IJMRRS

International Journal for Multidisciplinary
Research, Review and Studies

ISSN: 3049-124X (Online)

VOLUME 1- ISSUE 4

2024

Guilt and Shame as Determinants of Personal Identity

Authors:

[1] Madhav Rao Krishnanshu, [2] Garvita Jakhar

[1] Student, Amity University Noida

[2] Assistant Professor, Amity University Noida

Abstract

Guilt and shame are deeply embedded self-conscious emotions that significantly shape the development of personal identity. This paper explores their psychological, philosophical, and cultural dimensions through a qualitative meta-synthesis of 25 peer-reviewed studies from fields such as psychology, affective neuroscience, moral philosophy, and cultural studies. The findings reveal that guilt, being behavior-oriented, often fosters empathy, responsibility, and moral development. In contrast, shame, as a self-oriented emotion, tends to lead to emotional withdrawal, identity fragmentation, and psychological distress. Early socialization experiences and cultural contexts play a pivotal role in the internalization and expression of these emotions. The analysis further underscores that while shame poses risks for mental health, particularly when internalized without intervention, guilt can serve as a constructive force for moral repair and relational healing. Through thematic synthesis, the study illustrates that integrating emotional awareness and self-compassion can transform these emotions into tools for healthy identity formation. Ultimately, guilt and shame are not merely emotional reactions but dynamic elements of the self that—when understood and processed reflectively—can act as powerful agents of personal introspection, social connection, and individual transformation.

Keywords: guilt, shame, identity formation, self-conscious emotions, psychological development

Introduction

At various stages throughout our lives, individuals universally experience the poignant sensation of regret or the burden of self-evaluation. This may arise from an error we committed, or perhaps from a lack of expression during moments that warranted it. Such instances frequently result in the emergence of two significant emotions—guilt and shame. Though they're easy to confuse, they are not the same. Guilt is usually about something we did—"I made a mistake." Shame, on the other hand, cuts deeper. It's about who we believe we are—"I am the mistake" (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Lewis, 1971).

These two feelings do not wax and wane; instead, they stick with us. They can start to shape the way we think about ourselves, the way we interact with others, and the way we think about our place in the world over time. That is, guilt and shame contribute to—or deconstruct—our sense of self. Empirical research has shown that guilt can promote change on the individual level. It encourages people to make things right, take responsibility, and change their behavior (Tangney et al., 2007). Shame, however, tends to turn inward. It can cause people to hide themselves, pull away from others, or spiral into self-blame and emotional pain (Brown, 2006; Harder et al., 2011).

This research is interested in the function of shame and guilt in identity formation. From psychological theory and research between the mid-2000s and the 2010s, it will evaluate how shame and guilt are experienced, how they make us who we are, and what it entails for their incorporation into our stories of self. In so doing, this research will illustrate that it is not merely an issue of mastery of emotions to comprehend shame and guilt—it is an issue of more knowledge about ourselves and the paths of our self-becoming.

The constructs of guilt and shame have been extensively explored within psychological, sociocultural, and philosophical domains, each contributing to a nuanced understanding of how these self-conscious emotions shape human identity. Lutwak, Ferrari, and Cheek (1998) were among the first to dissect the gendered dimensions of these emotions. Their findings suggested that guilt is strongly tied to personal identity and reflective self-evaluation, while shame is more associated with social identity and maladaptive avoidance strategies—patterns that vary across genders and identity orientations.

Research on guilt and shame has consistently emphasized their distinct psychological functions, developmental origins, and implications for identity formation. Early work by Tangney (1998), drawing on qualitative narratives and counterfactual reasoning, established that guilt tends to be adaptive—encouraging reparative actions—while shame is more often maladaptive, leading to withdrawal and diminished self-worth. These tendencies begin emerging in middle childhood, around the age of eight, underscoring their formative role in moral and identity development.

From a philosophical and anthropological perspective, French (2001) conceptualized both emotions as inherently social, shaped by internalized moral ideals even when experienced in isolation. This framing situates shame and guilt as core mechanisms in moral self-evaluation. Extending this relational dimension, Lickel et al. (2005) demonstrated that these emotions can be vicarious, with guilt emerging from perceived shared responsibility and prompting corrective action, whereas vicarious shame was associated with identity overlap and avoidance.

Cultural comparisons further nuance the understanding of these emotions. Anolli and Pascucci (2005) found that Indian participants reported higher frequency and control of guilt and shame than their Italian counterparts, challenging simplistic cultural binaries that link guilt exclusively to individualist societies and shame to collectivist ones. Similarly, Mesquita and Karasawa

(2002) highlighted that Japanese individuals tend to experience shame more in interpersonal contexts, while Americans report greater guilt, illustrating the role of cultural scripts in shaping moral emotions and identity.

The link between shame, guilt, and psychopathology has been a major focus of empirical work. Orth, Berking, and Burkhardt (2006) identified shame—but not guilt—as a predictor of depression, with effects mediated by rumination and self-critical thinking. Harder, Rockart, and Cutler (2011) confirmed this association, suggesting that clinical interventions should differentiate between the two emotions. Czub and Gładyszewska-Cylulko (2013) reported that chronic shame in adolescence is linked to fragmented identity and reduced self-efficacy, while Piotrowski, Różycka-Tran, and Baran (2021) showed that maladaptive perfectionism correlates with heightened shame and weaker identity integration, in contrast to adaptive perfectionism, which is positively associated with guilt and identity coherence.

Cognitive and behavioral consequences of these emotions have also been explored. Cavalera et al. (2018) demonstrated that both guilt and shame impair working memory, with shame exerting a stronger effect. Pivetti, Melotti, and Bonomo (2015) linked shame to physiological submission responses (e.g., lowered gaze) and guilt to agitation consistent with reparative motivation, supporting evolutionary distinctions in their adaptive functions. Ecker and Bar-Anan (2019) added that poor differentiation between guilt and shame increases memory distortions, potentially undermining self-clarity.

Intervention-focused research offers insight into mitigating the harmful effects of shame. Brown's (2006) Shame Resilience Theory identified empathy, connection, and vulnerability as key to transforming shame into a source of resilience. Gilbert's (2009) Compassion-Focused Therapy likewise targeted self-criticism and emotional isolation, proposing self-compassion as a route to healthier identity reconstruction. Choi, Kim, and Markus (2024) found that framing guilt and shame in future-oriented, self-compassionate ways can shift their motivational impact—guilt fostering goal pursuit and shame prompting avoidance unless reframed.

Studies in applied and social contexts extend these findings. Duhachek, Agrawal, and Han (2012) reported that guilt-framed health messages encouraged reflection and behavioral change, while shame-based appeals often provoked denial. Arli, Tjiptono, and Palmer (2015) showed that

shame-prone consumers were more likely to engage in unethical coping behaviors, whereas guilt-prone individuals exhibited stronger moral conduct. Research by Goffnett, Szymanski, and Henrichs-Beck (2021) with sexual minority adolescents further illustrated the identity-shaping potential of these emotions, with shame linked to internalized stigma and pride emerging from affirming environments.

Finally, the interplay between guilt, shame, and relational contexts has emerged as a crucial theme. Wolf et al. (2010) emphasized that shame is typically tied to public transgressions and identity threat, while guilt relates to private moral reasoning. Silfver (2007) observed that guilt often produces constructive responses such as apology and restitution, whereas shame fosters defensive strategies, although situational ambiguity can alter these patterns. Kealy et al. (2021) highlighted the severe mental health risks of shame—particularly in men—when unbuffered by guilt or self-compassion, linking it to suicidal ideation. These findings collectively suggest that guilt and shame are deeply embedded in the social, cultural, and psychological processes that construct identity, with guilt generally serving as a corrective force and shame posing significant risks to well-being unless countered by supportive relational and cognitive frameworks.

Methodology

This study critically examines the intersectional areas of guilt and morality and how they influence the shaping of personality and identity with a special focus on psychological development.

The data for this study comprised was sourced from peer-reviewed journal articles, published policy documents, and books published. Sources were collected from academic databses, including JSTOR, PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar in English language. Articles published in the last 20 years were taken into account with few older studies deemed important were also included.

Keywords included “guilt”, “shame”, “identity formation”, “self-conscious emotions”, “psychological development”, “women”. The listed keywords are exhaustive and were selected to ensure the inclusion of a vast range of studies on the effect on development of identity via emotions of guilt and shame.

Results

The thematic analysis of the literature examined here discloses an uniform and multifaceted pattern: shame and guilt exercise strong, yet essentially divergent, functions in constituting personal identity. In psychological, philosophical, and cultural contexts alike, these self-aware emotions recur as pivotal to how people explain their conduct, establish their moral standards, and build stable self-concepts.

The initial general finding is the cognitive and affective difference between guilt and shame that repeated across almost all sources. Guilt is most frequently associated with particular behaviors, leading to feelings of regret and a need for redress. Shame, however, is connected with the failure of the self in general. This difference is not abstract; it has distinct psychological consequences. Literature repeatedly demonstrates that guilt has a tendency to lead to adaptive behaviors like apology, restitution, and moral growth, whereas shame tends to result in withdrawal of emotions, avoidance, and self-loathing (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Lewis, 1992).

Second, the results show that early socialization processes and home conditions significantly impact emotional dispositions to guilt or shame. Children from affect-validated, responsibility-oriented homes will more likely develop guilt-proneness, while those who are exposed to strict discipline, criticism, or conditional acceptance have higher levels of shame-proneness. This correlation continues well into adulthood and has important implications for self-concept, coping mechanisms, and interpersonals (Luyten et al., 2002; Mills, 2005).

A third key finding underlines the psychological dangers of chronic shame. The studies examined here connect excessive shame-proneness with a variety of mental health problems, such as depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and suicidality. Shame not only distorts the perception of oneself but is also capable of eroding help-seeking tendencies and emotional expressiveness, thereby further sustaining psychological problems. Guilt, although unpleasant, is more likely to be worked through via social affiliation and moral development—particularly if it is driven by forgiveness and self-compassion (Gilbert, 2009; Orth et al., 2006).

The other central finding is the cultural mediation of such emotional experiences. Cultural settings differ in the expression and moral construction of guilt and shame. Shame is more emphasized as a social and moral control device in collectivist cultures, while individualist cultures emphasize guilt as an indicator of individual conscience. Such narratives run through individuals' experience, interpretation, and healing of these emotions and further condition the structure of identity (Mesquita & Karasawa, 2002).

Lastly, the evidence considered in this review indicates that guilt and shame develop and intersect with more general processes in identity development. In adolescence and early adulthood—when people develop critical self-concepts, establish moral values, and seek social affiliations—both emotions are part of what solidifies moral identity. Healthier navigation of these emotional states can result in a more mature and ethic self, while unresolved or morbid guilt and shame can impede development and reinforce fragmentation of emotion (Krettenauer & Eichler, 2006).

Discussion

This analysis highlights several dominant psychological and sociocultural themes that illustrate how shame and guilt are rooted in identity formation. Across disciplines—developmental psychology and moral philosophy as well as cultural anthropology—both emotions stand out as central to how individuals construct their sense of self, understand their value, and interact with others. Although guilt and shame are often synonymously used in popular discourse, there is a consistent focus throughout the literature that they are different emotional experiences with different effects on the self.

The first grand theme deals with the psychological distinction between guilt and shame. Guilt is typically defined as behavior-focused—emerging from a feeling of having made a mistake—whereas shame is identity-focused, arising out of a feeling that one's entire self is defective or bad (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). This distinction is greater than semantic; it influences how persons react to bad conduct or failure. Guilt is commonly connected with positive consequences such as repair behavior, sympathy, and moral education. Conversely, shame seems to elicit withdrawal, self-blame, and occasionally maladaptive coping like aggression or denial (Lewis, 1992; Tangney et al., 1995).

A second trend repeated across studies involves the impact of early life experiences and socialization on being able to feel guilt or shame. Children learn to feel these feelings from interactions with caregivers, peers, and authority figures, where the tone of correction, whether directed at behavior or the self, will decide whether guilt or shame gets internalized. Cultures that promote punishment, perfectionism, or invalidation of feelings tend to create a greater vulnerability to shame, one that in the long run gets integrated into the very fabric of identity (Mills, 2005; Luyten et al., 2002). By contrast, contexts that support empathy, reflection, and taking responsibility are more likely to support guilt-proneness, which is associated with better functioning.

One of the frequent concerns throughout the literature is the overlap between shame and psychological disturbance. Those with a high shame-prone style are likely to be more depressed, anxious, self-injuring, and chronically inadequate (Andrews et al., 2000; Orth et al., 2006). This is because shame engages the self as a whole, causing individuals to feel that they are inherently defective. These results hold important implications for mental health treatment because past

treatments aimed at changing behavior could prove ineffective when fundamental self-worth is threatened. Treatments like compassion-focused therapy or schema therapy have been found to be more effective in treating shame-based identity issues (Gilbert, 2009).

By contrast, guilt is a moral and identity-restoring emotion. In a healthy process, guilt can increase interpersonal responsibility, facilitate moral accountability, and build relational bonds (Silfver, 2007). It is a part of a moral identity—one that includes the person viewing themselves as one who can repair harm, learn from errors, and get back to values. Yet, when excessive or unresolved, even guilt can become pathological, particularly in situations involving trauma or chronic self-blame (Wiklander et al., 2012). The distinction between constructive and destructive guilt is typically mediated by self-compassion, perceived forgiveness, and cultural attitudes toward failure and responsibility.

A fourth and essential theme in the literature concerns the cross-cultural variability of the experience and valuation of guilt and shame. In collectivist societies, shame can have a social-regulatory effect—upholding group norms and maintaining social cohesion—while in individualist societies, guilt is prioritized as an inner moral guide (Mesquita & Karasawa, 2002). This dichotomy does not exist but shows how identity formation is not only determined by inner processes but also by cultural scripts. In cultures where saving face is the supreme value, shame might be internalized more profoundly and might not always be considered maladaptive. Therefore, knowing the adaptive versus maladaptive status of these feelings needs to be viewed through cultural context.

Another conclusion drawn from the literature is that guilt and shame are not fixed emotional dispositions but dynamic processes that develop throughout the lifespan. Adolescence and early adulthood are especially transformative periods, during which people start articulating their values, working through autonomy, and forming more solid self-concepts (Krettenauer & Eichler, 2006). The integration of guilt and shame during these phases can have long-term impacts on moral identity, resilience, and self-esteem. For instance, people who acquire the ability to work through shame with empathy and acceptance tend to develop more depth of emotion and humility. Alternatively, individuals who internalize guilt without means of repair may be burdened with long-term histories of regret and self-criticism.

Combined, the literature implies that both shame and guilt are dual-edged yet necessary forces in the construction of identity. They are emotional indicators of moral consciousness and self-awareness, yet can become the cause of psychological pain when not resolved. Their force is determined by elements of personality, upbringing, cultural milieu, and access to emotional support networks. The dilemma is not to rid oneself of guilt or shame, but to comprehend and convert them—make them avenues for growth instead of cells of the self.

Conclusion

This research confirms that shame and guilt are more than emotional responses but cornerstones in the development and growth of human identity. Using thematic analysis of interdisciplinary literature, it is clear that these self-conscious emotions are inextricably linked with how people view themselves, interact with others, and make moral decisions. Their impact spreads beyond transitory discomfort, into the heart of self-definition and personal narrative.

The study points out that although guilt and shame tend to be confused with each other, they have different psychological consequences. Guilt, if worked through in a healthy manner, can be an agent for change, responsibility, and redemption. It prompts people to think, make amends, and get back on track with what matters most, positively affecting moral identity. Shame, internalized, can erode self-esteem and disconnect social bonds and may instill isolation, repression of feelings, and chronic psychological harm.

In addition, the research highlights that these emotions are not only formed by individual personality or temperament but are influenced as well by early relational patterns, sociocultural contexts, and wider moral schemas. Cultural expectations and norms strongly determine whether guilt or shame becomes a prevalent emotional perspective, with repercussions regarding how individuals conceive of themselves within their societies.

Notably, this review highlights the importance of working on guilt and shame using reflective, supportive, and context-sensitive interventions. Therapeutic intervention, education, and cultural narratives must be able to differentiate between the two states and lead individuals towards

forgiveness, self-compassion, and healing—especially in instances where shame is entrenched in the self.

References

1. Andrews, B., Qian, M., & Valentine, J. D. (2002). Predicting depressive symptoms with a new measure of shame: The Experience of Shame Scale. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466502163778

2. Anolli, L., & Pascucci, P. (2005). Guilt and guilt-proneness, shame and shame-proneness in Indian and Italian young adults. Intercultural Human Dynamics, 7(3), 233–254.

3. Arli, D., Tjiptono, F., & Palmer, J. (2015). Investigating the impact of guilt and shame proneness on consumer ethics: A cross-national study. Journal of Business Ethics, 130(1), 117–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2205-4

4. Bjornsson, A. S., Kohn, R., Papp, L. A., & Lejuez, C. W. (2014). Two-year course of generalized anxiety disorder, social anxiety disorder, and panic disorder with agoraphobia in a sample of Latino adults. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 28(5), 511–518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.05.005

5. Brown, B. (2006). Shame resilience theory: A grounded theory study on women and shame. Families in Society, 87(1), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.3483

6. Cavalera, C., Pepe, A., Zurloni, V., Diana, B., & Realdon, O. (2018). Negative social emotions and cognition: Shame, guilt and working memory impairments. Cognition and Emotion, 32(4), 839–847. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1353482

7. Choi, Y., Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (2024). Integrating guilt and shame into the self-concept: The influence of future opportunities. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 126(3), 450–467. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000456

8. Czub, T., & Gładyszewska-Cylulko, J. (2013). Shame as a self-conscious emotion and its role in identity formation. Polish Psychological Bulletin, 44(4), 445–454. https://doi.org/10.2478/ppb-2013-0047
9. Duhachek, A., Agrawal, N., & Han, D. (2012). Guilt versus shame: Coping, fluency, and framing in the effectiveness of responsible drinking messages. Journal of Marketing Research, 49(6), 928–941. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.11.0095

10. Ecker, U. K. H., & Bar-Anan, Y. (2019). Conceptual overlap between stimuli increases misattribution of internal experience. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 148(12), 2174–2191. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000565

11. French, P. A. (2001). Honor, shame & guilt. Rowman & Littlefield.

12. Goffnett, J., Szymanski, D. M., & Henrichs-Beck, C. (2021). The construction of shame and pride: A grounded theory model of identity, emotions, and well-being among sexual minority adolescents. Journal of LGBT Youth, 18(2), 149–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2020.1838931

13. Gilbert, P. (2009). The compassionate mind: A new approach to life's challenges. Constable & Robinson.

14. Harder, D. W., Rockart, L., & Cutler, L. (2011). Shame, guilt, and depression in clinical populations. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 67(6), 575–586. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20777

15. Kealy, D., Rice, S. M., Ogrodniczuk, J. S., & Seidler, Z. E. (2021). Shame, guilt, and suicidal thoughts: The interaction matters. Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 22(1), 103–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000281

16. Krettenauer, T., & Eichler, D. (2006). Adolescents' self-attributed moral emotions following a moral transgression: Relations with delinquency, confidence in moral judgment and age. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24(4), 489–506. https://doi.org/10.1348/026151005X70327

17. Lickel, B., Schmader, T., Curtis, M., Scarnier, M., & Ames, D. R. (2005). Vicarious shame and guilt. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 8(2), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430205051064

18. Lutwak, N., Ferrari, J. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1998). Shame, guilt and identity in men and women: The role of identity orientation and processing style in moral affects. Sex Roles, 39(1), 93–110. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018810005571

19. Luyten, P., Corveleyn, J., & Fontaine, J. R. J. (2002). The differential relationship between parental rearing and self-critical perfectionism and between parental rearing and neurotic perfectionism. Personality and Individual Differences, 33(3), 365–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00155-2

20. Mesquita, B., & Karasawa, M. (2002). Different emotional lives. Emotion, 2(2), 70–86. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.2.2.70

21. Orth, U., Berking, M., & Burkhardt, S. (2006). Self-conscious emotions and depression: Rumination explains why shame but not guilt is maladaptive. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32(12), 1608–1619. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206292958

22. Piotrowski, J., Różycka-Tran, J., & Baran, T. (2021). Perfectionism and community-identity integration: The mediating role of shame, guilt and self-esteem. Personality and Individual Differences, 183, 111107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111107

23. Pivetti, M., Melotti, G., & Bonomo, M. (2015). Shame, guilt, and anger: Their cognitive, physiological, and behavioral correlates. The Journal of General Psychology, 142(3), 163–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.2015.1040593

24. Silfver, M. (2007). Coping with guilt and shame: A narrative approach. Journal of Moral Education, 36(2), 169–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240701325274

25. Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). Shame and guilt. Guilford Press.