

Individual-Level Predictors of Intergroup Conflict: The Roles of Guilt, Shame and Empathy

Scott T. Wolf

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Psychology (Social).

Chapel Hill
2007

Approved by:

Advisor: Chester A. Insko

Reader: Melanie C. Green

Reader: Abigail T. Panter

Reader: B. Keith Payne

Reader: Lawrence J. Sanna

ABSTRACT

SCOTT T. WOLF: Individual-Level Predictors of Intergroup Conflict: The Roles of Guilt, Shame and Empathy
(Under the direction of Chester A. Insko)

The discontinuity effect is the tendency for intergroup interactions to be more competitive, or less cooperative, than interindividual interactions in the context of mixed-motive situations. Meta-analytic methods have shown this effect to be substantially large and robust (Wildschut, Pinter, Vevea, Insko, & Schopler, 2003). Explanations for the discontinuity effect have focused on norms, schemas, identifiability, and rationalization. Although, personality factors, in general, have received limited attention, Wildschut and Insko (2006) found that dispositional guilt of group members predicted competition in an intergroup prisoner's dilemma game (PDG) but only when group members were told that their decisions would be made public to their fellow ingroup members. The present studies sought to extend these findings by measuring guilt as well as other related personality variables (e.g., shame, empathy, and psychopathy) and assessing their relationships with intergroup competition when decisions remained private (in Study 1) and when decisions were made public (in Study 2). Study 1, in which decisions remained private, showed no relationship between guilt and intergroup competition, whereas Study 2, in which decisions were made public, revealed mixed results. Possible explanations for these results are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have been able to complete this dissertation without the guidance and support of my advisor, Chet Insko. In addition to training me to be a better scientist, sparking my curiosity, and pushing me to reach my potential, you have provided me with an exemplary model of decency, warmth, and kindness. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Role of Personality in the Discontinuity Effect	4
Guilt and Shame	5
Empathy	7
Psychopathy	9
II. STUDY 1	10
Introduction	10
Guilt and Shame	10
Empathy and Psychoticism	13
Personality Variables Related to Intergroup Competition	13
Prisoner's Dilemma Game Choices	16
Method	17
Results	19
Correlations with Session 2 Choices	19
Factor Analysis of Significant Predictors of Choice	21
Study 1 Discussion	23

III.	STUDY 2	24
	Introduction.....	24
	Method	25
	Results.....	26
	Correlations with Session 2 Choices.....	26
	Factor Analysis of PDG Choice Predictors	28
	Study 2 Discussion.....	31
IV.	FINAL DISCUSSION	34
V.	APPENDICES	47
VI.	REFERENCES	126

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table	
1. Study 1: Two-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors	36
2. Study 1: Two-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors Without IRI Perspective-Taking.....	37
3 Study 2: Four-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors.....	38
3. Study 2: Four-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors Without RFQ Prevention Orientation.....	40
4. Comparison of Significant Correlations with PDG Choice in Study 1 and Study 2.....	42

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure	
1. PDG matrix with ordinal outcomes	44
2. Two-choice PDG matrix used in pilot study.....	45
3. Four-choice PDG matrix used in pilot study	46

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The idea that individuals adopt a negative persona as group members has been prevalent throughout history. In his political and philosophical dialogue *The Republic*, Plato (1871/1999) held a pessimistic view of democratic rule and lamented the mob-like behavior of individuals in groups. Echoing the thoughts of Plato, LeBon (1895/1896) postulated that when part of a group, otherwise civilized and thoughtful individuals become “primitive beings” because the group setting provides for the loss of individual identity and reasoning ability. Similarly, Durkheim (1898) and McDougall (1920) held that group members were less civilized than individuals in isolation. Brown (1954) referred to the difference between the behavior of isolated individuals and group members as a “discontinuity” because of this striking difference.

Influenced by Brown (1954), McCallum et al. (1985), in the first study to explicitly investigate the difference between intergroup and interindividual cooperative and competitive behavior, labeled the observed difference between groups and individuals a “discontinuity effect.” In justification for the use of the term “discontinuity,” Insko and Schopler (1998) cite unpublished data indicating that in situations where competition (or noncooperation) is a viable option to cooperation, interactions between two individuals tend to be considerably more cooperative (less competitive) than interactions between two two-person groups; however, as group size increases, competition increases minimally. The

number of people variable thus has a “discontinuity” in competition between one-on-one and two-on-two interactions.

Most studies on the discontinuity effect have employed a prisoner’s dilemma game (PDG) to investigate competition and cooperation. The PDG has been used extensively in a variety of the social sciences to investigate cooperation and competition in laboratory settings. Merrill Flood and Melvin Dresher of the RAND Corporation are credited with formulating the PDG while attempting to test John Nash’s game theoretical equilibrium point solutions (Poundstone, 1992). In an attempt to make the game more understandable to an audience of psychologists, Albert Tucker, Nash’s advisor at Princeton, concocted the classic prisoner story and gave the matrix its name (Poundstone, 1992).

A sample PDG matrix with ordinal outcomes is shown in Table 1. In the PDG, two sides interact by choosing either X or Y. A choice of X is interpreted as a cooperative choice, while a choice of Y is interpreted as a competitive choice. The dilemma is whether to act in a self-interested fashion (by choosing Y) or in the best interest of the collective (by choosing X).

In a typical discontinuity study, upon arriving at the lab, same-gendered participants are randomly assigned to one of two groups and are led to their “homerooms.” Usually, two three-person groups comprise an intergroup session and two individuals comprise an interindividual session. Participants are familiarized with the PDG, generally represented in terms of cents earned per trial, and are told that they will interact with the opposite side for multiple trials. In a typical trial, sides are first given time to look over the matrix, and then individuals or group representatives meet with their counterpart of the opposite side to discuss the upcoming matrix interaction. During the meeting, participants are told that they

are free to discuss anything about the matrix that they wish, but that nothing said during the communication period is contractually binding. Following the meeting, the group representatives or individuals return to their homerooms and record their decision. After this period, the experimenter collects decisions from each side and allocates the money earned for that particular trial.

The finding that intergroup relations tend to be more competitive than interindividual relations (i.e., the discontinuity effect) is a well-established finding. In a recent meta-analytic review of 130 effect sizes in this domain, Wildschut et al. (2003) found the effect to be substantially large and robust. Most studies reviewed in the meta-analysis employed an experimental design though correlational diary and recall studies have produced similar results (Pemberton, Insko, & Schopler, 1996).

Five hypotheses have been advanced to explain the discontinuity effect. The *fear hypothesis* (Insko et al., 1990; Insko, & Schopler, 1998; Pemberton, Insko, & Schopler, 1996; Wildschut, Insko, & Pinter, 2004) postulates that groups, as a means of ensuring that the opposing group does not take advantage of them, are more likely than individuals to pick competitive choices in a PDG situation. This hypothesis rests on the assumption that people possess a schema-based distrust of outgroups. The *social-support hypothesis* (Insko, Schopler, Hoyle, Dardis, & Graetz, 1990; Schopler et al., 1993; Wildschut, Insko, & Gaertner, 2002) postulates that group members often persuade their fellow group members to act competitively. Because individuals, by definition, are not part of a group, social support for competition is not available to them. The third hypothesis is the *identifiability hypothesis* (Schopler et al., 1995). Since the group makes a unitary decision, it is possible for group members to avoid the appearance of responsibility for the group's collective decision. Such a

tactic is not available for individuals because the responsibility for the decision is not shared. The *ingroup-favoring-norm hypothesis* (Wildschut, Insko, & Gaertner, 2002) proposes the presence of a norm within groups to behave in a manner that benefits the ingroup, even at the expense of an outgroup. Finally, the *altruistic-rationalization hypothesis* (Pinter et al., 2006) proposes that the discontinuity effect can be explained by the tendency of group members to justify their competitive decision through the benefit that their fellow ingroup members might receive as a result.

The Role of Personality in the Discontinuity Effect

Absent from these explanations is whether personality factors play a role in the discontinuity effect. Most studies in this area report little if any competition in interindividual interactions (Wildschut et al., 2003). As such, the variability of competition in interindividual interactions is minimal. However, intergroup interactions have produced relatively high levels of competition and variability in competition. As such, the focus of many analyses within the discontinuity effect literature has been on the variability of competition in intergroup interactions. Because of the relative lack of competition in interindividual interactions, interpersonal norms guiding interindividual interactions likely override the effect of most individual-level personality factors. But what about personality factors in the context of intergroup situations?

Wildschut and Insko (2006), in a reanalysis of an earlier published finding (Wildschut, Insko, & Gaertner, 2002), report an experiment in which participants, as part of an intergroup PDG situation, made independent choices to determine their group's majority vote in what was ostensibly an intergroup situation. Participants were told that their decisions would either remain private or be made public to their fellow ingroup members. At an earlier

session, participants completed the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989), a measure that includes a dispositional guilt-proneness subscale. For participants low in guilt-proneness the public vs. private manipulation did not make a difference, but for participants high in dispositional guilt, those in the public condition were significantly more competitive than those in the private condition. They further found that when guilt proneness was high, participants in the public condition were significantly more concerned with relative in-group outcomes and less concerned with equality of outcomes.

These findings point to the possible role that guilt plays in intergroup situations. Because guilt is a “moral emotion” (Tangney, 2003, p. 387), it is possible that highly guilt prone individuals approach intergroup mixed-motive situations with the intention to benefit the ingroup, even if such benefit comes at the expense of the outgroup. In the PDG, this is accomplished through competition.

Guilt and Shame

But what exactly *is* guilt? Colloquially and within the academic literature, the terms guilt and shame have often been used interchangeably (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). To add to the confusion, historically there has not been overwhelming agreement on the key differences between guilt and shame.

Early psychodynamic theory failed to differentiate the constructs of guilt and shame (Freud, 1905/1935). Later, Freud (1914/1957; 1923/1961a; 1924/1961b; 1925/1961c) ignored shame and focused on guilt, maintaining that guilt was the result of a conflict between the morally superior superego and the urges and behaviors of the id and ego.

The idea that shame and guilt differ based on the types of situations that invoke them arose within the field of anthropology (e.g., Benedict, 1946). Traditionally, shame has been

thought of as a public emotion whereas guilt has been thought of as a private emotion (Smith, Webster, Parrott, & Eyre, 2002). Though scholarly traditions present the distinction as a public vs. private distinction, this conception remains controversial. While there is evidence to suggest that guilt and shame both occur more frequently in public settings (Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996), other evidence from a variety of methods, (i.e., responses to hypothetical scenarios, recall of past experiences, and the coding of literary passages) suggests that shame is relatively more public than guilt (Smith, et al., 2002).

Are there different types of behaviors that elicit the two emotions? Universal and overarching shame and guilt-inducing behaviors do not appear to exist (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Identical behaviors often cause feelings of guilt in one person and shame in another, or guilt at one point in time and shame at another point in the same person.

Lewis (1971) maintained that the primary difference between shame and guilt resides in the role of the self and one's behavior. According to Lewis, with shame, the primary center of attention is the self (e.g., *I did an awful thing.*), whereas the primary center of attention with guilt is the behavior (e.g., *I did that awful thing.*). Within this paradigm, guilt is seen as an adaptive emotion that can be used to repair the consequences of one's moral transgressions and ensure that steps be taken in the future to avoid such outcomes. If one's behavior is the problem, one can learn from the experience and work to repair the consequences of the transgression (e.g., through apology). Shame, however, is seen as a maladaptive emotion because it is difficult in the short-term to change one's entire self. Considerable evidence points to the importance of the self-behavior distinction of guilt and shame (Ferguson, Stegge, & Damhuis, 1991; Ferguson & Stegge, 1995; Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Lindsay-Hartz, DeRivera, & Mascolo, 1995; Tangney, 1993; Tangney et al., 1994;

Tangney, et al., 1996; Wicker, Payne, & Morgan, 1983) and to the adaptive nature of guilt and maladaptive nature of shame (Tangney, 1994; Tangney et al., 1995; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1992; Gramzow & Tangney, 1992; O'Connor et al., 1999).

Based on Lewis' (1971) self-behavior distinction and the resultant empirical evidence, Tangney & Dearing (2002) outlined similarities and differences between shame and guilt. Both are negatively valenced, moral, self-conscious, and self-referential emotions. Both occur most frequently in interpersonal situations and are used to make internal attributions. In addition, events that cause both guilt and shame are highly similar, though the experienced level of distress is greater with shame than with guilt. With shame, people often report a shrinking feeling; with guilt, people are often remorseful, regretful, and tense. A person experiencing guilt will be primarily concerned with how one's behavior has affected another, but with shame, the primary concern is how others are evaluating one's self. With shame, counterfactual thinking attempts to undo parts of the self; with guilt, counterfactual thinking attempts to undue one's past behavior. Resultant behaviors differ as well: With shame, people report wanting to hide, escape, or aggress; with guilt, people report wanting to confess, apologize, or "fix" what was "broken."

Empathy

Empathy is closely related to guilt, but is negatively related to shame (Leith & Baumeister, 1998). Batson (1994) defines empathy as "other-oriented feelings congruent with the perceived welfare of another person" (p. 606). Sympathy and empathy differ in that with empathy, one vicariously experiences another's emotions; with sympathy, concern for another is present without this vicarious experience (Eisenberg, 1986). In addition, a distinction between empathy and personal distress has been made (Batson, 1990; Batson &

Coke, 1981; Davis, 1983; Fultz, Batson, Fortenbach, McCarthy, & Varney, 1986). Empathy is centered on another person and often results in an offer of help or comfort while personal distress is centered on the self and results in feelings of fear, vulnerability, and uncertainty.

While research suggests that guilt and empathy work together (Eisenberg, 1986; Hoffman, 1982; Zahn-Waxler & Robinson, 1995), shame has been shown to inhibit empathy (Tangney et al., 1994). The probable reason for this is that shame is self-oriented while empathy is other-oriented. Since guilt is focused on one's behavior and its impact on others, empathy and guilt appear to be closely related emotions, if not antecedents of one other in a feedback loop. In fact, research suggests that whereas shame inhibits empathic concern (Marschall, 1996), guilt may make empathy possible (Tangney, 1991; 1995).

Empathy and guilt have been explored in the context of intergroup competition. Cohen, Montoya, and Insko (2006) manipulated empathic concern in an intergroup situation by instructing group members to either empathize with fellow ingroup members or take an objective perspective when independently voting on a decision in a PDG matrix. Dispositional guilt of group members was measured with the TOSCA (Tangney, et al., 1989). An interaction between dispositional guilt and ingroup empathy was observed. For group members told to empathize with their ingroup, guilt proneness was associated with increased intergroup competition. For group members told to take an objective perspective concerning their PDG decision, the relationship between guilt proneness and competition was nonsignificant and in the reverse direction. Cohen et al.'s (2006) findings suggest that guilt-prone group members are likely to act competitively toward outgroups when they feel empathy towards their fellow ingroup members.

Psychopathy

Two items in the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PC-R; Hare, 2003) are a “lack of remorse or guilt” and a “lack of empathy.” The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, DSM-IV-TR, 2000) groups the classic diagnoses of psychopathy and sociopathy into a single diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder. Lack of remorse is one of seven typical behaviors used to diagnosis antisocial personality disorder in the DSM-IV-TR. Given the relative agreement among different diagnostic tools concerning the criteria of this disorder, guilt and empathy are likely correlated negatively with psychopathy. The strength of these relationships, of course, depends upon the degree to which the lack of guilt and empathy defines psychopathy.

CHAPTER 2

STUDY 1

Study 1 was designed to investigate the relationships of guilt, shame, empathy, and psychoticism with intergroup competition in a PDG situation. Additional variables were also investigated because of their predicted relationships with the variables of primary interest.

Guilt and Shame

The relationship between intergroup conflict and guilt was of primary concern for the study. Wildschut and Insko's (2006) and Cohen et al.'s (2006) results both suggest that guilt plays a role in intergroup conflict (see also Insko, Kirchner, Pinter, Efaw, and Wildschut, 2005; Pinter, et al., 2006). The first goal of the study was to expand upon the previous research already mentioned by including five scenario-based guilt subscales. These scales, created with contrasting operational definitions, were chosen because separate guilt and shame subscales could be derived from each. The guilt subscales of the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989), the Anxiety Attitude Survey (AAS; Perlman, 1958), the Beall Shame-Guilt Test (BSGT; Beall, 1972), the Measure of Susceptibility to Guilt and Shame (MSGs; Cheek & Hogan, 1983), and the Dimensions of Conscience Questionnaire (DCQ; Johnson, Danko, Huang, Park, Johnson, & Nagoshi, 1987) were administered to participants.

The second goal of the study was to investigate the role of shame in intergroup conflict. To this end, the pilot study included five different shame scales—the shame

counterparts to the TOSCA, AAS, BSGT, MSGS, and DCQ guilt subscales listed above. The five scales used for this study are described below.

Test of Self-Conscious Affect. The TOSCA differentiates shame and guilt using Lewis' (1971) self vs. behavior distinction (Tangney et al., 1989). According to this viewpoint, after committing a moral transgression, the guilt-prone individual will feel bad about his or her behavior and work to repair the misdeed. Shame, on the other hand, is defined by feeling bad about one's self following a moral transgression. The TOSCA presents 15 scenarios and participants indicate the likelihood that they would react to each scenario with typical guilt responses (e.g., apologizing, repairing one's misdeed) or with typical shame responses (e.g., hiding, withdrawing from public). The TOSCA is reproduced in Appendix A.

Anxiety Attitude Survey. The AAS guilt subscale was designed with Freud's conception of guilt as a theoretical basis. According to this viewpoint, guilt results from a conflict between the ego and superego. Twenty-six situations thought to induce guilt comprise the subscale but rather than rating on how they would feel themselves, participants rate how anxious the average person would be in these situations. The AAS shame subscale defines shame as a conflict between the ego and ego ideal. In contemporary self-discrepancy theory terminology (Higgins, 1989), this can be thought of as the difference between the actual and ideal self. Twenty-six situations thought to induce shame are included in the shame subscale and participants rate how anxious the average person would be in these situations (see Appendix B).

Beall Shame-Guilt Test. The definition of guilt used in the construction of the BSGT was "the desire to violate or the violation of the person's moral code which in turn either

injures or implies injury to the self or other” (Smith, 1972, p. 53). Though not explicitly mentioned in this definition, most of the guilt-inducing situations in the BSGT are private situations. Twenty-one scenarios thought to induce guilt comprise the subscale and participants rate how “upset” they would feel in each situation. The definition of shame used was “the failure to live up to an ideal, being embarrassed, made a fool of, or having deficiencies in the self exposed.” Part of this definition implies a public component to shame, and most of the scenarios in the BSGT shame subscale are public situations. Twenty-one scenarios thought to induce shame comprise the subscale and participants rate how “upset” they would feel in these situations (see Appendix C).

Measure of Susceptibility to Guilt and Shame. The MSGS defines guilt as the emotion one feels after committing a non-public moral transgression. Five scenarios comprise the subscale and participants rate how “guilty or ashamed” they would feel in such a situation. Shame is defined as the emotion one feels after committing a public moral transgression. Five scenarios are included in the shame subscale and participants rate how “guilty or ashamed” they would feel in such a situation (see Appendix D).

Dimensions of Conscience Questionnaire. In the DCQ, guilt is defined as the emotion resulting from privately committing a moral transgression. The DCQ guilt subscale is comprised of 15 guilt-inducing situations for which participants rate how “bad” they would feel. Shame was defined as the emotion occurring after committing a publicly exposed moral transgression. Thirteen shame-inducing scenarios are included and participants rate how “bad” they would feel in each situation (see Appendix E).

Empathy & Psychoticism

The third goal of this study was to investigate variables related to guilt to obtain a more complete picture of the role of guilt and related constructs on intergroup conflict. These variables included empathy and psychoticism. Empathy was measured using the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980). This scale includes four subscales related to empathy: perspective-taking, fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress (see Appendix F). Psychoticism was measured with the psychoticism subscale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck, 1988; see Appendix G).

Personality Variables Related to Intergroup Competition

The fourth goal of the study was to develop a somewhat comprehensive list of personality variables related to intergroup competition in the PDG. To this end, I included assessments of trust, social value orientation, social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, patriotism, belief in a just world, Machiavellianism, conventional morality, and the importance of moral identity. The inclusion of these variables stemmed from the belief that they would be related to one's choice in a prisoner's dilemma game. Each variable is described below.

Trust was measured with the Yamagishi (1986) Trust Scale. This measure gauges a person's expectation that others are cooperative and will act prosocially rather than selfishly (see Appendix H).

The Social Value Orientation (SVO) questionnaire (Van Lange et al., 1991) classifies participants as cooperators, competitors, or individualists (see Appendix I). In the event that no clear pattern emerges, participants remain unclassified. Cooperators are generally concerned with the joint welfare of themselves and others, competitors are primarily

interested in maximizing the relative outcome between themselves and others (i.e., winning), and individualists are concerned with maximizing their own outcomes regardless of the others' outcomes. Competitors and individualists are often referred to as “pro-self” while cooperators are referred to as “pro-social” (Kramer, McClintock & Messick, 1986; McClintock & Liebrand, 1988; Van Lange & Kuhlman, 1994; Van Vugt, Van Lange & Meertens, 1995). In addition, the computations used to classify participants produce three different though nonindependent, scores for each participant: level of cooperative orientation, level of competitive orientation, and level of individualistic orientation.

The Social Dominance Orientation Questionnaire (SDO; Pratto et al., 1994) yields a single score for individuals based on views concerning the justification of the status quo in regard to social inequality (see Appendix J).

The Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA; Altemeyer, 1997) produces a single score based on authoritarian subscription to politically conservative social issues (see Appendix K).

Patriotism was measured with the American National Election Studies (ANES) 1987 Pilot Election Patriotism Scale. This scale assesses affiliation and devotion to one's country of citizenship (see Appendix L).

Belief in a just world was measured with the Belief in a Just World Scale (BJW; Rubin & Peplau, 1973). This scale measures the extent to which people subscribe to the idea that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get (see Appendix M).

Machiavellianism was measured with the Mach-4 Scale (Christie & Geis, 1970). This scale measures a person's self-reported tendency to deceive and manipulate others in the pursuit of personal gain. It produces three subscales: tactics, which refers to the endorsement

of manipulative tactics in interpersonal relationships, views, which refers to a cynical view of human nature, and morality, which refers to a disregard for conventional morality (see Appendix N).

Conventional morality was measured with the Conventional Morality Scale (Tooke & Ickes, 1988). This scale produces a single score based on the avoidance of the “seven deadly sins” from conventional Judaeo-Christian morality (see Appendix O).

Moral identity was measured with The Self-Importance of Moral Identity Measure (SIMI; Reed & Aquino, 2003). This scale measures the importance participants place upon their identity as morally upstanding individuals. It produces two subscales: the internalization of moral identity and the symbolization of moral identity (see Appendix P).

Finally, a number of personality variables were investigated for exploratory purposes. These included the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; see Appendix Q), which produces separate indices of Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism, the sensing-intuition dimension of the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (Briggs & Meyers, 1977; see Appendix R), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965; see Appendix S), the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1989; see Appendix T), which measured the social desirability of responses, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988; see Appendix U), with subscales for authority (i.e., dominance, assertiveness, leadership, criticality, self-confidence), exhibitionism (i.e., exhibitionism, sensation-seeking, extraversion, lack of impulse), exploitativeness (i.e., rebelliousness, nonconformity, hostility, lack of consideration, low tolerance for others), entitlement (i.e., ambitiousness, need for power, dominance, hostility, toughness, lack of self-control, low tolerance for others), self-

sufficiency (i.e., assertiveness, independence, self-confidence, need for achievement), vanity (i.e., regarding oneself and being judged by others as physically attractive), and superiority (i.e., capacity for status, social presence, self-confidence, ego-inflation), the Ego Control (VI) Scale (Letzring, Block, & Funder, 2005; see Appendix V), which measures the inhibition or expression of impulsive urges, the Ego Resiliency Scale (Letzring, Block, & Funder, 2005; see Appendix W), which measures one's ability to modify ego control depending upon the situational context, the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ; Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001; see Appendix X), which measures levels of promotion orientation (i.e., a focus on advancement and achievement) and prevention orientation (i.e., a focus on security and responsibility), the sensation-seeking subscale of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (Zuckerman & Kuhlman, 1993; see Appendix Y), the negativism subscale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility-Guilt Questionnaire (Buss & Durkee, 1957; see Appendix Z), and the Hong Psychological Reactance Scale (Hong & Faedda, 1996; see Appendix AA). The demographic variables of age and year in college were also collected.

Prisoner's Dilemma Game Choices

Participants completed the personality questionnaires at an initial session. At a later session, participants interacted in the prisoner's dilemma game as part of one of two three-person groups. Participants were told that their group's decisions would be determined by majority vote, but unlike Wildschut and Insko's (2006) study investigating guilt proneness, the pilot study did not include a public- vs. private-responding manipulation. Instead, all participants were told that they would be dismissed individually and thus would not meet their fellow ingroup members. While previous studies indicate that guilt proneness predicts

competitive intergroup votes when decisions are made public (Wildschut & Insko, 2006) or with a manipulation of empathy (Cohen, Montoya, & Insko, 2000), the following study was conducted with private decisions as the primary step in a two-part project. In the second part (Study 2), participants' decisions were made public.

Method

Participants enrolled in the introductory psychology course at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill signed-up for a two-session study through the Department of Psychology's participant pool website. Participation in the study partially fulfilled a course requirement. Participants were informed of the requirement of attending two sessions. The first session lasted approximately 1½ hours and the second session lasted 1 hour. Of the initial 99 participants completing the first session (53 males, 46 females), 71 (71.7%) (42 males, 29 females) returned to complete the second session. One participant's data was lost midway through the first session by a computer malfunction.

The first session consisted entirely of completing computerized questionnaires. Participants worked on the questionnaires at their own pace. Because the guilt and shame inventories (TOSCA, AAS, BSGT, MSGS, and DCQ) were of primary importance to the study, these were administered first to all participants in a random order. Further, the individual items within each questionnaire were randomly presented. After completing the five guilt and shame questionnaires, participants received the rest of the questionnaires in a random order. These were the IRI, the EPQ psychoticism subscale, the Yamagishi Trust Scale, the Social Value Orientation Questionnaire, the Social Dominance Orientation Questionnaire, the RWA Scale, the ANES Patriotism Scale, the Machiavellianism Scale, the Conventional Morality Scale, the Self-Importance of Moral Identity Measure, the Big Five

Inventory, the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator Sensing-Intuition subscale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory, the Ego Control (VI) Scale, the Ego Resiliency Scale, the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire, the sensation-seeking subscale of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire, the negativism subscale of the Buss-Durkee Hostility-Guilt Questionnaire, the Hong Psychological Reactance Scale, and self-reported age and year in college.

A second session was conducted exactly one week after the initial session. Six same-sexed participants were assigned to one of six individual rooms within an experimental suite. One side of the suite was composed of three rooms and classified as group A and the other side, also composed of three rooms, was classified as group B.

Participants were familiarized with a two-choice PDG matrix (see Figure 2) and given a sheet of exercises asking about all possible combinations of choices and the associated outcomes for both groups. This was done to ensure participants' understanding of the matrix. The outcomes in the matrix were represented as U.S. cents. When participants completed the exercises, the experimenter went to each room, checked participants' answers, answered any questions, and if necessary, informed participants about the mechanics of the matrix.

Next, participants were shown a four choice PDG matrix (see Figure 3). This matrix was identical to the two-choice matrix in all four corners of the matrix; however, two intermediate choices were included between the original choices. The matrix functioned identically to the two-choice matrix except that four choices were possible instead of two. Again, participants were given exercises to ensure their understanding of the matrix and the experimenter checked answers and resolved any confusion.

Following the completion of exercises, participants were informed that they would be making a decision about the choice they wanted their group to make on one trial of the four-choice PDG. Group decisions were based on majority vote. Since there were four possible choices and two groups, the possibility of a vote without a majority was possible. Because of this, the experimenter told participants that they would be asked to revote if such a situation arose.¹ Participants were informed that they would be given as much time as necessary to cast their votes. After all participants had recorded their votes, the experimenter tallied the decisions and handed out post-experimental questionnaires. Following completion of the questionnaire, the experimenter dispensed the money earned, debriefed participants, and dismissed them.

Results

Correlations with Session 2 Choices

Decisions from session 2 were coded from 1 (the most cooperative choice, W) to 4 (the most competitive or least cooperative choice, Z). High scores indicated more competition while low scores indicated cooperation.

Correlations between decisions made in the intergroup PDG situation and the variables measured during the first session were conducted to determine which variables predicted intergroup competition. Significant variables included: the IRI perspective taking subscale, $r = -.24, p < .05$; the RFQ promotion orientation scale, $r = -.27, p < .05$; the Machiavellianism views subscale, $r = .35, p < .01$; the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, $r = -.30, p < .05$; the BIDR (social desirability), $r = -.37, p < .01$; Conventional Morality, $r = -.26, p < .05$; and Yamagishi Trust Scale, $r = -.25, p < .05$. In addition, the SVO cooperative

¹ Participants were always given a set amount of money at the end of the experiment regardless of their decision, though they were unaware of this while making their decisions.

orientation subscale, $r = -.41$, $p < .01$, and the SVO individualistic orientation subscale, $r = .39$, $p < .01$, were also significant. None of the guilt or shame subscales significantly predicted intergroup competition.

When SVO was analyzed as a categorical variable, it significantly predicted intergroup competition, $F(3, 68) = 3.61$, $p < .05$. Individualists ($n = 16$) were associated with the highest level of competition ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .77$), followed by competitors ($n = 3$; $M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.53$), and cooperators ($n = 41$; $M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.42$). Unclassifiable participants ($n = 12$) had a mean of 2.83 ($SD = 1.40$). When the SVO classifications were changed to proself (i.e., competitors and individualists combined), prosocial (i.e., cooperators), or unclassifiable, the result was also significant, $F(2, 69) = 4.51$, $p < .05$. Prosocial individuals reported a mean of 2.49 ($SD = 1.42$) while proself individuals reported a mean of 3.58 ($SD = .96$).

Next, to determine which of these variables contributed unique predictive variance to PDG choice, I simultaneously regressed PDG choice on the IRI perspective taking subscale, the RFQ promotion orientation scale, the Machiavellianism views subscale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the BIDR, the Conventional Morality scale, the Yamagishi Trust Scale, the SVO cooperative orientation subscale, and the SVO individualistic orientation subscale. (i.e., all of the scales with significant bivariate correlations with choice). When both SVO cooperative orientation and SVO individualistic orientation were included in the model, results indicated that none of the variables were unique predictors of choice although the omnibus test of the model was significant, $F(9, 61) = 3.62$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .35$. Because the two SVO subscales were not independent, and were, in fact highly correlated ($r = -.89$), I reran the model with only one of them in the analysis. Because the absolute strength of the

correlation between SVO individualistic orientation and choice ($r = .38$) was slightly lower than the absolute strength of the correlation between SVO cooperative orientation and choice ($r = -.41$), I dropped SVO individualistic orientation from the model. The resulting model included IRI perspective taking, RFQ promotion orientation, MACH-4 views, SVO cooperative orientation, Rosenberg self-esteem, BIDR social desirability, conventional morality, and trust. Results showed that the omnibus test of the model was significant, $F(8, 62) = 4.11, p < .01, R^2 = .35$. SVO cooperative orientation was the only variable to uniquely predict choice, $B = -.12, SE = .04, F(1, 62) = 8.33, p < .01$.

Because the SVO questionnaire presents participants with decomposed matrices similar to the PDG matrix encountered in the second session, the significant SVO result might be expected. It is arguable that this result is due, at least in part, to method variance. As such, I dropped SVO from the model and reran the analysis. However, while the omnibus model was significant, $F(7, 63) = 3.14, p < .01, R^2 = .26$, none of the personality variables uniquely predicted choice.

Factor Analysis of Significant Predictors of Choice

Because the omnibus models from the above ANOVAs all significantly predicted choice and because of the lack of conclusive results regarding individual predictors, a factor analysis was conducted to uncover the underlying structure of the data. All of the continuous predictors of choice except SVO individualistic orientation were first entered into a one factor model.² Measures of fit for the one factor solution indicated poor model fit ($RMSEA = .18$, test of perfect fit, $p = .00$, test of close fit, $p = .00$, three eigenvalues > 1).³ As such, a

² Factor loading rotation is only necessary with solutions of more than one factor.

³ For the tests of perfect fit ($H_0: RMSEA = 0$) and close fit ($H_0: RMSEA \leq .05$), $p > .05$ is desired.

two-factor solution was computed using oblique rotation (i.e., allowing for the correlation of factors) and the quartimin rotation criterion with Kaiser weights.⁴ The two factor solution indicated excellent fit ($RMSEA = .00$, test of perfect fit, $p = .82$, test of close fit, $p = .90$). The factor structure of the two factor solution is shown in Table 1. The two factors that emerged were not highly correlated ($r = .23$) and can be characterized as a “self-positivity” factor and a “trust/morality” factor. Variables loading heavily on the self-positivity factor were promotion orientation ($\lambda = .72$), self-esteem ($\lambda = .85$), and social desirability ($\lambda = .75$). All other loadings on this factor were relatively small (absolute values all $\lambda s \leq .15$). Variables loading heavily on the trust/morality factor were Machiavellian views ($\lambda = -.86$), SVO cooperative orientation ($\lambda = .50$), conventional morality ($\lambda = .50$), and trust ($\lambda = .62$). All other loadings on this factor were relatively small (absolute values all $\lambda s \leq .11$). IRI perspective taking did not load heavily on either factor ($\lambda = .14$ on the self positivity factor, and $\lambda = .02$ on the trust/morality factor). The standards errors for all factor loadings were low (all $SEs \leq .16$). With the exception of IRI perspective taking, the two factor solution provided excellent simple structure.

Because IRI perspective taking did not load heavily on either factor, it was removed from a subsequent two-factor analysis using identical methods. Indices of fit were excellent ($RMSEA = .00$, tests of perfect fit, $p = .51$, test of close fit, $p = .63$, three eigenvalues > 1) and the factor loading standard errors after rotation were low (all $SEs \leq .11$). The two factors were not highly correlated ($r = .21$) and the pattern of factor loadings for the remaining variables was consistent with the previous model (see Table 2).

⁴ Factors themselves can be correlated (i.e., when using oblique rotation) and items can load on multiple factors. However for good simple structure, low loadings on all but one factor are desirable.

Study 1 Discussion

None of the correlations between session 2 choices and the five guilt subscales were significant (all $ps > .23$). This exactly replicates findings obtained by Wildschut and Insko (2006) in the private condition and conceptually replicates findings obtained by Cohen et al. (2006). The relative anonymity afforded by being merely one vote in a group of three likely led to the absence of the norm to act in a manner benefiting the ingroup at the expense of the outgroup. The weight of the prospect of being held accountable for one's decision likely creates a norm within the situation promoting competition by highly guilt-prone participants but not in low guilt prone participants. As such, Study 2 was designed to assess these same personality traits while imposing an ingroup benefiting norm by making decisions public.

CHAPTER 3

STUDY 2

Study 2 was designed with goals similar to Study 1. Of primary importance was the relationship between guilt and intergroup conflict in the presence of an ingroup benefiting norm. Because the decisions remained private in Study 1, an explanation for the lack of significant findings pertaining to guilt and intergroup conflict is that participants weren't sufficiently concerned with benefiting their ingroup. In fact, guilt appears to relate to competitive intergroup decisions, but only when decisions are made public (Wildschut & Insko, 2006). To account for this, I conducted essentially the same study with the modification that participants were told that their decisions would be known to their fellow ingroup members.

Why might guilt-prone individuals be more prone to competition in an intergroup mixed-motive situation in which decisions are made public? It is possible that guilt is an emotion applied to a greater degree to ingroups than outgroups. While initially counterintuitive, the findings by Wildschut and Insko (2006) suggest that guilt-prone individuals feel compelled to gain an advantage for their ingroup even if it comes at the expense of the outgroup. Because the PDG is a mixed-motive game, the gains of one side necessarily come at the expense of the other side. While one might initially suspect that group members would feel guilty about profiting at the expense of another group, it is possible that the guilt-prone individual's competitive decision is to counteract later feelings of guilt about not adequately benefiting the ingroup. Like the study conducted by Wildschut

and Insko (2006), I predicted that the public nature of the PDG choice would make highly guilt-prone participants more competitive in the intergroup PDG situation compared to participants low in guilt proneness. Research indicates that the presence of this instruction has the effect of imposing an ingroup benefiting norm thereby causing individuals high in guilt proneness to compete.

Method

Participants enrolled in the introductory psychology course at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill signed-up for a two-session study through the Department of Psychology's participant pool website. Of the initial 135 participants completing the first session (69 males, 66 females), 131 (97%) (67 males, 64 females) returned to complete the second session.

Study 2 was similar to Study 1 but with a few key differences. For the first session, participants completed the same number of questionnaires as in Study 1, with the exception of those variables shown in the first study to be unrelated to the variables of primary interest (i.e., PDG choice, guilt, and shame). Variables that were not significantly correlated with PDG choice or with any of the guilt or shame subscales were dropped. In the event that one subscale in a measure fit the 'discard' criteria while another subscale in the same scale did not, the entire measure was retained to ensure the overall scale integrity. The variables that fit the criteria for removal were the Social Dominance Orientation questionnaire, the Ego Resiliency scale, and the sensation-seeking subscale of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire. In their place, the Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992; Appendix AB), the Consideration of Future Consequences Questionnaire (Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, & Edwards, 1994; Appendix AC), the Self-Construal Questionnaire (Singelis,

1994, Appendix AD), which ostensibly measures individual differences concerning independence and interdependence, and the Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (Downey & Feldman, 1996; Appendix AE) were administered. Aside from these changes, the first session was largely identical to the first session of Study 1.

Similarly, for the second session, only minor methodological changes were made. Most importantly, participants were told that their PDG choices would be made public. In addition, to address possible differences regarding the self following PDG choice, the measures directly related to the self were given following the same set of dependent variable questions given in Study 1. These measures were the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Questionnaire (Rosenberg, 1965; Appendix S), the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1989; Appendix T), and the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001; Appendix X). Also, questions were designed to gauge the extent one took into consideration the ingroup's expectation about one's PDG choice, the consequences one's choice would have on the ingroup, and whether one was concerned with making a good impression on the ingroup. Aside from these minor changes, the second session was virtually identical to the second session in Study 1.

Results

Correlations with Session 2 Choices

PDG choices from the second session were coded from 1 (the most cooperative choice, W) to 4 (the most competitive choice, Z). High scores indicated more competition while low scores indicated more cooperation.

Correlations between PDG choice and the variables from session 1 were calculated to determine predictors of intergroup competition. Significant predictors of PDG choice were

BSGT guilt, $r = -.18, p < .05$, AAS guilt, $r = .25, p < .01$, AAS shame, $r = .20, p < .05$, BFI conscientiousness, $r = -.17, p < .05$, BFI neuroticism, $r = .20, p < .05$, BFI openness, $r = -.18, p < .05$, IRI perspective-taking, $r = -.22, p < .05$, IRI personal distress, $r = .26, p < .01$, RFQ prevention orientation, $r = -.22, p < .05$, Machiavellianism views, $r = .19, p < .05$, SVO cooperative orientation, $r = -.25, p < .01$, SVO individualistic orientation, $r = .27, p < .01$, Patriotism, $r = .23, p < .01$, NPI exhibitionism, $r = .18, p < .05$, conventional morality, $r = -.20, p < .05$, Aggression, $r = .33, p < .01$, and consideration of future consequences, $r = -.20, p < .05$. Marginal correlations which with TOSCA guilt, $r = -.16, p < .06$, the Meyers-Briggs sensing-intuition dimension, $r = .16, p < .07$, Right Wing Authoritarianism, $r = .17, p < .06$, and Negativism, $r = -.16, p < .07$. The block of questionnaires concerning the self administered after participants made choices on the PDG were all nonsignificant. In addition, questions about consideration of the ingroup's expectation about one's PDG choice, the consequences one's choice would have on the ingroup, and whether one was concerned with making a good impression on the ingroup were all nonsignificant.

Analyzing SVO as a four level categorical variable revealed only a marginal effect, $F(3, 127) = 2.63, p < .06$, though the effect was significant when classifying participants as proself, prosocial, or unclassifiable, $F(2, 128) = 3.31, p < .05$. Proself individuals ($n = 29$) were highest in competitive choices ($M = 3.48, SD = 1.06$) followed by unclassified individuals ($n = 11; M = 3.09, SD = 1.04$) and prosocial individuals ($n = 91; M = 2.78, SD = 1.38$).

To determine which of these variables contributed unique predictive variance to PDG choice, I simultaneous regressed PDG choice on all of the variables that were significantly or marginally correlated with PDG choice. These variables were TOSCA guilt, Beall guilt, AAS

guilt, AAS shame, BFI conscientiousness, BFI neuroticism, BFI openness, Meyers-Briggs sensing intuition, IRI perspective-taking, IRI personal distress, RFQ prevention orientation, Machiavellianism views, SVO cooperative orientation, SVO individualistic orientation, right wing authoritarianism, patriotism, negativism, NPI exhibitionism, conventional morality, aggression, and consideration of future consequences. Regressing these variables revealed a significant omnibus test of the model, $F(21, 109) = 3.10, p < .01, R^2 = .37$. The Beall guilt subscale, $F(1, 109) = 7.01, p < .01$, and the AAS guilt subscale, $F(1, 109) = 10.59, p < .01$, both contributed unique variance to PDG choices. However, since SVO cooperative orientation and SVO individualistic orientation were not independent and highly correlated ($r = -.94$), I computed the model without SVO cooperative orientation. Results were similar without SVO cooperative orientation. The omnibus test of the model was significant, $F(20, 110) = 3.17, p < .01, R^2 = .37$. The Beall guilt subscale, $F(1, 110) = 7.45, p < .01$, and the AAS guilt subscale, $F(1, 110) = 10.12, p < .01$, both uniquely predicted PDG choice. In addition, the aggression questionnaire was marginal, $F(1, 110) = 3.78, p < .06$.

As with Study 1, I dropped all SVO variables because of the possibility that it was simply a source of method variance. Doing so produced a similar omnibus test, $F(19, 111) = 3.22, p < .01, R^2 = .36$. AAS guilt, $F(1, 111) = 10.87, p < .01$, and Beall guilt, $F(1, 111) = 8.58, p < .01$, both uniquely predicted PDG choice, and aggression was marginal, $F(1, 111) = 3.53, p < .07$. However, unlike with the previous models, patriotism became significant, $F(1, 111) = 4.43, p < .05$.

Factor Analysis of PDG Choice Predictors

To further explore the possible factor structure of the PDG choice predictors, I conducted several exploratory factor analyses. All of the continuous predictors except SVO

cooperative orientation were entered into a one factor model employing maximum likelihood estimation. Computing this model indicated that six eigenvalues were greater than 1.0. However, the sample correlation matrix was not positive definite and a model could not be computed using maximum likelihood estimation. As such, I ran a one factor model using ordinary least squares estimation. The one factor solution was less than ideal and did not display simple structure. A two factor solution was computed next using oblique rotation and the quartimin rotation criterion with Kaiser weights. While the two factor solution improved upon the one factor solution, it still lacked adequate simple structure. I followed this analysis with separate analyses with three, four, and five factor solutions using the same parameters. Simple structure was obtained with the four factor solution and the factors were not highly correlated with each other. The addition of a fifth factor resulted in a far less simple solution than the solution obtained with four factors. Factor loadings for the four factor solution are displayed in Table 3.

With the four factor solution, the emerging factors can be described as a guilt-shame factor (AAS guilt, $\lambda = .91$; AAS shame, $\lambda = .82$; Beall guilt, $\lambda = .52$; TOSCA guilt, $\lambda = .40$), a morality factor (conventional morality, $\lambda = .93$; BFI openness, $\lambda = -.57$; Machiavellian views, $\lambda = .43$; patriotism, $\lambda = .37$), an empathy factor (IRI perspective-taking, $\lambda = 1.00$; TOSCA guilt, $\lambda = .38$), and an indeterminate factor (right-wing authoritarianism, $\lambda = -.81$; aggression, $\lambda = .60$; Meyers-Briggs sensing intuition dimension, $\lambda = .59$; IRI personal distress, $\lambda = .50$; BFI conscientiousness, $\lambda = -.48$; NPI exhibitionism, $\lambda = -.48$; negativism, $\lambda = .44$; SVO individualistic orientation, $\lambda = .40$; consideration of future consequences, $-.37$). Correlations between factors were all relatively low (all $r_s < .16$). Since the RFQ prevention orientation variable did not load heavily on any of the four factors,

I removed this variable and recomputed the four factor solution (see Table 4). The resulting factor structure did not differ substantially from the previous solution.

Next, I computed factor scores to predict PDG choice. Simultaneously entering all factor scores revealed that the empathy factor ($F(1, 126) = 6.23, p < .05$) and the indeterminate factor, ($F(1, 126) = 5.31, p < .05$) were significant unique predictors of PDG choice. The guilt factor marginally predicted PDG choice, $F(1, 126) = 2.99, p < .09$.

Because the fourth factor was difficult to interpret, and because the maximum likelihood solution to the four factor solution was non-positive definite, I recomputed the model without any of the variables that composed the indeterminate factor. To determine optimal model fit, I compared the solutions of 1, 2, 3, and 4 factor models. Indices of fit were relatively poor for all of these models (all RMSEAs $> .17$, all tests of perfect fit $< .01$, all tests of close fit $< .01$). Based on the overall series of inconclusive results, no further analyses were conducted on the PDG choice predictors.

To test the assumption that the SVO variables and PDG choice may have represented simple method variance, SVO independent orientation was analyzed as a mediator of the relationships with significant predictors of choice. Those variables that significantly predicted both SVO independent orientation and choice were AAS shame, BFI agreeableness, Machiavellian views, patriotism, and conventional morality. Separate structural equation models were computed to test for the mediation of the relationship between each predictor and PDG choice by SVO independent orientation. Results consistent with full mediation by SVO independent orientation was obtained for AAS shame ($RMSEA = 0, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00$), BFI agreeableness ($RMSEA = 0, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00$), patriotism ($RMSEA = 0, CFI$

= 1.00, *TLI* = 1.00), and conventional morality (*RMSEA* = 0, *CFI* = 1.00, *TLI* = 1.00). The model testing Machiavellian views did not converge.

Study 2 Discussion

Based upon the hypotheses concerning a positive relationship between guilt and intergroup competition, the results obtained in Study 2 were unexpected. While Study 1 found no relationship between guilt proneness and intergroup competition in the context of private decisions, I expected to find a positive relationship between competitive choices and guilt proneness in the context of public intergroup decisions. However, the directions of some of the correlations were in the opposite direction than I anticipated. I have a few tentative explanations for why this might have occurred, but am far less clear about the inconsistency across guilt scales.

The TOSCA guilt subscale and the Beall guilt subscale were negatively correlated with competition. This is in contrast to research that has shown that guilt proneness in the context of public intergroup PDG decisions predicts competitiveness (Wildschut & Insko, 2006). At this point, the reason for this finding is puzzling.

However, two subscales – the AAS guilt and AAS shame subscales – are in the predicted direction. While I didn't expect any of the shame subscales to be significant predictors in either direction, further examination of the AAS scale offers clues. As discussed in the description of the scales, the AAS scale was designed using psychodynamic concepts concerning the differentiation between guilt and shame. This scale and the psychodynamic distinction used to create it have since fallen out of favor in the current literature. With the AAS, it is difficult to determine which items measure shame-proneness and which measure guilt-proneness without a scoring sheet. As such, it was not surprising that both of these

subscales predicted the same variable. On the surface, they don't appear to measuring anything substantially different. This may explain why a shame subscale predicted intergroup competition.

A more vexing question pertains to the finding that guilt subscales used in previous work (i.e., the TOSCA) predicted intergroup competition in the present study, but in the opposite direction of what was expected. When decisions were made public, Wildschut and Insko (2006) found a positive correlation between guilt proneness and intergroup competition. In their study, participants were presented with the guilt-shame questionnaires, followed by the intergroup situation during the same session. While the two parts of the study were described to participants as separate and unrelated, it is entirely possible that completing the self-oriented guilt-shame questionnaires before participating in the intergroup PDG primed participants with concern about norms. While one might expect this prime to be effective within the same study, the effectiveness is likely to reduce over time. Consequently, while the prime may have been effective when the questionnaire was immediately followed by the intergroup situation, it is unlikely to continue affecting behavior at a follow-up session one week later. This could explain why I found a pattern of results opposite of those previously obtained. This issue could be explored empirically by varying the amount of time between the administration of the questionnaires and the intergroup PDG interaction.

Additionally, one possible reason for the opposite direction between the TOSCA and Beall guilt subscales and the AAS scales relates to the instructions and question wording. All of the guilt/shame questionnaires used in this study pose uncomfortable scenarios to participants who then rate the level of discomfort that would be felt in the situation. Through a variety of operationalizations, these scenarios are coded as shame-inducing or guilt-

inducing. For every guilt-shame questionnaire except the AAS, scenarios are presented to the participant, and the participant is asked to imagine the self in the situations. However, the AAS asks participants to rate how uncomfortable “most people” would feel in each of the given situations. It also poses the scenarios as if they have already happened to someone else. In other words, the AAS is other-oriented and the remaining scales are self-oriented. Since the AAS asks participants how “most people” would react to each of the given scenarios, it is plausible to assume that this scale measures something unique that the other scales do not – namely, the participant’s understanding of norms concerning the experience of guilt and/or shame. While the participant might not feel guilty or shameful in a given situation, he or she might recognize that most people would – and hence have a sensitive understanding about the norms concerning the experience of guilt and shame. Rather than measuring individual differences in the experience of guilt and shame, the AAS may be measuring individual differences in the recognition of guilt and shame inducing situations (i.e., in norms of appropriate behavior). Understanding how most people would feel in a given situation is probably influenced by one’s own level of guilt and shame proneness (hence the high correlations between the AAS subscales and the other measures of guilt and shame proneness), but nevertheless, it seems like a fundamentally different concept.

CHAPTER 4

FINAL DISCUSSION

Because of the lack of random assignment and minor differences between the two studies, only suggestive comparisons can be made between the studies. In addition, care needs to be taken when comparing the two studies since the second study had considerably more power than the first due to a much larger sample size ($n = 71$ vs. $n = 131$). Nonetheless, these comparisons offer potentially important information concerning the role of personality and individual-level variables in intergroup situations depending upon the publicity of one's PDG choice. A descriptive comparison of significant correlations observed in Study 1 and Study 2 can be seen in Table 5. Closer inspection revealed that the absolute value of the Fisher r to z transformations for all mutually measured variables with choice was nonsignificant (Study 1 $M = 15.12$, Study 2 $M = 12.46$).

Concerning the inconsistent findings of the role that guilt and shame proneness plays in intergroup public decisions, more research will need to be conducted to delineate situations and the different operationalizations of guilt and shame. The distinction between other-oriented guilt and shame displayed in the AAS scale vs. the more common self-oriented scales is an obvious avenue for further study. In addition, a conceptual replication of the current study would be beneficial to ascertain whether the results obtained were due to sampling error or a previously unobserved trend.

Although the results obtained in this study were not expected in the direction they were observed, these results indicate yet again that guilt is an important, perplexing, and often counterintuitive variable to consider in the context of intergroup competition.

Table 1:
Study 1: Two-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors

Variable	Self-Positivity Factor	Trust/Morality Factor
RFQ promotion orientation	.72	-.05
Rosenberg Self-Esteem	.85	-.03
BIDR Social Desirability	.75	.02
MACH-4 views	-.14	-.86
SVO cooperative orientation	-.05	.50
Conventional Morality	.15	.50
Trust	-.11	.62
IRI perspective taking	.13	.11

Table 2:

Study 1: Two-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors Without IRI Perspective-Taking

Variable	Self-Positivity Factor	Trust/Morality Factor
RFQ promotion orientation	.71	-.02
Rosenberg Self-Esteem	.85	.00
BIDR Social Desirability	.75	.04
MACH-4 views	-.13	-.87
SVO cooperative orientation	-.05	.50
Conventional Morality	.14	.51
Trust	-.11	.62

Table 3:

Study 2: Four-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors

Variable	Guilt-Shame Factor	Empathy Factor	Morality Factor	Indeterminate Factor
AAS guilt	.91	.01	.10	-.08
AAS shame	.82	-.07	.13	.09
Beall guilt	.52	.21	-.19	-.28
TOSCA guilt	.40	.38	-.26	-.28
IRI perspective-taking	.03	1.00	.01	.30
Morality	.01	.22	.93	.02
BFI openness	-.08	.22	-.57	-.07
Machiavellian views	-.06	-.07	.43	-.08
Patriotism	.07	.04	.37	-.02
Right-wing authoritarianism	.25	-.03	.01	-.81
Aggression	-.01	.11	-.02	.60
Meyers-Briggs sensing-intuition	-.00	-.25	-.18	.59
IRI personal distress	-.04	.09	.09	.50
BFI conscientiousness	-.04	.32	.04	-.48
NPI exhibitionism	-.02	.02	.10	-.48
Negativism	-.03	.14	.02	.44

SVO individualistic orientation	.25	-.07	-.25	.40
Consideration of future consequences	.08	.03	-.22	-.37
RFQ prevention orientation	.17	-.06	.13	.26

Table 4:

Study 2: Four-Factor Solution of Choice Predictors Without RFQ Prevention Orientation

Variable	Guilt-Shame Factor	Empathy Factor	Morality Factor	Indeterminate Factor
AAS guilt	.92	.00	.12	-.06
AAS shame	.82	-.08	.16	.11
Beall guilt	.53	.21	-.17	-.27
TOSCA guilt	.39	.38	-.25	-.28
IRI perspective-taking	.03	1.00	.01	.28
Morality	.05	.22	.96	.04
BFI openness	-.11	.23	-.59	-.10
Machiavellian views	-.07	-.07	.41	-.08
Patriotism	.05	.05	.34	-.03
Right-wing authoritarianism	.24	-.03	.00	-.80
Aggression	-.01	.11	-.02	.60
Meyers-Briggs sensing-intuition	.00	.10	-.00	.60
IRI personal distress	-.04	.09	.10	.49
BFI conscientiousness	-.07	.33	.02	-.50
NPI exhibitionism	-.03	.02	.09	-.48
Negativism	-.01	.14	.03	.44

SVO individualistic orientation	.24	-.06	-.24	.40
Consideration of future consequences	.06	.03	-.24	-.38

Table 5:
Comparison of Significant Correlations with PDG Choice in Study 1 and Study 2

Variable	Study 1: Private (<i>n</i> = 71)	Study 2: Public (<i>n</i> = 131)
SVO cooperative orientation	-.41**	-.25**
SVO individualistic orientation	.39**	.27**
Social desirability	-.37**	-.13
Machiavellian views	.35**	.19*
Rosenberg self-esteem	-.30*	-.08
RFQ promotion orientation	-.27*	-.15
Conventional morality	-.26*	-.20*
Yamagishi Trust	-.25*	-.06
IRI perspective-taking	-.24*	-.21*
Aggression	not measured	.33**
IRI personal distress	.21	.26**
AAS guilt	.01	.25**
Patriotism	.08	.23**
RFQ prevention orientation	-.08	-.22*
AAS shame	.05	.20*
BFI neuroticism	.16	.20*

Consideration of future consequences	not measured	-.20*
Beall guilt	-.12	-.18*
BFI openness	-.15	-.18*
BFI conscientiousness	.03	.17*

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

Figure 1:

PDG matrix with ordinal outcomes.

		A	
		W	Z
B	W	3 3	4 1
	Z	1 4	2 2

Figure 2:

Two-choice PDG matrix used in pilot study.

		A	
		W	Z
B	W	255 255	300 150
	Z	150 300	195 195

Figure 3:

Four-choice PDG matrix used in pilot study.

		A			
		W	X	Y	Z
B	W	255 255	270 220	285 185	300 150
	X	220 270	235 235	250 200	265 165
	Y	185 285	200 250	215 215	230 180
	Z	150 300	165 265	180 230	195 195

Appendix A:

Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989)

Directions: Below are situations that people are likely to encounter in day-to-day life, followed by two common reactions to these situations. As you read each scenario, try to imagine yourself in that situation. Then indicate how likely you would be to react in each of the two ways described. We ask you to rate both responses because people may feel or react in more than one way to the same situation, or they may react in different ways at different times.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
not likely				very likely

1. *You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o'clock, you realize that you stood him up.*
 - a. You would think: "I'm inconsiderate."
 - b. You would try to make it up to him as soon as possible.
2. *You break something at work and then hide it.*
 - a. You would think: "This is making me anxious. I need to either fix it or get someone else to."
 - b. You would think about quitting.
3. *You are out with friends one evening, and you're feeling especially witty and attractive. Your best friend's spouse seems to particularly enjoy your company.*
 - a. You would think: "I should have been aware of what my best friend is feeling."
 - b. You would probably avoid eye contact for a long time.

4. *At work, you wait until the last minute to plan a project, and it turns out badly.*
 - a. You would feel incompetent.
 - b. You would feel: "I deserve to be reprimanded."
5. *You make a mistake at work and find out that a co-worker is blamed for the error.*
 - a. You would keep quiet and avoid the co-worker
 - b. You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation.
6. *For several days you put off making a difficult phone call. At the last minute you make the call and are able to manipulate the conversation so that all goes well.*
 - a. You would regret that you put it off.
 - b. You would feel like a coward.
7. *You make a commitment to diet, but when you pass the bakery you buy a dozen donuts.*
 - a. Next meal, you would eat celery to make up for it.
 - b. You feel disgusted with your lack of will power and self-control.
8. *While playing around, you throw a ball and it hits your friend in the face.*
 - a. You feel inadequate that you can't even throw a ball.
 - b. You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better.
9. *You have recently moved away from your family, and everyone has been very helpful. A few times you needed to borrow money, but you paid it back as soon as you could.*
 - a. You feel immature.
 - b. You would return the favor as quickly as you could.
10. *You are driving down the road, and you hit a small animal.*
 - a. You would think: "I'm terrible."
 - b. You probably think it over several times wondering if you could have avoided it.

11. *You walk out of an exam thinking you did extremely well. Then you find out you did poorly.*
- a. You would think: "I should have studied harder."
 - b. You would feel stupid.
12. *You and a group of co-workers worked very hard on a project. Your boss singles you out for a bonus because the project was such a success.*
- a. You would feel alone and apart from your colleagues.
 - b. You would feel you should not accept it.
13. *While out with a group of friends, you make fun of a friend who's not there.*
- a. You would feel small ... like a rat.
 - b. You would apologize and talk about that person's good points.
14. *You make a big mistake on an important project at work. People were depending on you, and your boss criticizes you.*
- a. You would feel like you wanted to hide.
 - b. You would think: "I should have recognized the problem and done a better job."
15. *You volunteer to help with the local Special Olympics for handicapped children. It turns out to be frustrating and time-consuming work. You think seriously about quitting, but then you see how happy the kids are.*
- a. You would feel selfish and you'd think you are basically lazy.
 - b. You would think: "I should be more concerned about people who are less fortunate."

Scoring:

Guilt proneness items: 1b, 2a, 3a, 4b, 5b, 6a, 7a, 8b, 9b, 10b, 11a, 12b, 13b, 14b, 15b

Shame proneness items: 1a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 5a, 6b, 7b, 8a, 9a, 10a, 11b, 12a, 13a, 14a, 15a

Appendix B:

Anxiety Attitude Survey (AAS; Perlman, 1958)

Directions: There are many situations that happen every day that makes people feel anxious (nervous, tense, uncomfortable). For each of the following situations, rate how “disturbed” you think *most people* would feel were it to happen to them.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						extremely
anxious						anxious

1. Dave becomes aware he has mistreated another person.
2. In an emergency, when no one is around, Larry steals money from his parents' hidden penny bank.
3. An individual finds out he is sterile or impotent.
4. Hal belches in public.
5. After an argument, Fred sees that he has hit his wife and made her nose bleed.
6. Fred accidentally reveals his friend's secret.
7. John cheats on an examination.
8. Neal suddenly realizes he is unable to cope with his own problems.
9. Lester begins to indulge in extra-marital intercourse.

10. A businessman realizes that he did not act as forcefully in a business deal as he would have liked to.
11. Jim sees that he has failed to make a good impression on his boss.
12. Arthur hurts the feelings of another person by what he has said.
13. Bob is forced into a fight and hurts his antagonist seriously.
14. A person accidentally knocks over a crippled, old woman.
15. Sam loses his temper and strikes another person.
16. After arriving at his destination, Tom discovers that he is improperly dressed.
17. Ben discovers that he is failing in what he is trying to do.
18. Robert is the manager of the losing team in a tournament.
19. Jack inadvertently commits a felony.
20. Charles lets off gas in public.
21. Stan accidentally touches another person's genitals while on a streetcar.
22. While playing football, Ralph causes another person to become crippled.
23. Ned is criticized for his mistakes.
24. Phil becomes angry with his parents and tells them to leave him alone.
25. Al overhears his friends making fun of him.
26. Jack loses an important game.
27. Jerry makes poor progress in his job.
28. While backing his car out of his garage, a man accidentally runs over his son.
29. In a game, Carl sees that he has made some foolish mistakes.
30. Chuck gets into a card game and loses the family's food money.
31. Sam's wife confronts him with his failures.

32. John finds himself in the presence of more affluent people.
33. A person is criticized in front of his peers.
34. Milt recognizes that he has hurt a friend.
35. An individual discovers that he has been unintentionally responsible for allowing state secrets to get into the hands of his country's enemies.
36. A friend tells Al he boasts a great deal.
37. Buddy forgets his lines in a play on opening night.
38. While working in a bank, Bill has a fantasy of stealing money.
39. Stan is ignored by an old friend.
40. A young man finds out he has impregnated his girlfriend.
41. Joel finds out his child is ill from drinking poison he failed to put back on the top shelf.
42. In a fistfight, Mike kills another man accidentally.
43. A young man meets his friends at a time when is wearing dirty, unpressed clothes.
44. Charles feels that he looks awkward in a bathing suit and receives an invitation to a beach party.
45. Tom is shown up as a fraud.
46. A person awakes after dreaming about killing his father.
47. Herb meets a friend whose name he has forgotten.
48. Mort is refused a date.
49. Norm finds out his neighbor's child was seriously burned by the fire which started when he fell asleep while smoking.
50. Ken finds out he is the only one in his group that did not make the honor society.

51. Bill's mother becomes seriously ill the day after an argument in which he told her he didn't want to see her anymore.

52. Harold begins to feel that he was indirectly responsible for the death of a friend.

Scoring:

Guilt proneness items: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 30, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, 46, 49, 51, 52

Shame proneness items: 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50

Appendix C:

Beall Shame Guilt Test (BSGT; Beall, 1972)

Directions: In the following section, there are a number of descriptions of situations in which you might find yourself, or which you might have experienced. Try to place yourself in each situation and imagine how you would feel. Please indicate how upset or uncomfortable you would feel in each of the situations.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
not at all upset	somewhat upset	moderately upset	very upset	extremely upset

1. Your school is on the honor system. You're taking an important exam and copy some answers from your neighbor because you're afraid you might fail. You feel uneasy afterward.
2. You completely forgot your speech in front of an audience and just stand there awkwardly, unable to recall where you were.
3. You walk onto a bus and after walking all the way to the back someone suddenly points out that you have a huge rip in your pants.
4. Your friend tells you in confidence that she is secretly fond of someone. Later in passing, you tell him.
5. You're upset after giving someone information that you know will hurt a friend's chances of getting a job he wants very much.

6. You are trying to appear more knowledgeable than you are on a subject. An expert starts pointing out your misconceptions and you feel exposed.
7. Your boss has planned a meeting where your presentation is to be the highlight. You fail to live up to his expectations and your company loses the contract.
8. You falsify some information on a job application in order to get the job. You're worried about having lied.
9. You are driving by someone who has just had an accident and is obviously in trouble. You pass by because you are in a hurry and are afraid you'll get too involved if you stop.
10. You are finally involved intimately with someone you have seen as very attractive but interested in you. You find yourself suddenly impotent.
11. Your mother angrily asks you if you ate the last dessert she was saving for your father. You blandly say no as you swallow the last bit quietly.
12. You feel a nagging worry that you are not doing what you should to help solve social problems.
13. You show up in casual dress at a party where everyone is dressed to the teeth.
14. You're having an affair with a friend's spouse and while you avoid the friend, you feel funny just being around mutual friends.
15. You are unbelievably awkward trying to play a new sport. Your friends are trying to teach you and you feel as if you are all arms and no legs.
16. You're telling a joke and suddenly realize you are the only one who is laughing.
17. You're very angry at a friend. You lose your temper and hit him, after he insults you. You break his glasses and injure his eye.

18. You catch yourself indulging in petty bragging and feel silly and foolish.
19. You've been bragging about how well you're sticking to your new diet. You're secretly indulging in a hot fudge sundae when your friend walks in.
20. You are caught unexpectedly by someone talking to yourself.
21. You promise a friend that you will talk to someone you know about helping him get into graduate school. You wait too long and he fails to get in.
22. You're in the middle of a very involved discussion. You have an important point to make and you can't open your mouth because you're afraid you'll sound stupid.
23. You finish a small project and your boss compliments you. You feel silly for feeling so much pride over such a minor accomplishment.
24. A friend asks you to write a recommendation and is really depending on your letter. You don't honestly feel you can recommend him highly, so you write a mediocre one, but don't tell him.
25. You've promised your child that you'll take him to the football game. A good friend is in town and you take him instead since he is only visiting for one day and particularly likes football.
26. You have a reputation for being smart. Suddenly you find yourself in a situation where you're about to venture an opinion that you're afraid may be wrong, about a subject which you know very little. You go ahead but feel very uneasy.
27. You see an old man carrying a heavy load of groceries. You walk by quickly because you don't want to be held up.
28. You're usually very calm when discussing heated subjects. All of a sudden you hear your own voice and realize you're almost shouting.

29. You're an adolescent showing after gym class. You feel acutely self-conscious about undressing in front of the rest of the group, afraid they might tease you.
30. Everyone in your neighborhood takes pride in keeping the neighborhood clean. You're unwrapping a package and casually toss the wrapper on the street, hoping that no one will see you.
31. Your entire class has to read an article for a paper due the next day. You don't have time to read it in the library and the article cannot be checked out. You rip it out of the journal and take it with you.
32. You're reading your old diary and can't believe you wrote such nonsense. You feel ridiculous to have written down such things.
33. You're trying out for the high school basketball team in front of a large crowd. You attempt a fancy shot and trip, missing the backboard altogether.
34. You have a mild case of epilepsy. You forget to take your pills and have a convulsion before friends who didn't know.
35. A friend provokes you. In an angry moment you tell him a secret about his wife that he doesn't need to know and that you know will hurt him.
36. You accidentally let slip in a conversation something that was told to you in strict confidence.
37. You and a friend are both looking at houses. He shows you a house he has in mind. It's exactly what you are looking for. He worries about whether he will get it for weeks. You're afraid someone else will get it in the mean time, so you grab it, and your friend is very upset.

38. You find a lost wallet. It has only five dollars. You take the money and then turn the wallet in.
39. You are about to take an exam that is given great weight in your evaluation. You're afraid you won't do as well as you're expected to. While you're talking to one of your teachers, you notice that he is grading the same exam. You make a special note of most of the answers and do extremely well on the exam but feel very strange.
40. You're not very successful in relating to the opposite sex but in your daydreams you always contemplate fairytale romances. You find yourself feeling awful when you tell all this to a friend.
41. You are supposed to take a final exam. You haven't had time to prepare, but come to the exam to see how difficult the questions are. You find you can't answer any of them so you get up and leave. Later you call in to say you're sick and would like to take the make-up.
42. You are trying to park your car and smash into the car behind you, denting the fender. You see someone walking toward the car and drive off, figuring the damage was small.

Scoring:

Guilt proneness items: 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 21, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42

Shame proneness items: 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 40

Appendix D:

Measure of Susceptibility to Guilt and Shame (MSGS; Cheek & Hogan, 1983)

Directions: This section contains a list of situations that sometimes make people feel guilty or ashamed. Imagine yourself in each situation and decide how guilty or how ashamed of yourself you would feel.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
none at all	a little	a fair amount	much	very much

1. Not being honest with myself.
2. Changing plans that involve someone else at the last minute.
3. Acting in areas before deciding for myself whether they are right or wrong.
4. Not doing well as was expected of me on a group project.
5. Buying something I cannot really afford.
6. Breaking or losing something I have borrowed from a friend.
7. Not living up to my own expectations.
8. Causing other people time and trouble for me.
9. Lying to people, even though they won't find out about it.
10. Borrowing money from someone and suddenly realizing I forgot to pay them back.

Scoring:

Guilt proneness items: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9

Shame proneness items: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10

Appendix E:

Dimensions of Consciousness Questionnaire (DCQ; Cheek & Hogan, 1983)

Directions: Please indicate how badly you would feel after committing the following acts.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						as bad as I
bad						could
						possibly feel

1. Anonymously informing authorities on a friend who is involved in an illegal activity.
2. Strongly defending an idea or point of view in a discussion only to learn later that it was incorrect.
3. Your home is very messy and you get unexpected guests.
4. Being habitually cross or disagreeable to members of one's own family.
5. Inadvertently revealing something about a person that the person has told you confidentially.
6. Always agreeing with your boss because you need the job.
7. Having people in the bus stare at you while a friend of the opposite sex shows too much affection toward you.
8. Successfully stealing something from a store without anyone finding out.

9. Finding that your clothes have become disarranged, exposing part of you that usually is covered.
10. Realizing you've become exploitive and concerned chiefly with your own needs in a love relationship.
11. Allowing someone else to be blamed for something that you have done.
12. Being unintentionally rude to someone that you don't know, later realizing how hurt the person was.
13. Giving a talk on a topic that you're supposed to know, and having persons in your audience demonstrate that you are factually wrong.
14. Making a scene at the corner of a busy business district.
15. Repeating gossip which you know to be damaging to a person's reputation while assured that the person is unaware of your involvement.
16. Unwittingly making a remark disparaging to a minority group in front of a member of that group.
17. Unconsciously resorting to eating with your fingers at a rather formal restaurant as the rest of the diners stare.
18. Secretly making huge profits at the expense of others.
19. You, as a manager, retain working conditions for your workers known to be detrimental to their health.
20. Getting so bored listening to someone talk that you tell the person to shut up.
21. Stumbling and stuttering in an oral class presentation, having the instructor openly use yours as an example of poor presentation.

22. Failing to help someone you know who is in trouble when you could have been of help.
23. Upon making new acquaintances at a party, you tell a risqué or dirty joke and many are offended by it.
24. Cheating in an exam and not getting caught.
25. Finding out one's parents are in financial need just after one has spent a lot of money unwisely, selfishly, or unnecessarily, leaving one in no position to help.
26. Successfully stealing something from a friend without her ever discovering you are the thief.
27. Going to a party in casual clothes and finding that everyone is dressed up.
28. Spilling a plate full of food at a buffet dinner.

Scoring:

Guilt proneness items: 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26

Shame proneness items: 2, 3, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 27, 28

Appendix F:

Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980)

Directions: The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
does not				describes me
describe me well				very well

1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me.
2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.
3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the “other guy’s” point of view.
4. Sometimes I don’t feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.
5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.
6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.
7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don’t often get completely caught up in it.
8. I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.
9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.

10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation.
11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.
12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me.
13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm.
14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.
15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.
16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.
17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.
18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.
19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.
20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.
22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.
23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character.
24. I tend to lose control during emergencies.
25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while.
26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.
27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.

28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19

Perspective taking subscale items: 3, 8, 1, 15, 21, 25, 28

Fantasy subscale items: 1, 5, 7, 12, 16, 23, 26

Empathic concern subscale items: 2, 4, 9, 14, 18, 20, 22

Personal distress subscale items: 6, 10, 13, 17, 19, 24, 27

Appendix G:

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck, 1988) Psychoticism Subscale

Directions: Please answer the following questions by answering “yes” or “no” to each question. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too long about the exact meaning of the questions.

1. Do you stop to think things over before doing anything?
2. Would being in debt worry you?
3. Would it upset you a lot to see a child or an animal suffer?
4. Would you take drugs that may have strange or dangerous effects?
5. Do you enjoy hurting people you love?
6. Do you have enemies who want to harm you?
7. Do you enjoy practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people?
8. Do good manners and cleanliness matter much to you?
9. Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with?
10. Do most things taste the same to you?
11. Does it worry you if you know there are mistakes in your work?
12. Is (or was) your mother a good woman?
13. Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurance?
14. Do you try not to be rude to people?
15. Would you like other people to be afraid of you?

16. Do people tell you a lot of lies?
17. Do you lock up your house carefully at night?
18. Do people who drive carefully annoy you?
19. When you catch a train, do you often arrive at the last minute?
20. Do your friendships break up easily without it being your fault?
21. Do you sometimes like teasing animals?
22. Do you like to arrive at appointments with plenty of time?
23. Are there several people who keep trying to avoid you?
24. Would you feel very sorry for an animal in a trap?

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 22, 24

For each “yes” response, add one point.

Appendix H:
Yamagishi (1986) Trust Scale

Directions: For the following group of questions, indicate your level of agreement with each item.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	mildly	somewhat	Neither	somewhat	mildly	strongly
agree	agree	agree	agree nor	disagree	disagree	disagree
			disagree			

1. Most people tell a lie when they can benefit by doing so.
2. Those devoted to unselfish causes are often exploited by others.
3. Some people do not cooperate because they pursue only their own short-term self-interest.
4. Most people are basically honest.
5. There will be more people who will not work if the social security system is developed further.

Scoring:

Reverse scored item: 4

Appendix I:

Social Value Orientation Questionnaire (SVO; Van Lange et al., 1991)

Directions: Imagine that you have to distribute a sum of money between yourself and another person, whom we simply refer to as “Other.” You will never knowingly meet or communicate with this person, nor will he or she ever knowingly meet or communicate with you. In this decision task, both you and the other will be making choices by circling either the letter A, B, or C. Your own choice will produce points for yourself and the other person. Similarly, the other’s choices will produce points for him/her and for you. Therefore, the total number of points you receive depends on his/her choices and your choices as well.

Example:

	A	B	C
You get	500	500	550
Other gets	400	500	300

In this example, if you choose C you would receive 550 points and Other 300 points. At the same time, Other is also choosing between A, B, and C. If Other chooses A, he or she receives 500 and you receive 400. So the total number of points that you receive and that Other receives is determined by your own choice in combination with that of Other.

For each of the nine situations, choose A, B, or C depending on which column you prefer the most.

	A	B	C
(1) You get	480	540	480
Other gets	80	280	480

	A	B	C
(2) You get	560	500	500
Other gets	300	500	100

	A	B	C
(3) You get	520	520	580
Other gets	520	120	320

	A	B	C
(4) You get	500	560	490
Other gets	100	300	490

	A	B	C
(5) You get	560	500	490
Other gets	300	500	90

	A	B	C
(6) You get	500	500	570
Other gets	500	100	300

	A	B	C
(7) You get	510	560	510
Other gets	510	300	110

	A	B	C
(8) You get	550	500	500
Other gets	300	100	500

	A	B	C
(9) You get	480	490	540
Other gets	100	490	300

Scoring:

Add one point if any of the following answers are chosen:

Cooperative orientation: 1c, 2b, 3a, 4c, 5b, 6a, 7a, 8c, 9b

Individualistic orientation: 1b, 2a, 3c, 4b, 5a, 6c, 7b, 8a, 9c

Competitive orientation: 1a, 2c, 3b, 4a, 5c, 6b, 7c, 8b, 9a

Classification: if any one of the orientations has ≥ 6 points, this is the person's orientation

Appendix J:

Social Dominance Orientation questionnaire (SDO; Pratto et al., 1994)

Directions: Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards?

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very negative	negative	slightly negative	neither positive nor negative	slightly positive	positive	very positive

1. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal people are.
2. Some people are just more worthy than others.
3. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.
4. All humans should be treated equally.
5. Some people are just inferior to others.
6. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.
7. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.
8. Increased economic equality.
9. Increased social equality.

10. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on people.
11. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.
12. Equality.
13. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.
14. Some people are just more deserving than others.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13

Appendix K:

Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA; Altemyer, 1997)

Instructions: This survey is part of an investigation of general public opinion regarding a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements and disagree with others to varying extents. Please indicate your reactions to each statement using the given scale.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly	moderately	slightly	neither	slightly	moderately	strongly
disagree	disagree	disagree	agree or	agree	agree	agree
			disagree			

1. The established authorities generally turn out to be right about things, while the radicals and protesters are usually just “loud mouths” showing off their ignorance.
2. Women should have to promise to obey their husbands when they get married.
3. Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us.
4. Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.
5. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people’s minds.

6. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
7. The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.
8. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.
9. Our country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.
10. Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.
11. Everyone should have their own life-style, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.
12. The “old-fashioned ways” and “old-fashioned values” still show the best way to live.
13. You have to admire those who challenged the law and the majority’s view by protesting for women’s abortion rights, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayer.
14. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.
15. Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the “normal way things are supposed to be done.”
16. God’s laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, and those who break them must be strongly punished.
17. It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines so that people could not get their hands on trashy and disgusting material.

18. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.
19. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the “rotten apples” that are ruining everything.
20. There is no “ONE right way” to life; everybody has to create their own way.
21. Homosexuals and feminists should be praised for being brave enough to defy “traditional family values.”
22. This country would work a lot better if certain groups of troublemakers would just shut up and accept their group’s traditional place in society.
23. There are many radical, immoral people in our country today who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.
24. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.
25. What our country needs most is discipline with everyone following our leaders in unity.
26. It’s better to have trashy magazines and radical pamphlets in our communities than to let the government have the power to censor them.
27. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and trouble makers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
28. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.

29. The situation in our country is getting so serious that the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path.
30. A “woman’s place” should be wherever she wants to be. The days of women being submissive to their husbands belong strictly in the past.
31. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don’t like and to make their own “rules” to govern their behavior.
32. Once our government leaders give us the “go ahead,” it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.

Scoring:

Items 1 & 2 not scored.

Reverse scored items: 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31

Appendix L:

American National Election Studies Pilot Election Patriotism Scale (ANES, 1987)

Directions: For the following questions, indicate the extent to which each question applies to yourself.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4
not very	somewhat	very	extremely

1. How strong is the respect you have for your country?
2. How angry does it make you feel when you hear someone criticizing your country?
3. How proud are you to be a citizen of your country?
4. How angry does it make you feel when you see people burn your country's flag in protest?
5. How good does it make you feel when you see your country's flag flying?
6. How strong is your love for your country?
7. How mad do people who sell your government's secrets make you feel?
8. How proud do you feel when you hear your country's national anthem?

Appendix M:

Belief in a Just World Scale (BJW; Rubin & Peplau, 1973)

Directions: For the following group of questions, indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6
strongly	disagree	somewhat	somewhat	agree	strongly
disagree		disagree	agree		agree

1. I feel that the world treats me fairly.
2. I feel that I get what I deserve.
3. I feel that people treat me fairly in life.
4. I feel that I earn the rewards and punishments I get.
5. I feel that people treat me with the respect I deserve.
6. I feel that I get what I am entitled to have.
7. I feel that my efforts are noticed and rewarded.
8. I feel that when I meet with misfortune, I have brought it upon myself.
9. I feel that the world treats people fairly.
10. I feel that people get what they deserve.
11. I feel that people treat each other fairly in life.
12. I feel that people earn the rewards and punishment they get.

13. I feel that people treat each other with the respect they deserve.
14. I feel that people get what they are entitled to have.
15. I feel that a person's efforts are noticed and rewarded.
16. I feel that when people meet with misfortune, they have brought it upon themselves.

Appendix N:

Mach-4 Scale (Christie & Geis, 1970)

Directions: For the following statements, indicate your degree of agreement.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly			no opinion			strongly
disagree						agree

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.
4. Most people are basically kind and good.
5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.
6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
7. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.
8. Generally speaking, people won't work hard unless they're forced to do so.
9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest.
10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight.
11. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.

12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught.
14. Most people are brave.
15. It is wise to flatter important people.
16. It is possible to be good in all respects.
17. Barnum was very wrong when he said “there’s a sucker born every minute.”
18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.
20. Most people forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16

Tactics subscale: 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16,

Views subscale: 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20

Morality subscale: 3, 9, 19

Appendix O:

Conventional Morality Scale (Tooke & Ickes, 1988)

Directions: The following questions concern your personal lifestyle preferences. Please read each item carefully and consider how it describes your own lifestyle preference. Do not worry about the fact that your lifestyle preferences might differ from those of others. Just answer as honestly and accurately as possible.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
extremely	somewhat	neither	somewhat	extremely
uncharacteristic of	uncharacteristic	characteristic	characteristic of	characteristic of
me	of me	nor	me	me
		uncharacteristic		
		of me		

1. I like to read erotic books or magazines.
2. I am opposed to the use of alcohol or other recreational drugs.
3. I have taken things I wanted without paying for them or returning them later.
4. My behavior at parties has gotten me into trouble.
5. I donate money to charities.
6. I avoid going to social events where a lot of people will be drunk.
7. I am very forgiving of others who have injured or offended me.

8. If I had enough money, I wouldn't work another day.
9. I attend church services at least once a week.
10. I prefer a lifestyle that gives me an almost unlimited amount of leisure time.
11. I have not had more than one sexual partner.
12. I use profanity in my conversations with friends.
13. There are people in this world I would kill if I thought I could get away with it.
14. I 'tune out' most of what my parents have to say to me.
15. My pride has kept me from making up with someone I was at odds with.
16. I take care of myself and don't worry too much about other people.
17. Some people get offended at the kind of language I use.
18. I believe that if something feels good and is pleasurable, you should do it as much as you want.
19. I have avoided people rather than having to apologize to them for something I have done.
20. I envy people who have more than I do.
21. Morality and ethics don't really concern me.
22. I prefer a lifestyle that permits me to express my sexual needs with many different partners.
23. I am careful not to curse or use profanity around other people.
24. I enjoy working hard.
25. I am not willing to shift the blame to others, even if it will keep me out of trouble.
26. Once I start drinking, I don't know when to stop.
27. I like a good 'dirty joke' now and then.
28. The more I get of the fun things in life, the more I want.

29. It would bother me if I were required to kill someone in self-defense.
30. I have strong sexual thoughts or feelings about people I see every day.
31. The problems of other people concern me deeply.
32. My parents disapprove of my lifestyle.
33. I am envious of other people's sexual relationships.
34. If I want to have sex with someone, I don't worry about the complications it might cause.
35. No matter how much I get in life, I won't be satisfied.
36. I enjoy hearing about it when people I don't like get themselves into trouble.
37. I would not steal something I needed, even if I were sure I could get away with it.
38. I am honest in the way I deal with people.
39. I don't enjoy looking at pornographic films or magazines.
40. At parties, I drink more than most of my friends.
41. I make sure that I get my share of whatever rewards are available.
42. I am careful not to dress in a sexually provocative way.
43. I could not kill another person under any circumstances.
44. I will not take advantage of other people, even when it's clear that they are trying to take advantage of me.
45. I like to control other people's behavior as much as I can.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27,
28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 45

Appendix P:

Self-Importance of Moral Identity Measure (SIMI; Reed & Aquino, 2003)

Directions: Listed below are some characteristics that might describe a person:

Caring, Compassionate, Fair, Friendly, Generous, Helpful, Hardworking, Honest, Kind

The person with these characteristics could be you or someone else. For a moment, visualize in your mind the kind of person who has these characteristics. Imagine how that person would think, feel, and act. When you have a clear image of what this person would be like, answer the following questions.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree				strongly agree

1. It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.
2. Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am.
3. I often wear clothes that identify me as having these characteristics.
4. I would be ashamed to be a person who had these characteristics.
5. The types of things I do in my spare time (e.g., hobbies) clearly identify me as having these characteristics.

6. The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics.
7. Having these characteristics is not really important to me.
8. The fact that I have these characteristics is communicated to others by my membership in certain organizations.
9. I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics.
10. I strongly desire to have these characteristics.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 4, 7

Internalization subscale: 1, 2, 4, 7, 10

Symbolization subscale: 3, 5, 6, 8, 9

Appendix Q:

Big 5 Personality Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991)

Directions: Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to your actual self. For example, do you agree that your actual self is someone who likes to spend time with others? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree	disagree	somewhat disagree	neutral	somewhat agree	agree	strongly agree

I see myself as someone who

1. is talkative
2. tends to find fault with others
3. does a thorough job
4. is depressed, blue
5. is original, comes up with new ideas
6. is reserved
7. is helpful and unselfish with others
8. can be somewhat careless
9. is relaxed, handles stress well
10. is curious about many different things

11. is full of energy
12. starts quarrels with others
13. is a reliable worker
14. can be tense
15. is ingenious, a deep thinker
16. generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. has a forgiving nature
18. tends to be disorganized
19. worries a lot
20. has an active imagination
21. tends to be quiet
22. is generally trusting
23. tends to be lazy
24. is emotionally stable, not easily upset
25. is inventive
26. has an assertive personality
27. can be cold and aloof
28. perseveres until the task is finished
29. can be moody
30. values artistic, aesthetic experiences
31. is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. is considerate and kind to almost everyone
33. does things efficiently

- 34. remains calm in tense situations
- 35. prefers work that is routine
- 36. is outgoing, sociable
- 37. is sometimes rude to others
- 38. makes plans and follows through with them
- 39. gets nervous easily
- 40. likes to reflect, play with ideas
- 41. has few artistic interests
- 42. likes to cooperate with others
- 43. is easily distracted
- 44. is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 41, 43

Extraversion = 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36

Agreeableness = 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37, 42

Conscientiousness = 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38, 43

Neuroticism = 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39

Openness = 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 41, 44

Appendix R:

Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (Briggs & Meyers, 1977) Sensing-Intuition Dimension

Measure not included because of copyright (©Briggs & Meyers, 1977)

Appendix S:
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

Directions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself.
Indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

1	2	3	4
strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times, I think I am no good at all.
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 2, 5, 6, 8, 9

Appendix T:

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1989)

Directions: Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not true			somewhat			very true
			true			

1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
4. I have not always been honest with myself.
5. I always know why I like things.
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
11. I never regret my decisions.
12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.

14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
15. I am a completely rational person.
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
17. I am very confident of my judgments.
18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
19. It's alright with me if some people happen to dislike me.
20. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20

Add one point for every answer of 6 or 7

Appendix U:

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988)

Directions: For the following statements, indicate whether each applies to you and to what degree.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly disagree

1. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
2. Modesty doesn't become me.
3. I would do almost anything on a dare.
4. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.
5. If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.
6. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
7. I like to be the center of attention.
8. I will be a success.
9. I think I am a special person.
10. I see myself as a good leader.
11. I am assertive.

12. I like to have authority over other people.
13. I find it easy to manipulate people.
14. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
15. I like to display my body.
16. I can read people like a book.
17. I like to take responsibility for making decisions.
18. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
19. I like to look at my body.
20. I am apt to show off if I get the chance.
21. I always know what I am doing.
22. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.
23. Everybody likes to hear my stories.
24. I expect a great deal from other people.
25. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
26. I like to be complimented.
27. I have a strong will to power.
28. I like to start new fads and fashions.
29. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
30. I really like to be the center of attention.
31. I can live my life in any way that I want to.
32. People always seem to recognize my authority.
33. I would prefer to be a leader.
34. I am going to be a great person.

- 35. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.
- 36. I am a born leader.
- 37. I wish somebody would someday write my autobiography.
- 38. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.
- 39. I am more capable than other people.
- 40. I am an extraordinary person.

Scoring:

Authority subscale: 1, 8, 10, 11, 12, 32, 33, 36

Self-Sufficiency subscale: 17, 21, 22, 31, 34, 39

Superiority subscale: 4, 9, 26, 37, 40

Exhibitionism subscale: 2, 3, 7, 20, 28, 30, 38

Exploitativeness subscale: 6, 13, 16, 23, 35

Vanity subscale: 15, 19, 29

Entitlement subscale: 5, 14, 18, 24, 25, 27

Appendix V:

Ego Control (VI) Scale (Letzring, Block, & Funder, 2005)

Directions: Please answer the following questions by answering “true” or “false” to each question. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions.

1. I tend to buy things on impulse.
2. I become impatient when I have to wait for something.
3. I often say and do things on the spur of the moment, without stopping to think.
4. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
5. I have often had to take orders from someone who did not know as much as I did.
6. When I get bored, I like to stir up some excitement.
7. Some of my family have quick tempers.
8. People consider me a spontaneous, devil-may-care person.
9. I often get involved in things I later wish I could get out of.
10. I have been known to do unusual things on a dare.
11. I have sometimes stayed away from another person because I thought I might do or say something that I might regret afterwards.
12. I do not always tell the truth.
13. My way of doing things can be misunderstood or bother others.
14. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I am not supposed to.
15. At times, I am tempted to do or say something that others would think inappropriate.

16. At times I have very much wanted to leave home.
17. I would like to be a journalist.
18. I like to flirt.
19. Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much.
20. At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much.
21. In a group of people I would not be embarrassed to be called on to start a discussion
or give an opinion about something I know well.
22. I would like to wear expensive clothes.
23. It is unusual for me to express strong approval or disapproval of the actions of others.
24. I like to stop and think things over before I do them.
25. I don't like to start a project until I know exactly how to proceed.
26. I finish one activity or project before starting another.
27. I am steady and planful rather than unpredictable and impulsive.
28. On the whole, I am a cautious person.
29. I keep out of trouble at all costs.
30. I consider a matter from every viewpoint before I make a decision.
31. I am easily downed in an argument.
32. I have never done anything dangerous for the fun of it.
33. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the
same sort of thing.

Scoring:

Reverse score items: 23-33

If true, add one point. Scored to reflect ego undercontrol

Appendix W:

Ego Resiliency Scale (Letzring, Block, & Funder, 2005)

Directions: Please answer the following questions by answering “true” or “false” to each question. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions.

1. I am generous with my friends.
2. I quickly get over and recover from being startled.
3. I enjoy dealing with new and unusual situations.
4. I usually succeed in making a favorable impression on people.
5. I enjoy trying new foods I have never tasted before.
6. I am regarded as a very energetic person.
7. I like to take different paths to familiar places.
8. I am more curious than most people.
9. Most of the people I meet are likable.
10. I usually think carefully about something before acting.
11. I like to do new and different things.
12. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
13. I would be willing to describe myself as a pretty "strong" personality.
14. I get over my anger at someone reasonably quickly.

Appendix X:

Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ; Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson,

Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001)

Directions: This set of questions asks you how frequently specific events actually occur or have occurred in your life. For each question, indicate how often the event occurs in your life.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
never or seldom		sometimes		very often

1. Compared to most people, are you typically unable to get what you want out of life?
2. Growing up, would you ever "cross the line" by doing things that your parents would not tolerate?
3. How often have you accomplished things that got you "psyched" to work even harder?
4. Did you get on your parents' nerves often when you were growing up?
5. How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents?
6. Growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were objectionable?
7. Do you often do well at different things that you try?
8. Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times.
9. When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don't perform as well as I ideally would like to do.

10. I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life.

11. I have found very few hobbies or activities in my life that capture my interest or motivate me to put effort into them.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11

Promotion orientation: 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11

Prevention orientation: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8

Appendix Y:

Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (Zuckerman & Kuhlman, 1993)

Sensation-Seeking Subscale

Directions: The following list of statements may or may not be true for you. After reading each statement carefully, indicate how true each one is for you.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all			somewhat			very
true			true			true

1. I like to have new and exciting experiences and sensations even if they are a little frightening.
2. I like doing things just for the thrill of it.
3. I sometimes do "crazy" things just for fun.
4. I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening.
5. I enjoy getting into new situations where you can't predict how things will turn out.
6. I'll try anything once.
7. I prefer friends who are excitingly unpredictable.
8. I like "wild" uninhibited parties.

9. I would like the kind of life where one is on the move and traveling a lot, with lots of change and excitement.
10. I am an impulsive person.
11. I like to explore a strange city or section of town by myself, even if it means getting lost.
12. I would like to take off on a trip with no preplanned or definite routes or timetables.
13. Before I begin a complicated job, I make careful plans.
14. I very seldom spend much time on the details of planning ahead.
15. I tend to begin a new job without much advance planning on how I will do it.
16. I usually think about what I am going to do before doing it.
17. I often do things on impulse.
18. I often get so carried away by new and exciting things and ideas that I never think of possible complications.
19. I tend to change interests frequently.

Scoring:

Reverse scored items: 13, 16

Appendix Z:

Buss-Durkee Hostility-Guilt Questionnaire (Buss & Durkee, 1957) Negativism Subscale

Directions: The following of questions contain statements that may or may not be true for you. After reading each statement carefully, indicate whether the statement is true or false for you.

1. Unless somebody asks me in a nice way, I won't do what they want.
2. When someone makes a rule I don't like, I am tempted to break it.
3. When someone is bossy, I do the opposite of what he or she asks.
4. When people are bossy, I take my time just to show them.
5. Occasionally when I am mad at someone, I will give them the "silent treatment."

Appendix AA:

Hong Psychological Reactance Scale (Hong & Faedda, 1996)

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly		neither agree nor		strongly
disagree		disagree		agree

1. Regulations trigger a sense of resistance in me.
2. I find contradicting others stimulating.
3. When something is prohibited, I usually think “that’s exactly what I am going to do.”
4. I consider advice from others to be an intrusion.
5. I become frustrated when I am unable to make free and independent decisions.
6. It irritates me when someone points out things that are obvious to me.
7. I become angry when my freedom of choice is restricted.
8. Advice and recommendations induce me to do just the opposite.
9. I resist the attempts of others to influence me.
10. It makes me angry when another person is held up as a model for me to follow.
11. When someone forces me to do something, I feel like doing the opposite.

Appendix AB:

Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992)

Directions: Using the 5 point scale shown below, indicate how uncharacteristic or characteristic each of the following statements is in describing you.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
extremely	somewhat	neither	somewhat	extremely
uncharacteristic	uncharacteristic	uncharacteristic	characteristic of	characteristic of
of me	of me	nor	me	me
		characteristic of		
		me		

1. Some of my friends think I am a hothead
2. If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will.
3. When people are especially nice to me, I wonder what they want. H
4. I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.
5. I have become so mad that I have broken things.
6. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.
7. I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.
8. Once in a while, I can't control the urge to strike another person.
9. I am an even-tempered person.
10. I am suspicious of overly friendly strangers.

11. I have threatened people I know.
12. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.
13. Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.
14. When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.
15. I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.
16. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person.
17. At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.
18. I have trouble controlling my temper.
19. When frustrated, I let my irritation show.
20. I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back.
21. I often find myself disagreeing with people.
22. If somebody hits me, I hit back.
23. I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.
24. Other people always seem to get the breaks.
25. There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.
26. I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back.
27. My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.
28. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.
29. I get into fights a little more than the average person.

Scoring:

Reverse Scored: 9, 16

Physical Aggression: 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 22, 25, 29

Verbal Aggression: 4, 6, 14, 21, 27

Anger: 1, 9, 12, 18, 19, 23, 28

Hostility: 3, 7, 10, 15, 17, 20, 24, 26

The total score for Aggression is the sum of the factor scores.

Appendix AC:

Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, & Edwards, 1994)

Directions: For each of the statements below, please indicate whether or not the statement is characteristic of you. If the statement is extremely uncharacteristic of you (not at all like you) please fill-in a "1" on the answer sheet; if the statement is extremely characteristic of you (very much like you) please fill-in a "5" on the answer sheet. And, of course, use the numbers in the middle if you fall between the extremes. Please keep the following scale in mind as you rate each of the statements below.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
extremely	somewhat	uncertain	somewhat	extremely
uncharacteristic	uncharacteristic		characteristic	characteristic

1. I consider how things might be in the future, and try to influence those things with my day to day behavior.
2. Often I engage in a particular behavior in order to achieve outcomes that may not result for many years.
3. I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring the future will take care of itself.
4. My behavior is only influenced by the immediate (i.e., a matter of days or weeks) outcomes of my actions.

5. My convenience is a big factor in the decisions I make or the actions I take.
6. I am willing to sacrifice my immediate happiness or well-being in order to achieve future outcomes.
7. I think it is important to take warnings about negative outcomes seriously even if the negative outcome will not occur for many years.
8. I think it is more important to perform a behavior with important distant consequences than a behavior with less-important immediate consequences.
9. I generally ignore warnings about possible future problems because I think the problems will be resolved before they reach crisis level.
10. I think that sacrificing now is usually unnecessary since future outcomes can be dealt with at a later time.
11. I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring that I will take care of future problems that may occur at a later date.
12. Since my day to day work has specific outcomes, it is more important to me than behavior that has distant outcomes.

Scoring:

Reverse scored: 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12

Appendix AD:
Self-Construal Questionnaire (Singelis, 1994)

Directions: Please go through the following 24 statements and write the number in the box on the right-hand side, which most accurately describes how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement.

Response Scale:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly	disagree	neither agree nor	Agree	strongly agree
disagree		disagree		

1. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
2. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.
3. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
4. Speaking up during a class is not a problem for me.
5. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
6. Having a lively imagination is important to me.
7. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor.
8. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
9. I respect people who are modest about themselves.
10. I am the same person at home that I am at school.

11. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
12. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
13. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
14. I act the same way no matter who I am with.
15. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.
16. I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.
17. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
18. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.
19. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with the group.
20. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
21. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
22. My personal identity independent of others, is very important to me.
23. Even when I strongly disagree with the group members, I avoid an argument.
24. I value being in good health above everything.

Scoring:

Interdependence: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23

Independence: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24

Appendix AE:

Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (Downey & Feldman, 1996)

Directions: Each of the items below describes things college students sometimes ask of other people. Please imagine that you are in each situation. You will be asked to answer the following questions

- 1) How concerned or anxious would you be about how the other person would respond?
- 2) How do you think the other person would be likely to respond?

1. *You ask someone in class if you can borrow his/her notes.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to lend you his/her notes?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that the person would willingly give me his/her notes.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

2. *You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to move in with you.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not he/she also would want to move in with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to move in with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

3. *You ask your parents for help in deciding what programs to apply to.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want to help you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that they would want to help me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

4. *You ask someone you don't know well out on a date.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to go out with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that the person would want to go out on a date with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

5. *Your boyfriend/girlfriend has plans to go out with friends tonight, but you really want to spend the evening with him/her, and you tell him/her so.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would decide to stay in?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would willingly choose to stay in with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

6. *You ask your parents for extra money to cover living expenses.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would help you out?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that my parents would not mind helping me out.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

7. *After class, you tell your professor that you have been having some trouble with a section of the course and ask if he/she can give you some extra help.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your professor would want to help you out?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that the professor would want to help me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

8. *You approach a close friend to talk after doing or saying something that seriously upset him/her.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to talk with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to talk with me try to work things out.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

9. *You ask someone in one of your classes to coffee.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to go?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to go with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

10. *After graduation you can't find a job and you ask your parents if you can live at home for a while.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want you to come home?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that I would be welcome at home

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

11. *You ask your friend to go on vacation with you over Spring Break.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to go with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to go with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

12. *You call your boyfriend/girlfriend after a bitter argument and tell him/her you want to see him/her.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would want to see you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to see me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

13. *You ask a friend if you can borrow something of his/hers.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to loan it to you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would willingly loan me it.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

14. *You ask your parents to come to an occasion important to you.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want to come?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that they would want to come.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

15. *You ask a friend to do you a big favor.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to help you out?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would willingly agree to help me out.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

16. *You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend if he/she really loves you.*

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would say yes?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would answer yes sincerely.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

17. *You go to a party and notice someone on the other side of the room, and then you ask them to dance.*

How concerned would you be over whether or not the person would want to dance with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to dance with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

18. *You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to come home to meet your parents.*

How concerned would you be about whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would want to meet your parents?

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unconcerned					concerned

I would expect that he/she would want to meet my parents.

1	2	3	4	5	6
very					very
unlikely					likely

Scoring:

For each question multiply part a by the reverse scored part b. Take the mean of all items for overall score.

REFERENCES

- Altemyer, R. A. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 47-91). New York: Academic Press.
- American National Election Studies (ANES). (1999). *Patriotism Scale, 1987 Pilot Election Study*. University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th Edition, Text Revision). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing
- Batson, C. D. (1990). How social an animal? The human capacity for caring. *American Psychologist*, 45, 336-346.
- Batson, C. D. (1994). Why act for the public good? Four answers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 603-610, p. 606.
- Batson, C. D., & Coke, J. S. (1981). Empathy: A source of altruistic motivation for helping? In J. P. Rushton & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior: Social, personality, and developmental perspectives* (pp. 167-187). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1999). On the interface between personality and social psychology. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 367-377). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Beall, L. (1972). *Shame-Guilt Test*. Berkeley, CA: Wright Institute.
- Benedict, R. (1946). *The chrysanthemum and the sword*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Briggs, K. C., & Myers, I. B. (1976). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Form G*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Brown, R. (1954). Mass phenomena. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 833-876). Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Buss, A.H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452-459.
- Buss, D. M., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility in clinical situations. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 343-348.
- Cheek, J. M., & Hogan, R. (1983). Self-concepts, self-presentations, and moral judgments. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenswald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 249-273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cohen, T. R., Montoya, R. M., and Insko, C. A. (2006). Group morality and intergroup relations: Cross-cultural and experimental evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1-14.
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
- Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of Rejection Sensitivity for Intimate Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1327-1343.
- Durkheim, E. (1953). *Sociology and philosophy* (D. F. Pocock, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Original work published in 1896).
- Eisenberg, N. (1986). *Altruistic cognition, emotion, and behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eysenck, H. J., Eysenck, S. B. G. & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 21-29.
- Ferguson, T. J., & Stegge, H. (1995). Emotional states and traits in children: The case of guilt and shame. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 174-197). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., & Damhuis, I. (1991). Children's understanding of guilt and shame. *Child Development*, 62, 827-839.
- Freud, S. (1953). Three essays on the theory of sexuality. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 7, pp. 153-243). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1905).
- Freud, S. (1957). On narcissism: An introduction. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 73-102). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1914).
- Freud, S. (1961a). The id and the ego. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 12-66). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1923).

- Freud, S. (1961b). The dissolution of the Oedipus complex. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 173-182). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1924).
- Freud, S. (1961c). Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 248-258). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1925).
- Fultz, J., Batson, C. D., Fortenbach, V. A., McCarthy, P. M., & Varney, L. L. (1986). Social evaluation and the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 761-769.
- Gramzow, R., & Tangney, J. P. (1992). Proneness to shame and the narcissistic personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 369-376.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (2nd Edition). Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Higgins, E. T. (1989). Self-discrepancy theory: What patterns of self-beliefs cause people to suffer? In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 22, pp. 93-136). New York: Academic Press.
- Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3-23.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Developmental of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg-Berg (Ed.), *Development of prosocial behavior* (pp. 281-313). New York: Academic Press.
- Hong, S. M., & Faedda, S. (1996). Refinement of the Hong psychological reactance scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 173-182.
- Insko, C. A., Kirchner, J. L., Pinter, B., Efaw, J., & Wildschut, T. (2005). Interindividual-intergroup discontinuity as a function of trust and categorization: The paradox of expected cooperation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 365-385.
- Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Hoyle, R. H., Dardis, G. J. & Graetz, K. A. (1990). Individual-group discontinuity as a function of fear and greed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 68-79.
- Insko, C. A. & Schopler, J. (1998). Differential distrust of groups and individuals. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, and C. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- John, O., Donahue, E., & Kentle, R. (1991). *The "Big Five" Inventory – Versions 4a and 54*. Technical Report, Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley.
- Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Huang, Y. H., Park, J. Y., Johnson, S. B., & Nagoshi, C. T. (1987). Guilt, shame and adjustment in three cultures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 8, 357-364.
- Kramer, R. M., C. G. McClintock, and Messick D. M. (1986). Social values and cooperative response to a simulated resource conservation crisis. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 576-591.
- Le Bon, G. (1896). *The crowd*. London: Unwin. (Original work published in 1895).
- Leith, K. P., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1-37.
- Letzring, T. D., Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (2005). Ego-control and ego-resiliency: Generalization of self-report scales based on personality descriptions from self, acquaintances, and clinicians. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 395-422.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Marschall, D. E. (1996). Effects of induced shame on subsequent empathy and altruistic behavior. Unpublished master's thesis, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- McCallum, D. M., Harring, K., Gilmore, R., Drenan, S., Chase, J. P., Insko, C. A., & Thibaut, J. (1985). Competition and cooperation between groups and between individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 21, 301-320.
- McClintock, C. G. & Liebrand, W. B. G. (1988). The role of interdependence structure, individual value orientation and other's strategy in social decision making: A transformational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 396-409.
- McDougall, W. (1920). *The group mind*. New York: Putnam.
- O'Connor, L. E., Berry, J. W., & Weiss, J. (1999). Interpersonal guilt, shame and psychological problems. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 181-203.
- Paulhus, D.L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp.17-59). New York: Academic Press.

- Pemberton, M. B., Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (1996). Memory for and experience of differential competitive behavior of individuals and groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 953-966.
- Perlman, M. (1958). An investigation of anxiety as related to guilt and shame. *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, 80, 752-759.
- Pinter, B., Insko, C. A., Wildschut, T., Kirchner, J. L., Montoya, R. M., & Wolf, S. T. (2006). Reduction of interindividual-intergroup discontinuity: The role of leader accountability and proneness to guilt. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Plato (1871/1999). *The republic* (B. Jowett, trans.). New York: QPB (Original work translated in 1871).
- Poundstone, W. (1992). *Prisoner's Dilemma*. Doubleday: New York.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variability predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Raskin, R. N., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890-902.
- Reed, A., & Aquino, K. F. (2003). Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard toward out groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1270-2186.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schopler, J., Insko, C. A., Drigotas, S., Graetz, K. A., Smith, V. A., & Dahl, K. (1993). Individual-group discontinuity: Further evidence for mediation by fear and greed. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 419-431.
- Schopler, J., Insko, C. A., Drigotas, S., Wieselquist, J., Pemberton, M., & Cox, C. (1995). The role of identifiability in the reduction of interindividual-intergroup discontinuity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 31, 553-574.
- Singelis, T. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580-591.
- Smith, R. H., Webster, J. M., Parrott, W. G., & Eyre, H. L. (2002). The role of public exposure in moral and nonmoral shame and guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 138-59.

- Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D. S., & Edwards, C. S. (1994). The consideration of future consequences: *Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 742-752.
- Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 598-607.
- Tangney, J. P. (1992). Situational determinants of shame and guilt in young adulthood. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 199-206.
- Tangney, J. P. (1994). The mixed legacy of the super-ego: Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of shame and guilt. In J. M. Masling & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on object relations theory* (pp. 1-28). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tangney, J. P. (1995). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 114-139). New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P. (2003). Self-relevant emotions. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 384-400). New York: Guilford.
- 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 Press.
- Tangney J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. H. (1996). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1256-1269.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., & Gramzow, R. (1989). *The test of self-conscious affect (TOSCA)*. George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Proneness of shame, proneness to guilt, and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 469-478.
- Tooke, W.S., & Ickes, W. (1988). A measure of adherence to conventional morality. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 7, 310-334.
- Van Lange, P.A.M., & Kuhlman, D.M. (1994). Social value orientations and impressions of partner's honesty and intelligence: A test of the might versus morality effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 126-141.

- Van Lange P. A. M., & Liebrand, W. B. G. (1991). Social value orientation and intelligence: A test of the goal prescribes rationality principle. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 273-292.
- Van Vugt, M., Van Lange, P.A.M., Meertens, R.M. (1996) Commuting by car or public transportation? A social dilemma analysis of travel mode judgements. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 373-395.
- Wicker, F. W., Payne, G. C., & Morgan, R. D. (1983). Participant descriptions of guilt and shame. *Motivation and Emotion*, 7, 25-39.
- Wildschut, T., & Insko, C. A. (2006). A paradox of individual and group morality. In P. A. M. Van Lange (Ed.), *Bridging social psychology* (pp. 377-384). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wildschut, T., Insko, C. A., & Gaertner, L. (2002). Intragroup social influence and intergroup competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 975-992.
- Wildschut, T., Insko, C. A., & Pinter, B. (2004). The perception of outgroup threat: Content and activation of the outgroup schema. In V. Yzerbyt, C. M. Judd, & O. Corneille (Eds.), *The psychology of group perception* (pp. 335-360). New York: Psychology Press.
- Wildschut, T., Pinter, B., Vevea, J., Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (2003). Beyond the group mind: A qualitative review of the interindividual-intergroup discontinuity effect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 698-722.
- Yamagishi, T. (1986). The provision of a sanctioning system as a public good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 110-116.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., & Robinson, J. (1995). Empathy and guilt: Early origins of feelings of responsibility. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 143-173). New York: Guilford Press.
- Zuckerman, M. (2002). Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (ZKPQ): An alternative five-factorial model. In B. DeRaad and M. Perusini (Eds.), *Big five assessment* (pp. 377-396). Seattle WA: Hogrefe and Huber Publishers.