

THE DARK SIDE OF RELIGION,  
SPIRITUALITY AND THE MORAL EMOTIONS:  
SHAME, GUILT, AND NEGATIVE RELIGIOSITY  
AS MARKERS FOR LIFE DISSATISFACTION

Kelly Murray, Ph.D. & Joseph W. Ciarrocchi, Ph.D.  
Loyola College in Maryland

**Abstract**

This study examines the relationship among levels of spirituality, religiosity, shame, and guilt on subjective well-being. A convenience sample that included graduate and undergraduate students (N = 176; mean age = 37) completed a five-factor measure of personality as well as measures of spirituality, religiosity, shame, guilt, and subjective well-being. The more one felt disconnected from God, or had spiritual struggles, the more shame and guilt one experienced. These spiritual struggles also lead to increased congregational conflict and increased negative affect and overall subjective well-being. The higher one's satisfaction with life the more congregational support they experienced thereby decreasing spiritual struggles. One's positive spiritual experiences, private religious practices and congregational support predicted subjective well-being. These findings suggest that spirituality, especially one's spiritual struggles, are related to overall subjective well-being, indicating that these topics are particularly relevant for pastoral psychology.

**The Dark Side of Religion, Spirituality and the Moral  
Emotions: Shame, Guilt, and Negative Religiosity  
as Markers for Life Dissatisfaction**

The moral emotions of shame and guilt have long been thought of as negative and impeding. In fact, as far back as Adam and Eve, with the consequences of partaking in the forbidden fruit, shame and guilt have played dramatic roles in relationships and well-being (Watts, 2001). The intersection of the constructs of shame, guilt, religion, spirituality and well-being is often intertwined in the psychological and theological literature; the question arises as to what are the processes by which they relate to each other.

Traditionally the field of psychology has been ambivalent about shame and guilt with the emphasis on the negative, believing that these constructs reduced well-being and caused neurosis (Baumeister, Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994; Tangney, 1992, 1995). Consequently clinical work focused on attempting to lessen shame and guilt. The constructs of shame and guilt were often used synonymously in psychological research and treatment. In fact while shame and guilt often overlap, can co-occur, and are both affective reactions to internal and external standards, they do not have the same relationship effects (Baumeister, 1998; Lewis, 1971). Helen Block Lewis (1971) first influenced a change in the traditional view of shame and guilt and began the process of operationalizing them as distinct phenomena. She differentiated guilt as the experience of negative affect after engaging in a specific egregious action, while shame goes a step further to all-encompassing negative feelings about the self. To employ a sporting analogy, guilt follows from violating rules while shame occurs when one falls short of the goal. Guilt, then, involves some transgression, whereas shame relates to the feeling of not measuring up. June Tangney's (2002) empirical work on shame and guilt then provided empirical support for this more nuanced view. Her work suggested that guilt is often prosocial and motivating. At the same time she found that shame predicts decreased well-being. Tangney concluded that shame and guilt are distinctly different from each other cognitively, affectively and emotionally.

Ongoing empirical research shows that guilt can actually be healthy and promote one's interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships. Guilt is deeply tied to interpersonal connections in relationships; it acts to bind and strengthen those bonds while fostering prosocial, reparative behavior and enhancing empathy. Additionally, guilt has been found to be unrelated to psychopathology (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995, Tangney, 1992; Tangney, 1995) Shame, however, has been found to correlate with aggression, anger, a lack of empathy, disregard for others, substance abuse and a host of other psychological symptoms, including depression. Shame is less adaptive and affects a sense of self and self-worth in a global and negative manner (Dearing, Stuewig, & Tangney, 2005; Tangney, 1995; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992).

Theology nuances these distinctions even further by viewing each construct as having positive and negative aspects. Watts (2001) espouses the idea of good guilt and bad guilt, good shame and bad shame. His work is seminal in discussing the constructive properties of shame. He notes that,

Once consciousness has developed sufficiently to permit shame, shame functions to maintain and enforce the boundary between ourselves and the other. We need shame to remind us of our distinctness... Shame can also remind us of our humanity, bodiliness and mortality...The shame that arises from falling short of our ideals is more likely to be constructive than the shame that arises from falling short of our grandiosity. (p. 57)

According to Watts, shame can be constructive by bringing into awareness personal limitations which can serve as motivation to connect with others, to have a deeper sense of reverence, and develop a keen awareness of reality. Shame can also be destructive. In its worst form, shame can be alienating, debilitating, and negatively correlated with self-esteem and empathy. Individuals experiencing shame may give-up and/or pursue unhealthy forms of relief from their feelings of shame. Similarly, Watts (2001) discusses the polar differences of guilt. While experiencing too much guilt can cause neurosis, excessive self-focus and lack of self assertion, its positive effects can motivate, be prosocial regulators, and enhance one's relationship with God. Along with Watts, other writers have emphasized that religion, which traditionally emphasized guilt and shame (theologically sometimes synonymous with sin) can also be the vehicle for lessening or overcoming the maladaptive effects of shame and guilt (Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 1996; Luyten, Corveleyn, & Fontaine, 1998; Vergote, 1998).

To understand shame and guilt in the context of religious and spiritual experience requires an equally nuanced approach to these variables. Just as shame and guilt have been found to be distinct constructs so have spirituality and religiosity. Zinnbauer et al. (1997) found religiousness to be associated with higher levels of authoritarianism, religious orthodoxy, intrinsic religiousness, parental religious attendance, self-righteousness, and church attendance. Work based on Allport's (1950) concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity has focused on spirituality, or the degree to which

an individual describes his or her world view in terms of openness to transcendence. Such a self-definition may or may not include public religious expression. Evidence suggests that the religious and spiritual dimensions, while sometimes overlapping, often correlate differentially to psychosocial outcomes thereby yielding more robust information (Hill & Pargament, 2003; Piedmont, Ciarrocchi, Dy-Liacco, Mapa, and Williams, 2003). Others (Elkins, Hedstrom, Hughes, Leaf, and Saunders, 1988) described spirituality as the experience of searching for meaning and purpose as well as *something more* or transcendent. Miller and Thoresen (1999) delineated spirituality as an attribute of an individual (much like a personality trait) while religiosity is understood as encompassing more of the beliefs, rituals, and practices associated with an institution. Piedmont et al. (2001; 2003) have empirically defined religiosity as being shaped by the community and/or social structure. Spirituality, on the other hand, is most concerned with one's personal relationship to God or a higher power. Despite the considerable theoretical and empirical interest in the distinction between religion and spirituality most people in population surveys identify themselves as having some degree of both. In the General Social Survey in the United States 85% of the population described themselves as being religious to some degree and 88% viewed themselves as spiritual (Idler et al., 2003).

Religion and spirituality have been linked, positively and negatively, to a host of outcomes across multiple domains of physical and mental health (Baumeister, 2002; Pargament, 1997). Religious coping has been found to be a significant predictor for outcomes in illness and health, war, victimization and death (Pargament, Smith, Koenig, & Perez, 1998). Religious coping has also been found to be positively efficacious during times of crisis and stress. Pargament (1997) reported that during stressful life events, or during crisis, religious beliefs and practices are translated into various forms of coping methods which can directly impact a person's health. Positive and negative religious coping can take many forms. Positive religious coping can be seen in the expression of spirituality as feeling secure in relationship with God, feeling spiritually connected with self and others, seeking spiritual support and feeling a connected congregational relationship. Negative religious coping, commonly referred to now as "spiritual struggles" (Murray-Swank, Pargament, & Mahoney, 2005) on the other hand, can be viewed as having a less

secure relationship with God, with a greater struggle with meaning and belief in God, with a more disconnected congregational relationship, and more spiritual discontent (Pargament et al., 1998; Zinnbaur & Pargament, 1998). The concept and manifestation of spiritual struggles has been highlighted in recent writings about Mother Teresa. While famous for her charity and endless toil for the underserved, she has admitted desolation over her personal crisis of faith. While her missionary work may have buffered her profound spiritual struggle, she found little consolation or relief in her spirituality or belief in God (Van Biema, 2007).

One way to evaluate the differential effects of shame and guilt and their connection to religion and spirituality is to examine their ability to predict aspects of psychological well-being alone or in combination with each other. The concept of well-being, defined as one's negative emotion, positive emotion, and cognitive well-being (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwartz, 1999) as related to spirituality and religiosity is inconsistent, although the preponderance of evidence indicates a positive relationship with enhanced well-being. Studies have found religious beliefs positively correlated to positive emotion but with no relationship with negative emotions (Clark & Watson, 1999; Francis & Kaldor, 2002; Watson & Clark, 1993). Research that controlled for personality also found that spirituality predicted the positive aspects of subjective well-being, but did not predict negative emotionality (Ciarrocchi & Deneke, 2005; Geary, Ciarrocchi, & Scheers, 2004; Golden, Piedmont, Ciarrocchi & Rodgeron, 2004). Other researchers, however, found no relationship between any aspect of well-being and measures of religious coping (Francis, Jones, & Wilcox, 1997; Koenig, Siegler, & George, 1989).

The challenge for variables related to religiosity and spirituality at this juncture is to determine whether they are significant predictors of important psychosocial outcomes in their own right, or whether, according to some critics (VanWicklin, 1990), these effects may be spurious and represent the 'religification' of robust, established psychological variables. In other words, in terms of the present study, can the spiritual and religious aspects of personal experience have a significant relationship with subjective well-being even when the effects of powerful constructs such as shame and guilt are included?

This study, therefore, asks several questions. First, do shame and guilt predict differentially to subjective well-being in keeping with Tangney's hypotheses? Second, do spirituality and religiosity predict differentially to shame and guilt? Previous research suggests that spirituality might be related to decreased shame and guilt, while religiosity might be related in an inverse way. Finally, do spirituality and religiosity make an independent contribution to subjective well-being or do shame and guilt fully mediate these relationships? To examine this last issue we will use the incremental validity model recommended by Piedmont (1999) in order to provide a stringent empirical test for religious and spiritual variables. Personality has been found to account for a large variance in subjective well-being research (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998), thereby making it essential to control for this relationship as well.

## **Method**

### ***Participants***

Participants were recruited from a small Catholic liberal arts college on the east coast (U.S.A.). A total of 176 undergraduates and graduate students completed the surveys including 126 women (71.6%) and 50 men (28.4%) with a mean age of 36.7 years (range: 18-80). Ethnic make-up was 68% Caucasian, 18% African American, 6% Asian, 2% Hispanic, 2% Middle Eastern, and 4% other. Religious affiliations were 46% Protestant, 33% Catholic, 2% Jewish, 11% other religion unspecified, and 8% atheist or agnostic.

### ***Materials***

*State Shame and Guilt Scale (SSGS)*. The SSGS was originally developed by Marshall, Sanftner, and Tangney (1994). The SSGS is a self-rating scale of in-the-moment (state) feelings of shame, guilt, and pride experiences. There are 15 items (5 for each of the 3 subscales) and they are rated on a five-point Likert scale. Alpha reliability was .84 for both shame and guilt.

*Multidimensional Religious/Spiritual Scale*. Consistent with the understanding that religious experience encompasses various dimensions, participants completed relevant subscales of the 40-item Brief Multidimensional Scale of Religion and Spirituality (BMSRS).

Developed by a combined working group from the National Institute on Aging and the Fetzer Institute (Idler et al., 2003) the BMSRS covers eleven domains of religious experience, such as religious affiliation, public and private religious experiences, forgiveness, religious coping, and daily spiritual experiences. In the current study four content areas were explored-- spirituality, religiosity, congregational conflict and alienation from God. Spirituality was measured by the Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale, which measures the frequency that a person reports feeling a sense of closeness to God or spiritual reality. Examples of the items are, "I feel God's presence", "I feel a deep inner peace or harmony", and "I am spiritually touched by the beauty of creation." Respondents answered these items on a six-point scale that ranged from *Many times a day*, to *Never or almost never*. Religiosity was measured by two questions: "How often do you go to religious services?," and "Besides religious services, how often do you take part in activities at a place of worship?" Both of these questions were six-point scales from *More than once a week* to *Never*. Spiritual struggles were measured by two items: "I feel God is punishing me for my sins or lack of spirituality" and "I wonder whether God has abandoned me." Respondents answered these items on a four-point scale ranging from *A great deal*. to *Not at all*. Alpha reliability for this study was .88 for daily spiritual experiences, and .70 for religiosity (no alpha reliability was computed for God Alienation as it is only two questions).

*Adjective Checklist.* We measured personality according to the five-factor model, a standardized theory that captures a wide range of individual differences (McCrae & Costa, 1999). The five factors include neuroticism (tendency to experience negative emotion), extraversion (tendency toward sociability and positive experience of emotions), openness to experience (degree to which one is open to different types of experience), agreeableness (tendency to be cooperative and oriented toward others), and conscientiousness (degree to which one sets goals and adheres to responsible behavioral patterns). The 50-item Adjective Checklist (Goldberg, 1999) measured these five factors of personality on a 5-point scale, from *very inaccurate*, to *very accurate*. Some sample items are: "I am the life of the party." "I change my mood a lot" and "I have excellent ideas." Alpha reliability for this study was .87 for extraversion, .82 for agreeableness, .80 for conscientiousness, .87 for neuroticism, and .74 for openness.

*The Positive and Negative Affect Schedules (PANAS)*. The PANAS was designed by Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988) to assess the affective component of well-being. This instrument contains two subscales each with 10 items, measuring positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA). The PANAS is scored using self-ratings on a five-point scale, from *very slightly or not at all* to *extremely*. Alpha reliability for this study was .87 for positive affect and .75 for negative affect.

*Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)*. This instrument is a single-factor five-item measure of cognitive global life satisfaction developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen (1985). The SWLS is scored on a seven-point scale from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Sample items include: "I am satisfied with my life," and "In most ways my life is close to ideal." Alpha reliability for the current study was .86.

## Results

### *Descriptive Statistics*

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the study variables.

### *Correlations between Predictors*

Interestingly, shame was highly positively correlated with guilt,  $r = .65, p < .05$ . There were also correlations between shame and guilt with certain spirituality variables. The more one felt disconnected from God, or had spiritual struggles, the more shame ( $r = .42, p < .05$ ) and guilt ( $r = .30, p < .05$ ) one reported. Likewise, the more shame ( $r = .20, p < .05$ ), and guilt ( $r = .23, p < .05$ ) one reported, the more likely they were to report experiencing a conflict with their congregation. Shame and guilt were also positively correlated with the personality trait of neuroticism ( $r = .39, r = .37, p < .05$ ). The spirituality variables of spiritual experience ( $r = -.17, p < .05$ ) and spiritual struggles ( $r = .35, p < .05$ ) were also significantly correlated with neuroticism. Thus, despite the moderate correlations between shame, guilt, and personality these variables are not redundant, indicating that shame and guilt are independent of personality.

### ***Correlations of Predictors with Outcomes***

Higher levels of shame were significantly correlated with higher levels of negative affect ( $r = .50, p < .05$ ) and lower levels of satisfaction with life ( $r = -.42, p < .05$ ). Guilt, too, was negatively correlated with negative affect ( $r = -.32, p < .05$ ), but had no correlation with satisfaction with life. In terms of religious variables, satisfaction with life correlated with greater congregational support ( $r = .15, p < .05$ ), along with decreased congregational conflict ( $r = -.19, p < .05$ ) and spiritual struggles ( $r = -.26, p < .05$ ). Additionally, greater levels of positive affect were positively correlated with private religious practices ( $r = .20, p < .05$ ) and religious attendance ( $r = .16, p < .05$ ). Satisfaction with life was positively correlated to spirituality ( $r = .15, p < .05$ ), but not to religious practices or religious attendance.

As expected, the personality variables had moderate to strong relationships with the outcome variables. Neuroticism was strongly related to negative affect and decreased life satisfaction. Consistent with the subject well-being literature extraversion and conscientiousness were positively related to both positive affect and life satisfaction.

### ***Tests of Hypotheses***

A series of multiple, hierarchical regressions tested the main hypotheses, which stated that spirituality and religiosity will predict subjective well-being over and above shame, guilt and personality. The analyses were further specified to determine the unique contributions of each predictor to well-being. Table 2 presents the results of the regression models with negative affect, positive affect and life satisfaction as the criterion variables. In each of the models, personality explained a significant amount of the variance for negative affect, positive affect and for life satisfaction over and above age. The effect sizes for personality ranged from  $R^2 = .15$  for life satisfaction to  $R^2 = .39$  for negative affect.

*Negative Affect.* Shame, guilt, and congregational conflict explain unique variance in negative affect above and beyond personality and age. Furthermore, only spiritual struggles continue to explain significant unique additional variance in negative affect over personality, age, shame, and guilt.

*Positive Affect.* Shame, spiritual experiences, private religious practices, congregational support and spiritual struggles explained unique variance in positive affect above and beyond personality in predicting positive affect. Additionally, as with negative affect, only spiritual struggles explained significant unique additional variance over personality, shame, and guilt.

*Life Satisfaction.* Shame, congregational conflict, and spiritual struggles explained unique variance in life satisfaction above and beyond personality.

*Unique Contributions of Predictor Variables.* Table 3 displays the standardized Beta coefficients of the predictor variables, which represent each predictor's unique contribution to the explanation of the subjective well-being components. As expected, the personality variables of neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness had strong relationships with the outcomes. After controlling for personality, the variables of shame, guilt, and spirituality explained additional significant variance to subjective well-being. Increased shame was related to increased negative affect along with less subjective well being. Guilt predicted increased negative affect, but not positive affect or life satisfaction. Spiritual experiences, private religious practices and congregational support were positively related to positive well-being, while spiritual struggles were related to increased emotional distress and decreased positive affect and satisfaction with life. Additionally spiritual struggles predicted all facets of subjective well-being above personality and guilt. Shame and personality, however, fully mediated the relationship between spiritual struggles and positive affect.

## **Discussion**

This study examined the relative contribution of spirituality, religiosity, shame, and guilt on subjective well-being outcomes, as measured by negative affect, positive affect, and life satisfaction. The variables of spiritual experiences, private religious practices, congregational support, and spiritual struggles were each individually examined to determine their relationship with subjective well being. The findings indicated that positive spiritual experiences and

personal religious practices predict subjective well being controlling for personality, thus replicating previous research (Pargament, 1998). Religious attendance, however, did not predict subjective well being, replicating previous research in the area of positive psychology and spirituality (Ciarrocchi & Deneke, 2004).

There is a noteworthy connection between subjective well being, even when controlling for personality, with spiritual struggles and congregational conflict. The more one struggled spiritually, the greater the amount of negative affect and the less life satisfaction. These results also proved true for congregational conflict. Guilt did not eliminate these effects, whereas shame mediated it only for overall life satisfaction. Of further note is that congregational support predicted positive emotions. These results support the idea that negative spiritual struggles are moderately related to symptoms of emotional distress. Thus this study identified a link between spiritual struggles and decreased subjective well-being independent of such indicators as shame, guilt and personality. A further important link is the perception of congregation on subjective well-being. This study highlights the association between the perception of being supported within a congregation being a positive experience that is associated with increased subjective well-being versus feeling conflict within the congregation associated with decreased well-being, even after accounting for personality. Although these results are correlational in nature they merit mention for pastoral counselors working in the field, especially those working in congregations. It may be that happy people see positive aspects in their congregation and are happier because of it, or it could be that they strive to create a positive experience for themselves across broad experiences. The inverse could be hypothesized for those people who feel their congregation is conflictual. It is also possible that they see negative aspects of their congregation because they are unhappy anyway versus truly experiencing less subjective well-being as a result of feeling conflict within their congregation. Since this is a correlational study it is impossible to identify causation, yet the results indicate that congregational satisfaction has relevance for pastoral counseling and psychology.

These are noteworthy findings in that little empirical research in the psychology of religion controls for the effects of personality when studying subjective well-being. In the past this has led to criticism that

a variety of plausible alternatives to religious and spiritual variables predictors could account for their link to happiness. This current study, controlling for personality, demonstrates that spirituality is a robust predictor above personality to subjective well-being.

This study attempted, further, to tease out the relative contribution of shame and guilt to subjective well-being. As expected, both shame and guilt contributed to negative well-being. From these results it seems evident that experiencing these so-called moral emotions could lead to experiencing emotional distress, decreased positive emotions, and a lower sense of satisfaction with life. Even when controlling for personality, guilt predicted increased emotional distress, while shame predicted to all three dimensions of subjective well-being. Shame and guilt surely justify the clinical attention they receive in terms of their connection to emotional impairment and general dissatisfaction.

An intriguing and interesting aspect of this study was the relationship among shame, guilt, spirituality, and religiosity. As measured here, shame and guilt had no connection to positive dimensions of spirituality or religious behaviors – whether private or public. Shame and guilt are, however, related to negative dimensions of spirituality and religious experience – increased alienation from God and congregational dissatisfaction. Both these negative aspects of religiosity predict decreased subjective well-being controlling for personality, but their effects are fully mediated by shame. This should make shame a special target for pastoral psychology and counseling. To put it differently, shame is closely connected to feeling spiritually alienated yet, paradoxically, does not appear to reduce an overall sense of spiritual connection or eliminate engaging in religious practices. This suggests that shame has a complex relationship with spirituality and religiosity depending on the nature of the spiritual experience or religious activity. As suggested by the biographies of religious and spiritual exemplars, a person who experiences God as alien and perhaps punishing may still maintain an array of religious and spiritual practices.

Cross-sectional snapshots of shame paint a distressing portrait of current emotional and psychological experience. It may be that there can be developmental gains from a temporary dose of shame and spiritual alienation. Only longitudinal studies could demonstrate

whether shame and spiritual struggles together might represent a stage that triggers eventual spiritual growth, or whether it is a more permanent condition foreboding decreased psychological well-being. For now, it remains to be tested by empirical research whether such a “dark night of the soul” could be beneficial. The measures used in this study do not differentiate the subtleties of an approach such as Watts suggesting beneficial aspects to shame and represent an area for further empirical refinement. We may have been picking up trait or personality aspects of shame and guilt, versus the situational aspects of affect of shame and guilt. It may be that a person has a dispositional component to their experience of shame and guilt that ultimately gets reflected as part of their personality, specifically neuroticism and negative aspects of spirituality. What this scale may not have been sensitive to is a person’s situational experiences of shame and guilt that may be experienced as positively motivational, prosocial, and related to enhancing relationships.

When considering shame and guilt as emotions, it is difficult to imagine they are not reflected on a continuum from positive to negative. Aside from Watts, there is little research or writing on the potential positive aspects of shame. As with all emotions there are positive and negative aspects to each. However, shame has only been written about as negative in the psychological literature. While too much shame may be internalized as “I am bad and not worthy,” could there possibly be a level of shame where one may say, “I feel ashamed of my behavior or ashamed of myself for not doing or living up to important expectations, and I am going to work on not having this occur again”? It remains an open question whether multiple forms of shame can also have constructive, motivating and pro-social properties.

The ancient philosophers, for example, had no difficulty understanding the positive nature of shame. Plato directly noted the importance of shame and the wickedness of being shameless. Aristotle viewed shame as a restraint on undesirable impulses, and believed it was important to guide children away from moral ills through shame (Fortenbaugh, 2002). Further research in this area may add further clarification to these questions. A more robust understanding of shame may come through developing and fine-tuning instruments, as well as from longitudinal designs or experimental projects that could

elicit causal aspects of a perhaps multifaceted and bipolar nature of shame. The burden of proof as a result of the research that exists to date rests with researchers who will have to develop instruments to assess these potentially distinct aspects of moral emotions.

Whatever the eventual empirical structure of the moral emotions of shame and guilt, the results here suggest that pastoral helping professionals need to attend to the potential debilitating connection that shame and guilt have with spiritual experience and congregational conflict. The correlational nature of the this study precludes causal inferences but, at a minimum, the overwhelming amount of data that links spiritual struggles to negative outcomes make them an important marker of intrapersonal and interpersonal distress. Even if these markers are within a spiritual giant such as Mother Teresa, ordinary human compassion, not to mention clinical sensitivity, direct mental health professionals of any background to assess and determine whether alternative spiritual perspectives within the person's spiritual tradition may help alleviate her private and social unrest.

## REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. (1950). *The individual and his religion: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Macmillan.
- Baumeister, R.F. (2002). Religion and psychology: Introduction to the special issue. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 165-167.
- Baumeister, R.F. (1998). Inducing guilt. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 127-138). SanDiego, CA: Academic Press.
- Baumeister, R.F., Stillwell, A.M. & Heatherton, T.F. (1994). Guilt: an interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 243-267.
- Ciarrocchi, J.W., & Deneke, E. (2005). Hope, optimism, pessimism, and spirituality as predictors of well-being controlling for personality. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 16, 160-183.
- Clark, L.A. & Watson, D. (1999). Temperament: A new paradigm for trait psychology. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and Research* (2nd ed., pp.399-423). New York: Guilford Press.

- Dearing, R.L., Stuewig, J. & Tangney, J.P. (2005). On the importance of distinguishing shame from guilt: relations to problematic alcohol and drug use, *Addictive Behaviors*, 30, 1392-1404.
- DeNeve, K.M. & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 Personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 197-229.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J. & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Elkins, D.N., Hedstrom, L.J., Hughes, L.L. Leaf, J.A., Saunders, C. (1988). Toward a humanistic phenomenological spirituality. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 28, 5-18.
- Fortenbaugh. (2002). Aristotle on emotion: *A contribution to philosophical psychology, rhetoric, poetics, politics and ethics* (Second ed.). London: Duckworth.
- Francis, L.J. & Kaldor, P. (2002). The relationship between psychological well-being and Christian faith and practice in an Australian population sample. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 179-184.
- Francis, L.J., Jones, S.H., & Wilcox, C. (1997). Religiosity and dimensions of psychological well-being among 16-19 year olds. *Journal of Christian Education*, 40(1), 15-20.
- Geary, B., Ciarrocchi, J. W., & Scheers, N. J. (2004). Spirituality and religious variables as predictors of well-being in sex offenders. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 15, 167-187.
- Grogan-Henderson, K. & Ciarrocchi, J.W. (2003). Optimism and spirituality as predictors of subjective well-being in breast cancer patients. Poster session presented at the Sixth World Congress of Psycho-Oncology, Banff, Alberta, Canada.
- Golden, J., Piedmont R.L., Ciarrocchi, J.W., Rodgeron, T. (2004). Spirituality and burnout: An incremental validity study. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 32, 115-125.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I.
- Hill, P.C., & Pargament, K.I. (2003). Advances in the conceptualization and measurement of religion and spirituality. *American Psychologist*, 58(1), 64-74.
- Hood, R.W., Jr, Spilka, B., Hunsberger, B. & Gorsuch, R. (1996). *The psychology of religion. An empirical approach* (2nd ed). New York: The Guilford Press.

- Idler, E.I., Musick, M.A., Ellison, C.G., George, L.K., Krause, N., Ory, M.G., Pargament, K.I., Powell, L.H., Underwood, L.G., & Williams, D. R. (2003). Measuring multiple dimensions of religion and spirituality for health research: Conceptual background and findings from the 1998 general social survey. *Research on Aging, 25*, 327-365.
- Kahnemann, D., Diener, E., & Schwartz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Koenig, H.G., Siegler, I.C., & George, L.K. (1989). Religious and non-religious coping: Impact on adaptation to later life. *Journal of Religion and Aging, 5*, 73-94.
- Leith, K.P. & Baumeister, R.F (1989). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality, 66:1*, 1-35.
- Lewis, H.B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Luyten, P., Corveleyn, J., & Fontaine, J.R.J. (1998). The relationship between religiosity and mental health: distinguishing between shame and guilt. *Mental Health, Religion, & Culture, 1(2)*, 165-184.
- Marschall, D., Sanftner, J., & Tangney, J.P. (1994). *The State Shame and Guilt Scale*. George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (pp. 139-153). New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, W.R. & Thoresen, C.E. (1999). Spirituality and health. In W. Miller (Ed.) *Integrating spirituality into treatment* (pp. 3-18). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Murray-Swank, N.A., Pargament, K. Mahoney, A. (2005). At the crossroads of sexuality and spirituality: The sanctification of sex by college students. *The International Journal of the Psychology of Religion, 15(3)*, 199-219
- Pargament, K.I (1997). *The psychology of religion and coping: Theory, research, Practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Pargament, K.I., Smith, B.W., Koenig, H.G., & Perez, L. (1998). Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 37(4)*, 710-724.
- Piedmont, R.L., Ciarrocchi, J.W., Dy-Liacco, G. & Mapa, A.T., Williams, J. (2003). *An evaluation of spirituality and religiosity as empirical constructs for personality research*. (Unpublished paper).

- Piedmont, R.L. (2001). Spiritual transcendence and the scientific study of spirituality. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 67,4-14.
- Piedmont, R.L. (1999). Strategies for using the five-factor model of personality in religious research. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 27, 338-350.
- Tangney, J.P. (1992). Situational determinants of shame and guilt in young adulthood. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 199-206.
- 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*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J.P., Wagner, P.E., Fletcher, C. & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 669-675.
- Tangney, J.P. & Dearing, R.L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York, New York. The Guilford Press.
- Van Biema, D. (2007). The secret life of Mother Teresa. *Time Magazine*, 170(10), 36-43.
- Vergote, A. (1988). *Guilt and desire. Religious attitudes and their pathological derivatives*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Watson, D. & Clark, L.A. (1993). Behavioral disinhibition versus constraint: A dispositional perspective. In D.M. Wegner & J.W. Pennebaker (Eds.), *Handbook of mental control* (pp. 506-527). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- Watts, F. (2001). Shame, sin and guilt. In A. McFadyen & M. Sarot (Eds.), *Forgiveness and truth: Explorations in contemporary theology* (pp. 53-70). Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Zinnbaur, B. & Pargament, K.I. (1998). Spiritual conversion: A study of religious change in college students. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 161-180.
- Zinnbaur, B.J., Pargament, K.I., Cole, B., Rye, M.S., Butter, E.M., Belavich, T.G., Hipp, .M., Scott, A.B., & Kadar, J.L. (1997). Religion and spirituality: unfuzzifying the fuzzy. *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion*, 36(4), 549-564

Table 1. Correlations for Study Variables (N = 176)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Age																
2. Neuroticism	<b>-.19</b>															
3. Extraversion	-.11	<b>-.25</b>														
4. Openness	-.01	.04	<b>.22</b>													
5. Agreeableness	<b>.21</b>	-.14	.13	<b>.26</b>												
6. Conscientiousness	.05	<b>-.19</b>	.07	.00	<b>.27</b>											
7. Positive Affect	-.12	<b>-.48</b>	<b>.28</b>	-.05	.12	<b>.28</b>										
8. Negative Affect	<b>-.16</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>-.23</b>	-.02	-.16	<b>-.26</b>	<b>-.53</b>									
9. Life Satisfaction	<b>-.20</b>	<b>-.32</b>	<b>.22</b>	-.07	.11	<b>.18</b>	<b>.60</b>	<b>-.42</b>								
10. Shame	-.07	<b>.39</b>	-.12	-.08	-.11	-.12	<b>-.37</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>-.27</b>							
11. Guilt	-.13	<b>.37</b>	-.04	.06	-.05	-.13	<b>-.32</b>	<b>.43</b>	-.10	<b>.65</b>						
12. Spiritual Experience	<b>.20</b>	<b>-.17</b>	-.03	-.11	<b>.24</b>	.05	<b>.33</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>.15</b>	-.02	.07					
13. Private Religious Practices	<b>.33</b>	-.10	<b>-.22</b>	-.05	<b>.22</b>	.06	<b>.20</b>	-.06	.07	-.05	-.01	<b>.73</b>				
14. Religious Attendance	<b>.26</b>	-.12	-.12	-.14	.08	.12	<b>.16</b>	-.01	.10	-.08	-.05	<b>.57</b>	<b>.69</b>			
15. Congregation Support	.10	-.05	-.03	-.06	<b>.16</b>	.04	<b>.25</b>	-.09	<b>.15</b>	-.11	-.14	<b>.39</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>.46</b>		
16. Congregation Conflict	.10	.12	<b>-.19</b>	-.08	-.05	.06	-.02	<b>.21</b>	<b>-.19</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.35</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.31</b>	<b>.24</b>	
17. Spiritual Struggles	-.10	<b>.35</b>	-.13	-.09	-.11	-.01	<b>-.32</b>	<b>.37</b>	<b>-.26</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.30</b>	-.10	-.10	-.05	<b>.24</b>	

Note: Correlations in bold p < .05

Table 2. *Hierarchical Regression for Outcome Variables (N = 176)*

Criterion Step	Predictor Variable	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	F Change
<b>Negative Affect</b>				
1	Age	.03	.03	4.44*
2	Personality	.41	.39	22.28 ***
3	Shame	.49	.08	24.68 ***
3	Guilt	.46	.04	13.52 ***
3	Congregational Conflict	.43	.02	5.85 *
3	Spiritual Struggles	.44	.03	8.24 **
4	Congregational Conflict <sup>a</sup>	.50	.01	3.10
4	Spiritual Struggles <sup>a</sup>	.49	.01	2.26
4	Congregational Conflict <sup>b</sup>	.47	.01	2.85
4	Spiritual Struggles <sup>b</sup>	.47	.02	4.93
<b>Positive Affect</b>				
1	Personality	.30	.30	14.25 ***
2	Shame	.33	.04	9.18 **
2	Guilt	.31	.01	2.34
2	Spiritual Experiences	.36	.07	18.32 ***
2	Private Religious Practices	.33	.04	9.30 **
2	Religious Attendance	.31	.01	2.68
2	Congregational Support	.35	.05	12.92 ***
2	Congregational Conflict	.30	.00	0.51
2	Spiritual Struggles	.33	.03	8.35 **
2	Spiritual Struggles <sup>a</sup>	.35	.02	4.24 *
2	Spiritual Struggles <sup>b</sup>	.33	.03	6.87 **
<b>Life Satisfaction</b>				
1	Personality	.15	.15	5.99 ***
2	Shame	.17	.02	4.74 **
2	Spiritual Experiences	.16	.01	1.66
2	Congregational Support	.17	.02	3.18
2	Congregational Conflict	.17	.02	4.09 *
2	Spiritual Struggles	.18	.03	5.33 *
3	Congregational Conflict <sup>a</sup>	.19	.01	2.89
3	Spiritual Struggles <sup>a</sup>	.19	.01	2.93

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

Note: <sup>a</sup> entry after personality and shame

<sup>b</sup> entry after personality and shame

Table 3. *Beta Weights for Predictors of Subjective Well-Being (N = 176)*

Predictor Variable	Negative Affect	Positive Affect	Life Satisfaction
Age	-.16 *		
Neuroticism	.56 **	-.31 ***	-.18 **
Extroversion	-.09	.18 **	.17 **
Openness	-.01	-.10	-.13
Agreeableness	-.02	.00	.05
Conscientiousness	-.14 *	.19 **	.10
Shamea	.30 ***	-.21 **	-.17 **
Guilta	.23 ***	-.11	
Spiritual Experiencesa		.28 ***	.10
Private Religious Practices <sup>a</sup>		.21 **	.06
Religious Attendance <sup>a</sup>		.11	.06
Congregational Support <sup>a</sup>		.23 ***	.13
Congregational Conflict <sup>a</sup>	.15 *	.05	-.15 *
Spiritual Struggles <sup>a</sup>	.18 **	-.20 **	-.17 *
Congregational Conflict <sup>b</sup>	.10		-.12
Spiritual Struggles <sup>b</sup>	.09	-.15 *	-.14
Congregational Conflict <sup>c</sup>	.10		
Spiritual Struggles <sup>c</sup>	.14 *	-.18 ***	

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

**Note:** <sup>a</sup> variable entry after personality  
<sup>b</sup> variable entry after personality and shame  
<sup>c</sup> variable entry after personality and guilt

Missing data cells indicate relationships not meeting mediation criteria.