

补充一下，衡量尺度 1 是个选集衡量尺度，是文宪里用一些行为来定义羞愧这个词的。它跟尺度 5 是重复的。尺度 5 详细地说明羞愧行为的种类，特别是在年纪较小的小孩身上可以看到。

我的小孩 —— E 版（短）

1 为了讨人喜欢放低身架（7，取反）

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时		总是如此		

2. 对坏行为解释说是任务很难等等。（4）

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时		总是如此		

3. 失败后被批评会很痛苦。（1）

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时		总是如此		

4. 做错事后，一直说“我不好”，“我很糟糕”或类似的话。（3）

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时		总是如此		

5. 当道德行为出错时，不敢面视你的眼。（5）

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

从来没有 有时 总是如此

6. 他 / 她常有这种感觉，就是认为自己很可笑，或大家都在盯着自己（不自然）。 (7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

7. 如果没有完成好一个任务，好象需要很多次来确认他 / 她是个很值的男孩 / 女孩。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

8. 做错事或失败了，会变得很安静，或不想说话。 (1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

9. 做错事后会一直说他 / 她看起来很蠢。 (3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

10. 杰出的表现对他 / 她来说不是很重要。 (6, 取反)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

11. 如果有人说他 / 她不听话，会很生气。 (7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

12. 惹麻烦后或失败后会避开周围的人。 (5)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

13. 行为不当时，会一直担心着是不是大家都认为他 / 她很可怕。 (3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

14. 失败后会耷拉着脑袋。 (1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

15. 做错事后或失败了，尽可能避免谈及此事。 (1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

16. 没有完成好一个任务后，在父母面前会尽力表现得自己非常“聪明”。 (2)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

17. 没有达到父母的期望，不敢面视父母。 (5)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

18. 认为对于他 / 她所尝试的任务都应该成功。(6)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

19. 很容易感觉不被人赞同。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

20. 失败或行为不当后，总是念叨着自己的错误。(3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

21. 做错事后，他 / 她想确认父母不认为他 / 她是个坏小孩。(2)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

22. 老说自己是个多么不好的人。(3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

23. 失败了或行为不当，会尴尬地笑或傻笑。(5)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

24. 当别人不赞同他 / 她的行为时变恼火。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

25. 做错事后，巴不得能“消失”。(5)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

26. 自己失误，却责怪别人或当时情形。(4)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

27. 做错事后，会一次又一次地说自己“很蠢”。(3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

28. 把自己不好的行为归咎于别人或当时情形。(4)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

29. 看起来很羞怯或尴尬。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

30. 无法忍受达不到他 / 她的目标的想法。(6)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

31. 失败或惹了麻烦后, 尽力引开人的注意力。(5)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

32. 没达到目标时, 反复问父母是否还爱他 / 她。(2)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

33. 做错事或失败后, 会闷闷不乐或有挫折感。(1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

34. 曾经失败过就不想再次尝试。(3)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

35. 惹麻烦后会一直耷拉着脑袋。(5)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

36. 是个完美主义者。(6)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

37. 被批评后会退缩到自己的世界里。(7)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

38. 没有达到预期目标后会尽力“消失”, 不想与人接触。(1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

39. 当不符合标准时, 他 / 她想确认父母仍然认为他 / 她是个好孩子。(2)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

40. 找理由解释为何没有达到预期目标。(4)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

41. 清楚知道自己应该或不应该是某种人。(6)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	不符合
从来没有			有时				总是如此

42. 担心别人如何看自己。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

43. 试图通过不断的努力想做得比以前做的更好。(6)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

44. 当别人提及或评论他 / 她的失败或不好行为会生气。(7)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

45. 失败后, 巴不得能马上消失。(5)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

46. 倾向于用借口来减少自己的失误或不好行为的重要性。(4)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

47. 定下行为标准, 并认为他 / 她**必须**做到。(6)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

48. 尽量避开那些知道他在某事上失败的人。(1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

49. 当没有完成自己所定的目标时会看不起自己, 即使那任务对他 / 她这个年龄来说太难了。(6)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

50. 做错事或失败后, 低着头并避免面视他人。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

51. 因失败或做坏事被抓着而脸红。(1)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

52. 做错事或没有达到预期目的后, 遮着脸或眼。(5)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 不符合
从来没有 有时 总是如此

Appendix IV

Codes

WHB CODES (WITHDRAWAL)

*WHBCA. Places clown under or behind something or far away from him/herself.

WHBK. When E asks how things went (after a mishap has occurred), child says they went fine, or indicates lack of knowledge re: mishap.

WHBD. When E asks how things went (after mishap), child denies responsibility for the mishap (e.g., says, “I didn’t do it”)

*WHBE. Child moves away from E, after being with E

*WHBG. Child first fixates E’s face, then looks away WITHOUT FIXATING OTHER MEANINGFUL OBJECT OR PERSON.

*WHBU. Child ducks head under/behind or crawls under/behind object or person (table, mother, etc.).

*WHBL. Child tries or asks to leave room.

*WHBB. Child goes to bathroom

*WHBO. Other (specify)

TRB CODES (TAKING RESPONSIBILITY, TELLING E)

TRBE. Child goes over to E, explaining or showing E that object broke.

TRBEF. Child stares, soberly, at E’s face while E is reacting to broken object

TRBM. Child explains or shows M broken object.

TRBI. Child says, “I do it.” or otherwise indicates that **s/he** broke the doll

TRBN. Child explains or notices (e.g., picking up leg) that doll is broken to no one in particular.

RO CODES (REPAIRING THE CLOWN)

ROS. Tries to repair clown by self

ROM: Tries to get mom to repair doll

ROE: Tries to get E to repair doll

PSC: Compares legs (problem-solving about broken doll).