# SHAME MEMORIES ACROSS GENERATIONS: STUDIES ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR MOTHERS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EKİN DOĞA KOZAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

JULY 2026

Approval of the thesis:

**SHAME MEMORIES ACROSS GENERATIONS: STUDIES ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR MOTHERS**

submitted by **EKİN DOĞA KOZAK** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences _____

Prof. Dr. Bengi ÖNER ÖZKAN
Head of Department
Department of Psychology _____

Prof. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN ACAR
Supervisor
Department of Psychology _____

**Examining Committee Members:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arife Berna AYTAÇ (Head of the Examining Committee)
Hacettepe University
Department of Psychology _____

Prof. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN ACAR (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology _____

Prof. Dr. Sibel KAZAK BERUMENT
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağla AYDIN
Sabancı University
Department of Psychology _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Müberra SUATA
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology _____

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

**Name, Last Name:** Ekin Doğa KOZAK

**Signature:**

## ABSTRACT

SHAME MEMORIES ACROSS GENERATIONS: STUDIES ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR MOTHERS

KOZAK, Ekin Doğa
Ph.D., The Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN-ACAR

July 2026, 291 pages

Three interrelated studies were designed to investigate shame memories among 278 university students and their mothers. The first study was designed as a pilot study to reveal the relational context and memory content of the personal shame memories. Results revealed that university students narrated personal shame memories that took place in educational environments, family and peer context, while mothers narrated memories set in the family context and professional settings. The memory content was categorized under the *mishaps and missteps*, *aggression* and *performance-related* themes for all participants. The second study revealed that university students and mothers could and chose to narrate also vicarious shame memories, that are shame memories where their partner was the protagonist experiencing shame. Results of the second study revealed that *individuation* and *impaired limits schema domain* were statistically significant predictors for the thematic coherence and subjective perspective terms of university students in both their personal and vicarious shame memories. The third and last study aimed to collect shame memory conversations. To empirically capture the complex dynamics of this mother-daughter co-construction in

a naturalistic setting, we asked the mother-daughter dyads to have a memory conversation with each other in the absence of the researcher, analyzing the data via Actor-Partner Interdependence Model. Results revealed that *individuation* appeared as an actor and partner effect, while the *other-directedness schema domain* and *external shame* levels of mothers appeared as partner effects on their daughters' emotion word usage during their memory conversation. All results were discussed in the light of the existing literature.

**Keywords**: Emotion-induced memories, shame memory, mother-daughter memory conversation, actor-partner interdependence model

# ÖZ

JENERASYONLAR ARASI UTANÇ ANILARI: ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ VE ONLARIN ANNELERİYLE ÇALIŞMALAR

KOZAK, Ekin Doğa
Doktora, Psikoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN-ACAR

Temmuz 2026, 291 sayfa

Üniversite öğrencileri ve onların annelerine ait utanç anılarının araştırılması için 278 çift ile çalışılarak birbiriyle ilişkili toplam üç çalışma tasarlanmıştır. Bu çalışmalardan ilki pilot çalışma niteliğinde olup anlatılan utanç anılarının gerçekleştiği çevreyi ve anının içeriğini ortaya koymuştur. Sonuçlar gösteriyor ki üniversite öğrencilerinin anlattıkları utanç anıları eğitim, aile ve akran ortamlarında gerçekleşirken; annelerinkiler aile ve profesyonel ortamda gerçekleşmiştir. Anı içerikleri ise tüm katılımcılar için *hatalar ve yanlışlıklar, saldırganlık* ve *performansa ilişkin* temaları altında toplanmıştır. İkinci çalışma kapsamında üniversite öğrencileri ve onların annelerinden anının kahramanının çiftin diğer üyesinin olduğu dolaylı utanç anıları anlatmaları istenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, üniversite öğrencileri ve annelerin dolaylı utanç anıları anlatabildiklerini ve anlatmayı seçtiklerini göstermiştir. Ayrıca, üniversite öğrencilerinin hem bireysel hem de dolaylı anılarında *bireyselleşme* ile *zedelenmiş sınırlar şema alanının* anlatı bütünlüğü ve öznel perspektif terimleri için istatistiksel olarak anlamlı yordayıcılar olduğu bulunmuştur. Üçüncü ve son çalışma ise utanç anı konuşmalarını toplamayı amaçlamıştır. Doğal bir ortamdaki bu anne-kız

ortak inşasının karmaşık dinamiklerini görgül olarak ortaya koyabilmek adına, anne-kız çiftlerinden araştırmacı ortamda yokken kendi utanç anılarını seçerek bir anı sohbeti gerçekleştirmeleri istenmiş ve elde edilen veriler Aktör-Partner Karşılıklı Bağımlılık Modeli ile analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar *bireyselleşme* değişkeninin aktör ve partner etkisini ortaya koyarken, annelerin *diğeri yönelimlilik şema alanı* ve *dışsallaştırılmış utanç* seviyelerinin sohbet esnasında kızlarının kullandığı duygu kelimeleri üzerinde partner etkileri gözlenmiştir. Tüm sonuçlar alan yazındaki bulgular ışığında tartışılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler**: Duygu yüklü anılar, utanç anıları, anne kız anı konuşmaları, aktör partner karşılıklı bağımlılık modeli

*To the beautiful human capacity to change, reconstruct, and grow*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, my deepest thanks go to Kutlû, my one and only husband, and our dearest Mellûk. Thank you for your generous companionship every step of the way. Your endless support is more than I could have ever asked for, and I am so proud of the life and the future we are building together, side by side. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar for her unwavering guidance throughout this process. Our time together taught me invaluable lessons about what truly matters, both professionally and personally. I am also sincerely grateful to Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument for standing by me from the very beginning; having the opportunity to work closely with her has been truly inspiring. My sincere thanks also go to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağla Aydın for her insightful mentorship as a committee member throughout my Ph.D. journey. I would like to express my special gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Berna Aytaç for her comforting presence during my defense meeting, which was absolutely invaluable to me. I am also sincerely grateful to Asst. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Suata for her insightful feedback and contributions. Furthermore, my sincere thanks go to Prof. Dr. Zehra Uçanok and Prof. Dr. Sait Uluç. Managing responsibilities across two major institutions was anything but easy, yet during this long process, their understanding and accommodation of my workflow at Hacettepe University allowed me to focus my energy on my thesis at critical moments. Special thanks are due to my former roommates: Asst. Prof. Dr. Battal Göktürk Gök, for his timely help and support when I needed it most; and to Dr. Ayşe Tûna for so many wonderful, meaningful, and deep conversations. Additionally, I want to thank Yılmaz *abi* for lending a helping hand whenever possible, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynel Baran for his kind consideration and hands-on support at critical times, and Dr. Ata Cantürk Doğrul for his uncanny but real support, especially in last weeks. Next, I would like to thank my entire familik: my mother, my father, my auntie, my beloved sister Nidosh, *enishtem* Ulashî and my dear father-in-law Hasan *baba*, who

never ceased to believe in me and kept me motivated throughout this long journey. Through this process, Nidosh never once withheld her support, just as in every chapter of my life, holding a place in my heart like no other. It's wonderful to see our circle expanding beautifully. In addition, Ercan abi, Selçin abla, Aybala, Atalay, Murat abi, and İlkkuş were always there with their warm and smiling faces. I now look forward to simply enjoying our loud, joyful gatherings together.

In reaching the completion of this chapter, I owe a debt of gratitude to all the friends whose unwavering presence and strength kept me going. It is a pleasure to start by thanking my *güllü bahçe*z: Özlemovs, Çemhouse, Dolunur, and Busoş. Your presence, both with all of you together and one by one, taught me a lot. With you, I experience "in sickness and in health, for better or for worse" in its most literal sense. May our joyful *güllü bahçelik* continue until death do us part! I truly and deeply love each and every one of you. My *Gün Doğumu* girls deserve the greatest thanks: Sevicim, Berilcim, Ranacım, and Bilgecim. I learned so much from you and with you. Through our time together, I profoundly experienced the true meaning of *özen*: what it means to dedicate oneself to a purpose, to patiently build it step by step over time, and to support each other when the weight becomes heavy. You showed me the beauty and possibility of working and studying within a nurturing environment. I can never repay you for the corrective emotional experiences I found in your endless compassion. I wish us many more shared roads in our lifetime. To Çevrim and Gökçen, who initially turned Ankara into a safe haven for me and then built a beautiful, joyful new home for themselves elsewhere: witnessing your happiness inspires me to remain open to life's new chapters. Dear Gökçecim and Alkım, I feel a very deep, lifelong connection with you. Wishing our bonds grow even deeper, and that we share many healthy, long years as our circles grow beautifully crowded.

My dear friends: Ceren, Ökmen, and Mevsimişko; Yasemin and Can; Dilar, Benek, and Zeek; Selmin, Ali Can and Umut; Begüm, Uri, and Can; Saybılım, Resul, Elif Ada, Nehir and Zeynep; Büşrilkom; Yımışım; Barbo and Pınar; Özlem *hocam* and Gizem; Zengo and her ridiculous foods… Our routine connections always brought me closer to life outside of my Ph.D. and kept me engaged with the real world. Thank you for always being there with open hearts. I hope we always keep sharing the comfort of

knowing we are each happy and healthy, as our paths continue to beautifully cross along the way. This thesis would not have been possible without the contribution of approximately 80 undergraduate students from start to finish. I am deeply grateful to each and every one of them for their efforts, no matter how small. Among them, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my students in PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology class during the 2023-2024 Spring Semester (listed in alphabetical order): Ahmet Hakan Güler (also part of the core team), Ahmet Raşit Kara, Aleyna Caner, Balım Öykü Sayın, Berfin Ekin Güneş, Beyza Şeker, Beyza Şenyurt, Beyza Şerife Ateş, Doğa Nalçacıoğlu, Elif Semerci, Gülnihal Yıldız, Hatice Begüm Kaya, Hilal Erdem, Melike Kahraman, Naciye Betül Demiray, Özge Ağsaran, Pelin Hastoprakçılar, Rana Yolcu, Şebnem Şimşek, Selin Taylan, Sümeyye Şimşek, Yaren Naz Şentürk, Zeynep Gül Evci, and Zeynep Nihal Özdemir. Additionally, I extend my special thanks to the 1002-B project core team, especially Zehra Nur Ayaz and Hevin Atak, for their dedicated efforts in keeping this thesis on track during an incredibly challenging process. I am also grateful to Ayla Ismayilzada for her meticulous work in the final stretch of bringing this thesis to completion. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK) for their support through both the 2211 scholarship and the 1002-B project grant. This was a long, long journey. There were times I felt like I wasn't just trying to complete a thesis, but trying to survive the trek to Mount Doom. Fortunately, throughout this adventure, I have had Kutlû by my side, ever faithful. Now, it feels as though I have finally cast the thesis into the fires of Mount Doom and brought the whole journey to an end. During the final turn of this journey, when unexpected hurdles left me feeling completely helpless and overwhelmed, the wonderful staff at the Graduate School of Social Sciences truly showed me what it means to be a community. I am profoundly grateful for their emotional support and comfort during that vulnerable moment. I would also like to extend my deepest, most heartfelt gratitude especially to the director of the institute, Prof. Dr. Saadettin Kirazcı, whose assistance was of immense value to me. In this way, the invaluable lessons and growth that this doctoral journey offered me continued until my very last day. As I bring this doctoral chapter to a close, I look forward to channeling my development into my future path, honoring our beautiful capacity to change, reconstruct, and grow.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM ..... iii
ABSTRACT ..... iv
ÖZ ..... vi
DEDICATION ..... viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ..... ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... xii
LIST OF TABLES ..... xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... xviii
CHAPTERS
1. INTRODUCTION ..... 1
1.1. Overview ..... 1
1.2. Autobiographical Memory Development ..... 4
1.3. Narrative Identity ..... 6
1.4. Personal Memory and Vicarious Memory ..... 7
1.5. Roles of Memory Conversation Characteristics ..... 9
1.6. The Role of Emotions in Autobiographical Memory ..... 10
1.6.1. Self-Conscious Emotions ..... 12
1.6.2. Shame Memories ..... 14
1.7. Autobiographical Memory in the Context of Mother-Daughter Dyad ..... 15
1.8. Autobiographical Memory in the Context of Culture ..... 18
1.8.1. Self-Construal and Autobiographical Memory ..... 19
1.9. Autobiographical Memory Codings and Characteristics ..... 21
1.9.1. Thematic Coherence ..... 21
1.9.2. Subjective Perspectives ..... 23
1.9.3. Identity Connections ..... 24
1.9.4. Relationships / Social interaction ..... 25
1.9.5. Reasons ..... 26

1.9.6. Phenomenological Characteristics ..... 27
1.9.7. Narrative Characteristics ..... 29
1.10. Early Maladaptive Schemas and Schema Domains ..... 30
1.11. Current Studies ..... 34
2. STUDY 1: PILOT STUDY ..... 36
2.1. Aim ..... 36
2.2. Method ..... 37
2.2.1. Participants ..... 37
2.2.2. Procedure ..... 39
2.2.3. Measures ..... 41
2.2.4. Data Analysis ..... 42
2.3. Results ..... 43
2.3.1. Preliminary Findings ..... 43
2.3.2. Main Findings: Two-Dimensional Analysis: Relational Context and Memory Content ..... 46
2.4. Discussion ..... 58
2.4.1. Discussion Regarding Relational Context ..... 59
2.4.2. Discussion Regarding Memory Content ..... 67
3. STUDY 2: PERSONAL AND VICARIOUS MEMORY ..... 72
3.1. Introduction ..... 72
3.2. Method ..... 74
3.2.1. Participants ..... 75
3.2.2. Procedure ..... 76
3.2.3. Meausures ..... 77
3.2.4. Coding Schemes ..... 83
3.3. Results ..... 89
3.3.1. Data Screening ..... 89
3.3.2. Preliminarily Findings ..... 90
3.3.3. Main Findings ..... 91
3.3.4. Results for University Students ..... 91
3.3.5. Results for Mothers ..... 115
3.3.6. Reasons for Sharing Vicarious Shame Memories ..... 126

3.4. Discussion ..... 127
3.4.1. Narrative Construction Across Contexts (Personal vs. Vicarious Shame Memories) and Generations (University Students and Their Mothers) ..... 128
3.4.2. Evaluation of the Models: What Works? ..... 138
4. STUDY 3: MEMORY CONVERSATION ..... 147
4.1. Introduction ..... 147
4.2. Method ..... 149
4.2.1. Participants ..... 149
4.2.2. Measures ..... 150
4.2.3. Codings ..... 157
4.2.4. Procedure ..... 158
4.2.5. Analytic Strategy ..... 160
4.3. Results ..... 161
4.3.1. Data screening ..... 161
4.3.2. Preliminarily Findings ..... 162
4.3.3. Main Findings: Actor-Partner Interdependence Models and Regression Analyses Predicting Narrative Outcomes ..... 170
4.4. Discussion ..... 180
5. GENERAL DISCUSSION ..... 185
5.1. Recap of the Current Studies ..... 185
5.2. Relational Contexts of Personal Shame Memories ..... 186
5.3. Content of Personal Shame Memories ..... 189
5.4. Personal and Vicarious Shame Memories in University Students and their Mothers ..... 191
5.5. Memory Conversations about Personal Shame Memories in University Students and their Mothers ..... 198
5.6. Contributions and Strengths ..... 200
5.7. Limitations and Future Directions ..... 201
5.8. Conclusion ..... 205
REFERENCES ..... 208
APPENDICES ..... 238

A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE .238
B. INFORMED CONSENT .....240
C. POST-NARRATIVE QUESTION.....242
D. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM.....246
E. BALANCED-INTEGRATION DIFFERENTIATION (BID) SCALE .....250
F. YOUNG SCHEMA QUESTIONNAIRE (YSQ) .....252
G. THE GUILT AND SHAME SCALE (GSS) .....257
H. GUILT AND SHAME PRONENESS SCALE .....259
I. CURRICULUM VITAE.....261
J. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET .....266
K. THESIS PERMISSION FORM/TEZ İZİN FORMU .....291

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants ..... 38
Table 2. Frequencies for the Occurrence of Personal Shame Memory across Participant Type and Socioeconomic Status ..... 44
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Post-Narrative Questions of Participants in Study 1 ..... 45
Table 4. Frequency Table for Participants regarding the Relational Context of Memories ..... 46
Table 5. Relational Contexts across Participant Groups ..... 50
Table 6. Frequency Table for Participants regarding the Content of Memories ..... 51
Table 7. Memory Contents across Participant Groups ..... 58
Table 8. Reliability Scores for all the Measures in Study 2 ..... 77
Table 9. Interrater Reliability Scores for Coding Schemes of Study 2 ..... 84
Table 10. Occurrence of Personal and Vicarious Shame Memory Narratives by Participant Group ..... 91
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Questions of Participants in Study 2 ..... 92
Table 12. Bivariate Correlations for University Students ..... 94
Table 13. Bivariate Correlations for Mothers ..... 98
Table 14. Hierarchical Regressions for University Students: Thematic Coherence (PSM & VSM), Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective & Cognitive & Total words (PSM & VSM), Identity Connections and Relationships / Social Interaction ..... 102
Table 15. Hierarchical Regressions for Mothers: Thematic Coherence (PSM & VSM), Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective & Cognitive & Total words (PSM & VSM), Identity Connections and Relationships/Social Interaction ..... 116
Table 16. Reliability Scores for all the Measures in Study 3 ..... 150

Table 17. Interrater Reliability Scores for Coding Schemes of Study 3.....157
Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Questions of Participants in Study 3.....164
Table 19. Bivariate Correlations for University Students.....166
Table 20. Bivariate Correlations for Mothers.....168
Table 21. Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Total Emotion Words.....172
Table 22. Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Positive and Negative Emotion Words.....174
Table 23. Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Unique Emotion Words.....176
Table 24. Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Shame-Related Words.....178
Table 25. Regression Analyses Predicting Turn-Taking Frequency for Daughters and Mothers.....180

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| AM | Autobiographical Memory |
| APIM | Actor-Partner Interdependence Model |
| BID | Balanced Integration-Differentiation |
| CFI | Comparative Fit Index |
| EMS | Early Maladaptive Schema |
| ICC | Intraclass correlation |
| GSS | The Guilt and Shame Scale |
| MLR | Robust Maximum Likelihood |
| OAS | The Other As Shamer Scale |
| PSM | Personal Shame Memories |
| PTSD | Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder |
| RMSEA | Root Mean Square Error of Approximation |
| SES | Socioeconomic status |
| SRMR | Standardized Root Mean Square Residual |
| TLI | Tucker-Lewis Index |
| VSM | Vicarious Shame Memories |
| WEIRD | Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic |

# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Overview

"Light griefs are loquacious, but the great are dumb."

Seneca

Do you share your day-to-day experiences with people close to you? What about more private ones? Have you ever noticed differences in how those around you talk about their experiences, perhaps in terms of what they choose to share, or how often they do so?

My academic path into developmental psychology started with a clinical background. As part of my clinical training, I've begun listening to clients' autobiographical memory narratives, and observed differences in how clients narrate their experiences: while some narrate their stories in a coherent and structured way, others do so in a fragmented or disjointed manner. However, beyond the style of narration, what is left unsaid also holds considerable significance. Fivush (2010) highlights this by distinguishing between *being silenced* and *being silent*. To her, being silenced is referred to as externally imposed, in contrast, being silent is referred to an understanding that does not require verbal expression. According to her view, being silent might even function as a form of power, but being silenced is a direct form of losing power.

Fivush's conceptualization about being silenced vs. silent also contributes to the salience of sharing our past and perspective on it with others. When we talk about our memories, we also choose from an array of content that is socially accepted to share

with others. Moreover, emotions that are attached to our personal memories are also shaped and influenced by whether we can freely share those with others, or not.

During my clinical psychology training, my first client shared an incident in our first session that she had kept to herself for years. As we worked through it together, it became clear that one of the most powerful emotions enforcing her silence was *shame*. As Erikson (1950) states, "... (shame) is (being) visible and not ready to be visible" (p. 252). *Shame* kept individuals silenced, enforcing an agreement to keep certain memories unvoiced, never allowing their emotions in their personal or vicarious memories to be processed. The experience of being silenced creates a gap in one's self and prevents untold stories from being integrated into a coherent sense of identity (Janoff-Bulman, 1992).

Previous studies about shame have been mainly researched in the field of clinical psychology, predominantly relying on self-report measures (Ferreira et al., 2014; Matos et al., 2012, 2017; Matos, Pinto-Gouveia, & Costa, 2013; Matos, Pinto-Gouveia, & Duarte, 2013; Matos & Pinto-Gouveia, 2010, 2014; Pinto-Gouveia & Matos, 2011). Although Matos and Pinto-Gouveia developed a semi-structured interview called the *Shame Experience Interview* (Matos & Pinto-Gouveia, 2006), detailed information regarding the specific content of shame memories remains limited. In their studies, traumatic content of shame memories and/or centrality of shame memories were mainly investigated in relation to depression, anxiety, and stress. Although these studies offer important insights into the experience of shame, the specific qualities of shame memories remain an area that warrants further investigation.

Previously, Türe (2021) conducted a study on mothers' shaming memories across two socioeconomic status groups, namely advantaged and disadvantaged groups, and contributed to the literature by examining maternal self-discrepancies both quantitatively and qualitatively. Results of the study of Türe (2021) offered that regardless of socioeconomic status, mostly strangers and close family members were the primary shamers of mothers. Within the strangers category, people unknown to them and doctors are the two most frequent subgroups of shamers, while mother-in-

law and own mothers are the most frequent family members. The content of the mother-shaming memories frequently concerns child-rearing practices (specifically criticism for being careless/inattentive and overanxious) and insufficient feeding (specifically inability to breastfeed and insufficient breastmilk) regardless of perceived socioeconomic status of mothers. The qualitative findings of the study suggest that attempting to conform to ideal motherhood standards can lead to negative emotional responses in women (Türe, 2021).

Building upon these studies, we wanted to examine shame memories. As the literature suggests, women are the *emotional historians* of families (Fivush, Marin, et al., 2009), therefore we intended to explore memory characteristics of shame in a context of mother-daughter dyad context.

My advisor and I designed three interrelated studies with female university students and their mothers to investigate their shame memory narratives and shame memory conversations. The first study was a pilot study. Online semi-structured interviews with 21 dyads were conducted separately about their personal shame memories. Thematic analyses were applied to the narratives to reveal 1) *relational context* of the memory, and 2) the *content* of the memory. The aim was to explore whether the themes of shame memories differed depending on the participant type (university student and mother) and socioeconomic status (low and middle-to-high).

In the second study, online semi-structured interviews with 69 dyads were conducted separately about their both personal and vicarious shame memories. Those narratives have coded in terms of thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive terms), relationship/social interaction, identity connections, and reasons. After the interviews, participants received online questionnaires that included self-report measures of self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables (external shame, internal shame, and shame-guilt proneness). The possible relationships between narrative characteristics of personal and shame memories and self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables were investigated.

In the third study, 188 mother-daughter dyads participated the study for a memory conversation about their shame memories with each other. Each dyad member was requested to select one personal shame memory and have a conversation together with each other in the absence of the researcher. As in the second study, after the memory conversation was over, participants received online questionnaires that included self-report measures of self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables (external shame, internal shame, and shame-guilt proneness). These memory conversations were coded according to their autobiographical memory characteristics, such as volume, total emotion words, unique emotion words, shame-related words, and conversational turn-taking. Memory conversation characteristics of daughters and their mothers, and their self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables were investigated by a dyadic analysis.

Through these online interviews, I listened to more than 650 shame memories; some were light and easy to express (and to hear), others were heavy and difficult to put into words (and to witness). These stories provided preliminary insights into the complexities of how shame is experienced, remembered, and at times, silenced.

### 1.2. Autobiographical Memory Development

At the most basic level, autobiographical memories are defined as the personally experienced past events (Reese, 2002). More nuanced descriptions would include that autobiographical memory is the memory of oneself interacting with others to achieve both short-term and long-term goals that define one's being and purpose in the world (Conway et al., 2004; Fivush, 2011). Autobiographical memory development is influenced by a combination of cognitive (e.g., improvements in executive function and self-awareness), social (e.g., parent-child reminiscing and elaborative conversations), and linguistic factors (e.g., vocabulary growth and narrative skills) (Bauer, 2007; Nelson & Fivush, 2004; Reese, 2002) and develops gradually during the preschool years.

The act of remembering the past starts at a young age and follows the notions of Vygotskian theory (Vygotsky, 1978). Social and cognitive skills stem from interpersonal interactions and are later developed as individual skills. Although all

normally functioning human individuals are capable of recalling past experiences, the forms and functions of autobiographical memory exhibit social and cultural variability (Fivush, 2011). Cultures equip individuals with the necessary skills and tools to become competent members of these cultures (Fivush, 2013). Furthermore, these frameworks establish canonical forms of social interactions and activities, shaping individuals' shared understanding of reality. This shared perception shapes the behaviors and interactions that are deemed acceptable and unacceptable within a particular culture (Fivush, 2011).

Children develop memory and narrative skills by engaging in adult-scaffolded social interactions. Once children reach 16 to 18 months of age and start communicating verbally, they also start engaging in conversations about past events (Fivush, 2007). Young children need the guidance and support of older, more experienced adults to help direct the conversation and guide them through it. When discussing a past emotional experience, a child has to remember the event and their emotional response, as well as think about and make sense of the experience (Dunn et al., 1991). Nelson and Fivush (2004) propose a *Social Cultural Developmental Theory*, which emphasizes that autobiographical memory is shaped by personal experiences embedded in a social and cultural context (Nelson & Fivush, 2004). They noted that children are not passive recipients of adult scaffolding; instead, they view the parent-child dyad as a mutually accommodating system. From a social-cultural point of view, one of the most fundamental ways that cultures organize events is through language (Bruner, 1990; Fivush, 2008; Fivush et al., 2011; Vygotsky, 1978). Language organizes stories, especially when it comes to remembering your own memories. Autobiographical memory serves as the fundamental *raw material* for constructing narrative identity, which is the overarching narrative that integrates a person's past, present, and anticipated future into a coherent sense of self-identity (Thomsen et al., 2025). Narratives are canonical linguistic structures that establish a chain of actions and the links between them (Fivush, 2011).

Building on the notion that culture and language jointly shape the structure of our life stories and self-understanding, we must consider how these narrative frameworks are internalized or acquired indirectly. These narrative schemas are internalized through

social interactions (such as parent-child reminiscing or storytelling) where children gradually adopt culturally specific ways of structuring and interpreting memories (Bruner, 1990; McAdams, 2003; Nelson & Fivush, 2004). Over time, these patterns shape not just *what* is remembered, but *how* experiences are framed into meaningful life stories, blending individual recollection with shared cultural frameworks (Fivush, 2011). Therefore, autobiographical memory is more than just a personal or shared construction; it's a dynamic and fluid process of reconstruction that occurs repeatedly through conversations during social interactions (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000; Fivush, 2010, 2019; McLean et al., 2007; Rubin, 2006), that lays the foundation for one's narrative identity.

### 1.3. Narrative Identity

As Thomsen et al. (2025) outlines, in the late 1980s, there has been a shift in perspective towards viewing human beings as storytellers in the field of psychology. This idea has been influenced by various disciplines such as philosophy, psychoanalysis, and cognitive science. Researchers and clinicians now understand human lives as narratives that are shaped by personal experiences, beliefs, and cultural influences. This narrative approach has led to a deeper understanding on how individuals construct their identities and make sense of their past, present, and future (Thomsen et al., 2025).

Literature indicates that narrative identity develops slowly over time through the process of storytelling about their experiences to and with others (McAdams & McLean, 2013). Over time, selves create stories, which in turn create selves (McAdams & McLean, 2013; McLean et al., 2007). As these stories are repeatedly processed, reconstructed, reinterpreted, and retold, a broader and more integrative narrative identity gradually develops (McAdams & McLean, 2013).

In their late-adolescent and young-adult years, individuals begin to inquire about their identity, the ways in which their past experiences have influenced their current identity, and their aspirations for the future (McAdams, 2011; Norona et al., 2015). McAdams (2013) posits that the responses to these inquiries shape one's narrative

identity. He argues that narrative identity is a dynamic and ongoing process within lifespan, and involves who a person has been, is, and going to be (McAdams, 2013).

Narrative identity is contingent upon autobiographical memory, the imagination of future events, and autobiographical reasoning, that is, the capacity to connect and comprehend memories and imagined scenarios in a manner that defines the self and imparts meaning (Habermas & Bluck, 2000; McAdams, 2001; Pasupathi, 2007). When all of these elements contribute to the construction of a coherent life narrative, the narrative serves as a psychological resource, establishing temporal continuity and a certain degree of unity, purpose, and meaning in life (McAdams, 2001). Content and structural dimensions of narrative identities have been linked to psychological health, well-being (Baerger, & McAdams, 1999), and depression (Adler et al., 2006). Consequently, the manner in which individuals conceptualize and interpret this evolving narrative of their selves serves as a crucial factor in constructing meaning and comprehending their lives. Thomsen (2025) suggested that negative self-beliefs and negative personal stories develop together. Personal memories usually function as a means of emotion regulation (Habermas, 2019; Pasupathi et al., 2017).

As McLean et al. (2007) pointed out, untold stories warrant further investigation, which has been indirectly addressed by subsequent studies. The process model of self-development (McLean et al., 2007) posits experiences is affected by whether they are shared with others and by the level of importance attributed to them in their unique cultural context. The lack of disclosure prevents these stories from being fully integrated into the self (Fivush, 2004; McLean et al., 2007).

Before delving into further complexities, it is essential to examine the two fundamental types of narratives we construct: personal memories and vicarious memories.

### 1.4. Personal Memory and Vicarious Memory

In typical family conversations, past experiences of the family members are recounted every five minutes (Bohanek et al., 2009). Family is formed, reshaped, and presented through storytelling (Fivush, 2019). Autobiographical memories serve as the fundamental substrate upon which narrative identity is constructed, which is the

internalized and evolving story of the self (Adler, 2012). However, not only do our direct experiences shape our life stories and self-understanding, but so do those we acquire through others' stories, conversations, or cultural narratives (Hirst & Manier, 2008; Pasupathi, 2001; Pillemer et al., 2024). These indirect memories, termed *vicarious memories*, can influence our self-understanding and emotional development in both subtle and profound ways (Schank & Abelson, 1995; Wang, 2001).

Pillemer and his colleagues' (2015) pioneering study revealed that personal memories of firsthand experiences and vicarious memories (that happened to other people, including but not limited to parents, siblings, friends, work colleagues, and support group members) had similar phenomenological qualities (emotion, vividness, seeing the memory image, experiencing a physical reaction), similar patterns of intercorrelations between memory qualities, and served many of the same functions. Moreover, content analyses identified similar major themes in both personal and vicarious memories (Pillemer et al., 2015). İlgün (2024), in her study with emerging and young adults, found that phenomenological ratings (valence and vividness) and autobiographical memory functions (for self and social functions partially, for directive function fully supported) of personal life stories and vicarious life stories were positively related with each other.

Given the inherent connection between self and memory (Conway, 2005), and the tendency of humans to remember self-related information (İlgün, 2024; Klein & Loftus, 1988; Markus, 1977), robust research highlights that despite their similarities, personal and vicarious memories diverge in several key aspects. Although positively correlated, phenomenological characteristics such as vividness, emotional intensity and coherence levels are significantly higher in personal memories compared to vicarious ones (İlgün, 2024; Pillemer et al., 2015; Pond & Peterson, 2020).

Both personal and vicarious memories serve as the foundation for the development of valuable frameworks that facilitate the understanding of oneself and others (Pillemer et al., 2024). The results of Duke et al. (2008) showed that children who knew more about their family histories reported lower anxiety, higher self-esteem, greater internal control, better family functioning, fewer behavioral problems, and more cohesive

families (Duke et al., 2008). Through vicarious memories, people are able to learn from the lives and experiences of others, rather than relying only on their own past (Pillemer et al., 2024). However, Fivush et al. (2019) suggests that all families harbor secrets: some concealed and lost to history, others known yet deliberately unspoken. Difficult experiences shared without elaboration (stories that are told and not told simultaneously) can lead younger family members to confusion and even *shame* (Fivush et al., 2019). Such confusion manifests itself in the form of incoherent narratives, which are not only associated with lower levels of psychological well-being but also result in suboptimal outcomes for both adolescents and the intergenerational transmission of family history (Fivush et al., 2019). Furthermore, all narratives are influenced by culturally dominant narrative forms that establish structural and evaluative frameworks for interpreting human experience (McLean & Syed, 2016). Cultural differences between American and Japanese students were observed in their self-disclosure, such as sharing their most embarrassing experience (Schug et al., 2010). These differences suggest that the thematic content of narratives may reflect culturally shaped frameworks that guide how individuals' structure and evaluate personal experiences.

The transmission of these narrative frameworks to the individual is fundamentally deeply rooted in early conversational environments.

### 1.5. Roles of Memory Conversation Characteristics

The origins of narrative identity can be traced to interactions between children and their caregivers, where parental scaffolding influences the capacity of children and adolescents to remember and narrate memories (Fivush, 2019b; Fivush et al., 2011; Marshall & Reese, 2022; McLean et al., 2007; Thomsen et al., 2025). Literature suggests parents can reminisce with their children either in a high or low elaborative style regardless of their talkativeness. When mothers reminisce with their children about past experiences and emotions in a highly elaborative style, it helps the children to better understand and manage their own emotions. This practice, known as *elaborative maternal reminiscing*, can also lead to a more positive self-image and the ability to create coherent narratives even into adolescence (Reese et al., 2019). Studies

indicate that children of parents with more elaborative conversational styles subsequently narrate more extensive and coherent accounts of personal experiences than their less elaborative counterparts (Fivush, 2019; Nelson & Fivush, 2004), and her colleagues (Reese et al., 2010) conducted a comprehensive longitudinal study on maternal reminiscing that began when the children were 16 months old and continued through adolescence. Interestingly, adolescents whose mothers used a more elaborative style during their preschool years reported an earlier age of first memory (on average, about three months earlier) than those whose mothers had a less elaborative style, as assessed when the children were 12 years old. Beyond reporting an earlier first memory, it was also found that children who exposed to a highly elaborative reminiscing style about their early life experiences are able to recall more memories from that time period. This helps them develop a more detailed personal history and better anchor themselves in their past. The findings indicate that the way parents, particularly mothers, talk about past events has a significant influence on children's autobiographical memory characteristics (Reese et al., 2010).

The scaffolding provided by parents becomes especially critical in helping children navigate and make sense of negative experiences (Salmon & Reese, 2015). In some familial settings, it is not uncommon to encounter an active discouragement or even silencing of the sharing of personal narratives, particularly those involving negative experiences (Fivush, 2019; Salmon & Reese, 2015). Therefore, a discouraging attitude can have a substantial impact on children's sense of narrative identity, highlighting the inherent link between emotional experience and memory construction.

### 1.6. The Role of Emotions in Autobiographical Memory

When we talk about the past, we often talk about our emotions. Throughout the day, we frequently talk about our personal experiences. Research shows that people tend to discuss over 90% of their daily emotional experiences with someone else within a few days of their occurrence (Rimé, 2007; Rimé et al., 1991). Rimé (2009) referred to the natural inclination of individuals to share and discuss their emotional experiences as *the social sharing of emotion*. By sharing these events with others, we are able to gain a better understanding of our personal history, and the emotions attached to them.

Darwin (1872/1965) posited that emotions serve a survival purpose and are expressed in a similar manner across different species (Darwin, 1965). Emotions are generally divided into two main categories: primary and self-conscious emotions (Lewis, 1992). Primary emotions consist of six universal emotions (happiness, surprise, fear, sadness, anger, and disgust) that are easily recognized through facial expressions (Ekman et al., 1972). In contrast, self-conscious emotions (shame, guilt, pride, embarrassment etc.) are considered more complex because they require self-awareness and an understanding of social rules (Santrock, 2023).

Children learn more about emotions through conversations with their parents. Reminiscing about emotions is particularly critical for children's self-understanding and emotional-self-concept development (Fivush, 2004, 2019). By at least 18-24 months children begin to label emotions, talk about past and future emotions, and converse about the context of emotional states (Lewis, 2016). These conversations improve children's understanding of self-knowledge, emotions, and other's emotions, that are vital to survival skills in the social world (Eisenberg et al., 1998).

Remembering and reminiscing emotionally charged memories were widely investigated in the autobiographical memory literature. Researchers have examined how mothers reminisce with their children during memory conversations in different emotional memories such as happiness, fear, anger, and sadness (Fivush et al., 2003; Reese et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2010) regards that there are different underlying goals for remembering different emotion-induced experiences, such as positive versus negative: While reminiscing positive events may serve to create emotional bonds through the sense of shared history, reminiscing about negative experiences may help children to understand and resolve negative affect (Fivush, 2007). Studies have shown that reminiscing negative memories with their mothers can help children comprehend and manage their emotions better. These conversations don't just focus on what happened, but also on the emotions that were felt and why they happened. Mothers and children focus on discussing emotions and reasons for feeling them, regardless of the type of negative event (i.e., highly stressful, traumatic, or mundane) (Fivush et al., 2003; Reese et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2010).

In addition, McLean and Lilgendahl (2008) have found that high-point and low-point life stories have different reminisce functions and effects on well-being in different age groups. While older adults utilize both high-point and low-point memories for self-functions, emerging adults seem to focus more on the high-point memories, which aligns with their current developmental needs. Specifically, self-functions were more crucial for the well-being of younger individuals, while social functions held greater significance for the well-being of older adults. To put it another way, positive memories seem to help younger people build a sense of who they are and help older people connect with others (McLean & Lilgendahl, 2008).

Literature moreover suggests that the narration of positive and negative events has also distinct effects on individuals. Pasupathi (2003) demonstrated that individuals tend to report less negative emotional responses after recounting a negative incident compared to their initial emotional state. Conversely, there was no discernible difference in positive emotional responses. Lyubomirsky et al., (2006) extended the findings by noting that while writing or talking about negative events is associated with increased well-being, simply thinking about negative experience (without sharing) is associated with decreased well-being. By contrast, thinking about positive events (without sharing) is related to increased well-being while writing or talking about positive events is not (Lyubomirsky et al., 2006). This finding is in line with the hypothesis that emotionally negative memories contain more crucial information to our survival than emotionally positive memories (Rasmussen & Berntsen, 2009; Taylor, 1991).

### 1.6.1. Self-Conscious Emotions

As noted earlier, Lewis (1992, 2016) distinguishes emotions into two main categories: The former is the primary emotions which appear in the first 6 months of infants, and present in humans as well as in other animals (surprise, interest, joy, anger, sadness, fear, and disgust). The latter refers to self-conscious emotions that necessitate self-awareness at some point which appear in the second half of the first year or within the second year (shame, guilt, pride, embarrassment etc.) (Santrock, 2023).

The significance of others is particularly evident in the realm of emotions. While all emotions are fundamentally social in nature, the self-conscious emotions stand out in

a different aspect in this regard. These emotions are not only rooted in social relationships but also encompass evaluations and judgments of oneself and others in a reciprocal manner (Fischer & Tangney, 1995). For instance, when individuals perceive that their actions or inherent characteristics are subject to judgment, they may experience a sense of shame. This reaction is to be expected, as research indicates that when individuals receive new information that reduces their perceived social value (e.g., diminished social status), audiences tend to place less emphasis on that person's well-being (e.g. see Delton & Robertson, 2016; Sparrowe, 2020).

Among self-conscious emotions, shame is a prevailing emotion that has remarkable social significance (Gilbert, 2003; Tangney & Dearing, 2002) and profound impacts on one's sense of identity (Gilbert, 1998; Nathanson, 1996). The emotion of shame has been linked to the mental perception of oneself as unattractive, unpleasant, inadequate, and flawed (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996) the thoughts of others (Gilbert & McGuire, 1998; Keltner & Harker, 1998). The feeling of shame can impact how we behave in social situations and affect our self-perception and social standing. It can also shape our sense of identity and desirability (Gilbert, 1998; Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

Lewis (1992) and Nathanson (1994) suggests that an individual's tendency to feel excessive shame may stem from negative self-images that develop in relation to past experiences of being shamed. Furthermore, shame-proneness appears to have associations with negative rearing experiences during childhood, specifically with critical and harsh parenting styles (Claesson & Sohlberg, 2002; Webb et al., 2007). Given that the development of shame-proneness is closely intertwined with early emotional socialization (Loader, 1998; Mills, 2003; Mukherjee & Bhattacharjee, 2023); children's shame has been found related to parental criticism, under-recognition of positive behaviours, parental hostility, love withdrawal, and manifestation of power assertion strategies (Abell & Gecas, 1997; Alessandri & Lewis, 1996; Ferguson & Stegge, 1995; Hoglund & Nicholas, 1995; Mills, 2003; Stuewig & McCloskey, 2005).

While recent research on shame and shame memories has gained more attention, the overall body of research on autobiographical memory remains limited.

### 1.6.2. Shame Memories

Shame is a powerful self-conscious emotion that permeates to the individual's sense of self, profoundly have an impact on well-being and making individuals more vulnerable to psychopathology (Keltner & Harker, 1998; Kim et al., 2011; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Existing research on shame and shame memories primarily grounded in the self-report measures, particularly the traumatic impact [(Impact of Event Scale - Revised; Weiss & Marmar, 1997)] and centrality of shame experiences (Centrality of Event Scale; Berntsen & Rubin, (2006)], in relation to depression, anxiety and stress. Results indicated that the traumatic impact of shame experience and its subscales (intrusion, avoidance and hyper-arousal) were moderately and positively correlated with external shame ($r$ = .43; $p$ < .01) and internal shame ($r$ = .44; $p$ < .01) (Matos & Pinto-Gouveia, 2010). Additionally, it was observed that external shame, internal shame, and traumatic impact of shame experience significantly predicted depression, explaining 26.5% of the variance (Matos & Pinto-Gouveia, 2010). In another study, Matos and Pinto-Gouveia (2011) found that the centrality of shame memories was highly and positively correlated with traumatic stress reactions ($r$ = .63; $p$ < .01). Internal shame, external shame and centrality of the event produced a significant model, accounting for 25% of the total variance in depression, 21% in anxiety, and 19% in stress (Matos & Pinto-Gouveia, 2011).

Literature offered that people do not talk about their shame experiences in an everyday conversation frequently (Macdonald, 1998). Shimanoff (1984) analyzed the conversations of college students and married couples and revealed that *shame* was among the least frequently mentioned emotion. While one might expect shame to differ from other emotions regarding Rimé et al.'s conceptual framework of *social sharing of emotions* (Rimé et al., 1991, 1996), a similar proportion of sharing was observed for shame memories. In their study, Rimé et al. (1991) demonstrated that shame shared at a later point in time, and more selectively compared to other emotions. The recipient of shame was a partner, friend, or sibling; rather than acquaintances, colleagues, and parents. This result suggested that people are prepared to share their shame experiences, but they are more cautious and selective regarding the recipient (Rimé et al., 1991).

Recently, Türe (2021) conducted a series of studies using shame memory narratives, focusing on their specific content and characteristics. Her research involving mothers' experiences uncovered both the perpetrators and the thematic content of *shaming memories* embedded in their mothering practices.

Shame is widely regarded as a predominantly maladaptive emotion, in which individuals often feel inadequate, empty, lonely, or incapable, and perceive themselves as defective, bad, weak, or insecure. Feeling this way can lead people to avoidance responses, similar to how fear can (Pascual-Leone & Greenberg, 2007). This avoidance may interrupt the embedding of the experience in a narrative, a fundamental way of making sense of it (Baumeister & Newman, 1994), and hinder the coherent integration of the experience into one's life story, which is what distinguishes life narratives from mere lists of past events (Habermas & Bluck, 2000).

As previously noted, the key difference between the studies discussed and the current study is that prior research primarily investigated the impact of shame on individuals, specifically asking participants to recall situations in which they felt shame and to complete self-report questionnaires accordingly. In contrast, the present studies elicited shame memory narratives, focusing on the content and characteristics of these narratives themselves, while also investigating their relationships with self-report measures. To this end, the present research moves from analyzing relational context and the content of memories (Study 1) to investigating the predictive links between narrative characteristics and individual differences (Studies 2 and 3) in the context of mother-daughter dyad.

### 1.7. Autobiographical Memory in the Context of Mother-Daughter Dyad

Autobiographical memory development of children is deeply shaped by parent-child reminiscing styles in the context of family dynamics (Fivush, 2019; Nelson & Fivush, 2004)). Reminiscing is the process of remembering autobiographical memories and is defined as thinking, writing, or talking about personal past events. It is a fundamental human activity that begins to develop in early childhood (Nelson & Fivush, 2004). Parents play a crucial role in scaffolding their children's narratives by teaching them which information is important to include and how stories should be structured (Fivush

& Nelson, 2006; Peterson & Roberts, 2003; Şahin-Acar et al., 2019; Zaman & Fivush, 2013). This process is pivotal for a child's developing autobiographical memory, sense of self, and socio-emotional skills, and it offers an opportunity to interpret experiences, fostering connections between past, present, and future events (Fivush & Nelson, 2006; Peterson & Roberts, 2003). In their study, Paterson and Roberts (2003) explored the similarities and differences in autobiographical narratives between parents and children, particularly focusing on same-sex dyads and age groups (2-5 years and 8-13 years). Results suggested that mother-daughter dyads exhibited remarkable similarity in their narrative styles in older daughters, even after controlling for narrative length. These results can be discussed in the framework of Chodorow's *identity theory* (Chodorow, 1978), which offers the bonds between girls and their mothers would be stronger than those between boys and their fathers, leading to greater same-sex concordance for mother-daughter dyads. Moreover, parental socialization practices often vary by the child's gender. Mothers are found to talk more with their daughters compared to their sons (Fivush et al., 2000, 2003; Leaper et al., 1998). This differentiation extends to the goals of reminiscing: while women more frequently report *emotional reasons* than men for sharing memories, men are more likely to prioritize *teaching purposes* (Bakır-Demir, 2021).

Building on this emotional focus and their role as the *emotional historians* of families (Fivush et al., 2009), exploring the narrative characteristics of shame within the mother-daughter dyad provides a highly relevant context. To understand how mothers navigate emotion induced reminiscing with their children, broader research on mother-child reminiscing offers valuable insights. Laible (2011) explored the impact of mother-guided reminiscing on preschoolers' emotional development. Specifically, the findings indicated that reminiscing about negatively charged memories, rather than positively charged ones, has a positive effect in regard to their emotional development. However, this positive influence is contingent upon mothers engaging in more elaborate conversations during these reminiscing sessions (Laible, 2011). More recently, Tamari et al. (2024) found that mothers' sensitive guidance of emotion dialogues during a child's preschool years (around age 4) can predict the child's attachment representations and overall narrative coherence in early adolescence

(around 12.5 years). This suggests that early mother-child interactions about emotions contribute significantly to how adolescents form secure representations of their relationships, particularly with their mothers (Tamari et al., 2024). These findings provide further evidence for influence of maternal guidance on a child's autobiographical memory and self-representation appears to have long-lasting effects.

Furthermore, as children grow older, the dynamics of reminiscing can change. When reminiscing is taken into account within a conversation, it takes on a collaborative quality known as *co-construction* (Fivush & Wang, 2005; Nelson, 2003; Wang & Leichtman, 2000). This type of memory conversation serves both personal and social functions. It allows individuals to develop their self-identity while helping mothers and daughters build a shared history and strengthen their social bonds (Nelson, 2003; Reese & Brown, 2000). Furthermore, parents also use their personal memories to teach and guide their children (McLean, 2015; Pratt et al., 2008). In addition, the literature on parent-child conversations makes a distinction between *reminiscing* and *recounting* (Şahin-Acar et al., 2019). Whereas *reminiscing* involves the discussion of experiences that took place in the presence of both parties, *recounting* refers to memory conversations regarding experiences that occurred in the absence of the other party. This distinction matters because the primary focuses of the talks can be varied: *reminiscing* primarily serves the function of bonding, while the primary goal of *recounting* would be information elicitation rather than bonding (Reese & Brown, 2000; Wang, 2013).

Expanding our scope beyond the dyadic level, the results highlight that narrative styles are not merely shared between two generations but persist across three, demonstrating a broader intergenerational transmission (Şahin-Acar et al., 2017). In their study, Şahin-Acar et al. (2017) investigated the earliest childhood memories of daughters, mothers, and grandmothers within the same families and discovered significant intrafamilial similarities in the overall narrative styles. Members of the same family shared remarkably similar levels of detail and volume in their earliest childhood memories, suggesting a transgenerational trend (Şahin-Acar et al., 2017). Şahin-Acar et al. (2017) proposed that socialization patterns about reminiscing can explain these intrafamilial similarities.

Beyond the individual and familial factors inherent in dyadic (and occasionally triadic) interactions, cultural frameworks may worth noting in shaping the landscape of autobiographical memory and reminiscing literature.

### 1.8. Autobiographical Memory in the Context of Culture

Cultural contexts and tendencies profoundly influence autobiographical memory development (McLean et al., 2018; Wang, 2021; Wang et al., 2018). People raised in different cultural contexts remember their personal pasts differently (Ross & Wang, 2010). It is, therefore, important to acknowledge that the generalizability of the aforementioned studies can be influenced by cultural factors (Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2013; Graneist & Habermas, 2020; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992; Liang & Van Leeuwen, 2024; Svane et al., 2021). For example, studies in Spanish families have noted mothers mentioning a higher proportion of emotion words than fathers, reflecting traditional gender roles (Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2013, 2015), while research in an egalitarian Scandinavian context found no significant overall differences in reminiscing styles between mothers and fathers (Svane et al., 2021).

Furthermore, cultural differences, both between and within cultures, significantly influence reminiscing practices, and consequently, the development of narrative skills and autobiographical memory in children (Reese & Neha, 2015; Şahin & Mebert, 2013; Şahin-Acar & Leichtman, 2015; Wang, 2013). These differences often stem from varying cultural values regarding the self, relationships, and the purpose of communication (Reese & Neha, 2015). European-American mothers, for instance, have been reported discussing the past more often and for more diverse reasons, including conversational, relationship, and directive purposes, compared to Chinese mothers (Wang, 2013). In another study, researchers have observed that compared to the families from Costa Rica, Mexico, conversations in German families were least socially oriented (Schröder et al., 2013).

Besides, literature suggests some within-cultural variations in reminiscing and narrative styles: among different regions of Turkey, elaborativeness and repetitiveness levels of mothers have been observed in variation (Şahin-Acar & Leichtman, 2015). Among culturally affiliated and less affiliated Māori families, a difference in their

reminiscing frequency has been reported (Reese & Neha, 2015); and among European countries like Germany, Sweden, and Estonia, despite shared autonomy values, mothers have been different in their elaborations (Tõugu et al., 2011). These results demonstrate the complexity and fluidity of reminiscing practices.

Lastly, socioeconomic status (SES) is also accepted as a cultural variable (American Psychological Association, 2002). Although the literature regarding SES in reminiscence patterns is limited, such an influence seems plausible. SES is not merely a demographic variable; it also encompasses a powerful sociocultural context that profoundly influences individuals' experiences, values, worldviews, and access to opportunities. Children from low SES households often have parents with limited levels of education, income, and occupational prestige (Hoff, 2013). Moreover, Hoff (2003) found SES-related differences in the properties of maternal speech in terms of quantity, lexical richness, and sentence complexity. Literature suggests that SES-related differences in terms of vocabulary size (Hoff, 2013) productive vocabulary (Arriaga et al., 1998), grammatical development (Dollaghan et al., 1999), accessing the words they know (Fernald et al., 2013) and narrative skills (Vernon-Feagans et al., 2001), placing lower-SES children at a disadvantage.

Although understanding the underlying mechanisms lies beyond the scope of the current studies, the first (pilot) study offers initial insights into the association between SES and narrative characteristics. Subsequent studies predominantly focused on examining the effects of cultural dynamics on narrative characteristics through the self-consturals.

### 1.8.1. Self-Construal and Autobiographical Memory

Self-construal, as defined by Markus and Kitayama, (1991), refers to how individuals perceive and construct their identities, a process primarily shaped by social interactions within a specific environment (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). Expanding on these dynamics, İmamoğlu's (1998, 2003) Balanced Integration-Differentiation (BID) model proposes four self-construal types based on levels of relatedness (collectivism dimension or interpersonal integration) and individuation (individualism dimension or intrapersonal differentiation), which are considered distinct but complementary

cultural dimensions (İmamoğlu, 1998, 2003). İmamoğlu (1998) underlines that a person both needs to develop their unique potential and relate to others in a meaningful way. Optimal development of individuals depends on their satisfaction of these two complementing needs. Crossing these two poles of each orientation of relatedness and individuation, four self-construals have been proposed: *related-individuated* (balanced; high in both dimensions), *related-normative patterning* (high in relatedness, low in individuation dimensions), *separated- individuated* (low in relatedness, high in individuation dimensions), and *separated-normative patterning* (unbalanced; low in both dimensions). The optimal psychological functioning requires the satisfaction of two needs of relatedness and individuation, and such an individual is regarded as related-individuated. On the contrary, the most unbalanced type is separated-patterning self-construal which is destitute of satisfaction in both needs (İmamoğlu, 2003).

Previous studies have proposed that *related-individuated* students have reported their earliest memories from a significantly earlier age, and found easier to describe (Şahin & Mebert, 2013). In general, individuals high in relatedness perceived their memories as more important, kept more memorabilia, and shared their experiences significantly more often than their counterparts who were low in relatedness (Şahin & Mebert, 2013). Moreover, Şahin-Acar and Leichtman (2015) reported that the *individuation* was uniquely related with more elaborative talk about future events and less repetitiveness. Additionally, they reported that children of mothers with balanced self-construal engaged in more yes/no questions during past event conversations (Şahin-Acar & Leichtman, 2015). Researchers also reported that Western Turkish mothers and American mothers did not differ in their *individuation* and *relatedness* scores. However, Western Turkish mothers scored higher on both individuation and relatedness than Eastern Turkish mothers, indicating sub-cultural differences in self-construal within the same country (Şahin-Acar & Leichtman, 2015).

Before we get into the more specific layers of the topic, it’s worth looking at the autobiographical memory codings and characteristics.

## 1.9. Autobiographical Memory Codings and Characteristics

### 1.9.1. Thematic Coherence

Narrative coherence involves telling a coherent story that includes time and place information, presents events in a logical sequence, provides a resolution, and incorporates subjective perspectives (e.g., Baerger & McAdams, 1999; Reese et al., 2011). How we narrate significant life events reflects and predicts our psychological adjustment, especially during adolescence and emerging adulthood when identity construction is a salient developmental task (Waters & Fivush, 2015).

Narrative coherence is operationalized in various ways, but three critical dimensions emerge: chronology, context, and theme (Reese et al., 2011; Waters & Fivush, 2015). A coherent narrative clearly establishes the sequence of events (chronology), orients them in a specific time and place (context), and provides enough detail and elaboration to connect the individual actions meaningfully (theme) (Reese et al., 2011). Thematic coherence, which refers to the extent to which a clear topic is introduced, developed, and resolved (Reese et al., 2011; Waters & Fivush, 2015) was coded in these studies. To be coherent thematically, a story must have a clear and identifiable topic that is elaborated upon and, in its most mature form, concludes with a resolution or a connection to the self.

Researchers have long suggested that the coherence of our stories about significant life events is a critical feature of psychological health especially from adolescence onwards, as identity formation becomes a central focus (Waters & Fivush, 2015). Low levels of coherence in autobiographical narratives are thought to be characteristic of psychiatric problems (e.g., Adler, 2012; Hermans, 2006; Lysaker & Lysaker, 2006). It is argued that a breakdown in coherence indicates an inability to regulate the emotions associated with the recalled event (Main, 2000). From this perspective, narrative incoherence may serve as an indirect indicator of ineffective coping. Ultimately, the struggle to cope with experiences that challenge our understanding of self explains the connection between coherence, identity, and adjustment (Waters & Fivush, 2015). Furthermore, this relationship can be explained within a cognitive psychology framework: constructing a coherent narrative that includes a resolution allows the

event to be integrated into existing knowledge. This process frees up cognitive and regulatory resources while effectively reducing rumination (Schank, 1995).

Yenen (2023) in her study, researched the adolescents in terms of their personal and vicarious memory narratives and found that thematic coherence in personal life stories predicts thematic coherence in vicarious life stories. In another study, Bakır-Demir et al. (2023) recruited Turkish and New Zealander triads of daughter–mother–grandmother participants for their vicarious mother stories and results showed that more voluminous family stories were found to be more thematically coherent. A cultural difference was also revealed in that study, offering that Turkish women's stories were more thematically coherent than their New Zealander counterparts. In addition, for New Zealander women dyads in the same family, it was found that grandmothers' (Z) *relatedness* orientations were positively associated with the thematic coherence of mothers' (Y) vicarious stories about their mothers (Z), while there was no such relationship for Turkish women (Bakır-Demir et al., 2023). Aytuglu et al. (2023) also investigated the role of self-construals in the coherence of young adults' personal narratives, revealing that those who scored higher in autonomy and lower in relatedness orientations provided more thematically coherent memories.

As literature offers, being a woman is a significant positive predictor of narrative coherence regardless of low point, high point and turning point memories whether it's personal or vicarious ones (Fivush et al., 2011; Grysman & Hudson, 2013; İlgün, 2024; McLean, 2008; Vanden Poel & Hermans, 2019). In their study, Reese et al. (2017) showed that mothers of adolescent girls have more thematically coherent narratives compared to fathers. And this effect was not found for the parents of boys (Reese, Fivush, et al., 2017). Furthermore, education level was a significant predictor of thematic coherence. Narrators with higher education levels tended to produce more coherent vicarious stories (Bakır-Demir, 2021).

Age is another important factor that has an impact on thematic coherence of the narratives. Grysman and Hudson, (2010) found that the thematic coherence of life story narratives in the 18-22 age group was higher compared to 13-15 years old young adolescents. The results of İlgün (2024) also showed that after controlling for volume,

emerging adults (18-23 age group) are found to produced statistically more coherent personal turning point narratives compared to young adults (28-33 age group). She explained this finding by noting that since emerging adults are in transitional periods of their lives, they may process personal turning points in a more coherent manner (İlgün, 2024). Providing a broader perspective on how age affects coherence in the life narratives, Köber et al. (2015) conducted an eight-year longitudinal study involving multiple interviews with each participant that aged between 8 and 69 to assess their coherence in the life narratives. They found that while thematic coherence is nearly absent at age 8, it emerges during adolescence and continues to mature until age 40 (Köber et al., 2015). However, the stories of older adults' (approximate age range was 60-90) began to be less coherent than the younger ones, suggesting that there might be a decline in thematic coherence in late adulthood (Bakır-Demir et al., 2020, 2021).

### 1.9.2. Subjective Perspectives

Subjective perspectives refer to the extent to which narrators describe the thoughts and feelings of characters in the narratives (Bakir-Demir et al., 2021; Reese et al., 2017). Habermas and de Silveira (2008) stated that interpreting past events by relating a variety of subjective perspective terms may be regarded as developmental accomplishment for adolescents. This view was also supported by Chen et al. (2021), which found that adolescents' self-esteem was uniquely related to using subjective perspective terms in their mothers' stories.

Subjective perspective terms included *affective* and *cognitive* terms. Affective states, including emotions (e.g., happy, sad), emotional behaviors (e.g., fighting), or general affective evaluations (e.g., sensitive, enjoyable), were identified and counted. Similarly, cognitive states, such as thought, desire, and belief processes (e.g., think, realize, need), were identified and counted.

In their study that conducted with Western middle-class adolescents, Zaman and Fivush (2011) found that adolescents regardless of their gender told stories about their mothers included more of the parent's subjective perspective than stories about fathers. Reese et al. (2017) conducted a study with 3 cultural groups in New Zealand (Chinese, Māori and European) and found that regardless of the cultural group adolescents used

more subjective perspective terms with age, and girls' narratives about their mothers contained more subjective perspective terms than their narratives about their fathers. In their study conducted with three generations of daughter–mother–grandmother Turkish participants, Bakır-Demir et al. (2021) found that in their family stories, women used more subjective perspective terms compared to men and younger adults used a higher number of subjective perspective terms compared to the older ones. In addition, more voluminous family stories were found to include more subjective perspective terms (Bakır-Demir et al., 2021, 2023). More recently, Yön (2023) conducted her study with university students ranging from undergraduate to doctoral levels from Turkey and found that individuals who have higher scores in individuation orientation used more subjective perspective terms in their familial narratives. Moreover, Bakır-Demir et al. (2023) recruited Turkish and New Zealander triads of daughter–mother–grandmother participants for their vicarious mother stories and results showed that when individuation was low, Turkish women used more subjective perspective terms in their mother stories than did New Zealander women. There were no cultural differences found in terms of subjective perspective terms among women who were high or average in individuation orientations (Bakır-Demir et al., 2023).

### 1.9.3. Identity Connections

Identity connections that are explicit links created between the protagonist's story and others' identities, including the narrator can be observed in intergenerational narratives. These connections included life lessons that others wanted them to learn and different types of comparisons between the narrator and the other party.

In their study, Merrill and Fivush (2016) reported that identity connections show higher levels of identity exploration and commitment, and higher self-esteem. Identity connections are suggested helping individuals define themselves in relation to others (Reese et al., 2017). Therefore, adolescents from interdependently oriented cultures are expected to use more identity connections in intergenerational narratives compared to their counterparts from independently oriented cultures (Reese et al., 2017). In align with the expectation, Reese et al. (2017) found that Chinese and Māori adolescents

used more identity connections in their intergenerational narratives than their European counterparts.

The number of identity connections were consistently found low in personal (Banks & Salmon, 2013; Merrill et al., 2016) and intergenerational narratives (Reese et al., 2017; Zaman & Fivush, 2011, 2013). Yenen (2023) found that being female resulted in a higher amount of identity connections used in low point and high point narratives.

### 1.9.4. Relationships / Social interaction

Relationships coding was adapted by Reese et al. (2017) from McAdams et al.'s (1996) communion theme (Reese et al., 2017). This theme highlights a need for intimacy and social connection of autobiographical narratives (McAdams et al., 1996). The social interaction coding can be used to evaluate the relationships in the vicarious stories, and focuses on the level of social interaction (Bakır-Demir et al., 2023; Reese, Fivush, et al., 2017). Social interactions in the stories were coded on a four-point scale (Reese et al., 2017; adapted from the study by McAdams et al., 1996).

The results of the study that was conducted with 3 cultural groups in New Zealand (Chinese, Māori and European), Reese et al. (2017) found that girls provided meaning-making statements about relationships in their intergenerational narratives than did boys. More recently, Bakır-Demir et al. (2023) recruited Turkish and New Zealander triads of daughter–mother–grandmother participants for their vicarious mother stories and results showed that more voluminous family stories were found to be included more social interactions, and Turkish women focused more on social interactions in their mother narratives than did New Zealander women. In addition, for New Zealander women dyads in the same family, it was found that grandmothers' (Z) relatedness orientations were positively associated with the social interactions of mothers' (Y) vicarious stories about their mothers (Z), while there was no such relationship for Turkish women (Bakır-Demir et al., 2023).

### 1.9.5. Reasons

Reasons coding reflects the narrators' opinions on why their partners did share the vicarious story with them. While not directly related to the coding of reasons, literature provides a wealth of insights into the motivations of individuals who share their memories with one another.

Previous research comparing the functions of maternal reminiscing with young children about shared experiences (Kulkofsky et al., 2009) and vicarious events (Wang & Song, 2014) reveals cultural differences whereby European American mothers reported using reminiscing more frequently to engage their children in conversations and maintain relationships compared to Chinese mothers. Reese et al. (2017) conducted a study with 3 cultural groups in New Zealand (Chinese, Māori and European) and found that adolescent development/teaching reasons were more common for Chinese and Māori adolescents compared to their European counterparts. The New Zealander European adolescents, on the other hand, were more likely to report that their mothers told them the childhood stories for the purpose of enriching their family histories. Moreover, reasons that adolescents believed their mothers told these stories changes by age: older adolescents (18 to 21 of age) reported *family history* reasons more often than younger adolescents, and who younger adolescents more likely to report their mother told them the story for *no reason* (Reese et al., 2017).

In addition, Bakır-Demir et al. (2023) recruited Turkish and New Zealander triads of daughter–mother–grandmother participants for their vicarious mother stories and asked participants why they thought family members told stories. Results revealed that Turkish women believed that their mothers told these stories for *development and teaching purposes* and *expressing their emotions*; while New Zealander women believed that their mothers told them these stories for *sharing family history* and *entertainment* reasons (Bakır-Demir et al., 2023).

Wang (2013) suggests that people in individualistic cultures share memories to keep their relationships strong. In collective cultures, however, relationships are already seen as secure, so this extra effort isn't necessary. This perspective, as proposed by Wang (2013), is consistent with the findings for Asian and Turkish groups; as members

of collectivist cultures, they tend to recognize the *didactic* reason behind their mothers shared memories.

### 1.9.6. Phenomenological Characteristics

Rubin (2005) identified the phenomenology of autobiographical memory as the subjective experience of autobiographical memory, and as an important aspect of conscious experience (Sutin & Robins, 2007). Tulving (2002) described phenomenology as the capacity that allows us to mentally travel back in time and relive experiences we consciously remember.

Researchers have developed various models to capture the subjective experiences of individuals regarding their memories (Berntsen et al., 2019; Boyacıoğlu & Akfırat, 2015; Rubin et al., 2003; Sutin & Robins, 2007).

Sutin and Robins (2007) had identified 10 relevant dimensions to assess how autobiographical memories vary from one another including vividness, coherence, accessibility, time perspective, sensory details, visual perspective, emotional intensity, sharing, distancing, and valence. Similarly, in their scale named the Autobiographical Memory Characteristics Questionnaire which was developed to capture phenomenology of autobiographical memories, Boyacıoğlu and Akfırat (2015) reported 14 factors including vividness, belief in accuracy, place details, sensory details, accessibility, sharing, field perspective, observer perspective, narrative coherence, recollection, emotional valence, emotional intensity, emotional distancing, and preoccupation with emotions. Likewise, in Autobiographical Recollection Test which was developed to examine individual differences in how well people think they remember personal events, Berntsen et al. (2019) relieved seven aspects of recollecting autobiographical memories including reliving, vividness, visual imagery, scene, narrative coherence, life-story relevance, and rehearsal.

In the current studies, after participants finished their narration, data on the phenomenological qualities were collected using measures adapted from prior research (Boyacıoğlu & Akfırat, 2015; Sutin & Robins, 2007). These qualities included the intensity of their current and past emotions, the significance of the event, its valence,

accessibility, its clarity, the intensity of the memory, its vividness, and the temporal closeness of the memory. Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), allowing for a possible score range of 1–7 for each phenomenological characteristic. Higher scores indicate a more or a higher degree of that characteristic (e.g., more intense emotion or more significant event).

Previous research has shown that the phenomenology of memories is influenced by individuals' mental health status. For example, individuals suffering from depression or trauma-related symptoms tend to have less intense and more general memories. In their study, Contractor et al. (2020) found that more post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) severity was associated with reduced ability to retrieve positive memories. Furthermore, a daily assessment of PTSD symptoms and a daily diary study revealed that the severity of PTSD symptoms was associated with a reduced vividness and accessibility of positive memories. A recent systematic review reports that interpersonal childhood trauma was associated with decreased quality of memories with less vividness and less details (Borrelli et al., 2024).

In addition to mental health, various individual and contextual factors have been shown to influence how memories are recalled and experienced. Buchanan (2007) proposed that memories with stronger emotional valence tend to be more vivid and easier to recall. This aligns with Sutin and Robins (2007)'s observation that accessibility and vividness tend to be highly correlated. Building on this, D'Angiulli et al. (2013) also stated that vividness was linked to accuracy and greater availability of memories. Consistent with this, naming of emotions substantially was found to be associated with increased vividness (Habermas & Diel, 2013). Furthermore, a study conducted in real-world conditions, involving actual victims (or witnesses) of a road accident, revealed that participants who experienced a high level of stress recalled more central details compared to those who reported a low level of stress. Extending this line of research, Waters et al. (2013) also found that highly negative event narratives were rated as more emotionally intense than highly positive events (Waters et al., 2013).

In addition to these individual and emotional factors, demographic variables such as age and gender have also been found to influence autobiographical memory characteristics. For instance, memory narratives reported by women generally scored higher than those reported by men on narrative variables including affect, connectedness, thematic coherence, and factual and interpretive elaboration (Bakır-Demir et al., 2021; Fivush, 2011; Vanden Poel & Hermans, 2019). Similarly, age has been found to be associated with stronger perceived vividness, coherence, and accessibility (Luchetti & Sutin, 2018; Sutin et al., 2021).

### 1.9.7. Narrative Characteristics

In addition to the phenomenological features of autobiographical memories, the narrative aspects of memory reports provide further insight into how individuals express and structure their memories. Volume of the memory, total emotion words, and the unique emotion words used by the narrator are important aspects.

In their study Bohanek et al. (2005) examined women's self-nominated intensely and moderately negative and positive events. They found that intensely negative event narratives were longer, and contained more cognitive processing words than positive events (Bohanek et al., 2005). Waters et al. (2013) also found that negative event narratives were longer, negative experiences occurred earlier in the past and were rated as more emotionally intense than positive events.

In addition, literature suggests that females tend to report longer memory narratives, and use more emotion terms than males (Andrews et al., 2015; Bauer et al., 2003; Bohanek & Fivush, 2010). Although some gender differences would seem consistent, the nature of the narrative also had effects on emotion word uses. For instance, Waters et al. (2013) found narratives about highly positive experiences contained more positive emotion words than negative experiences. Moreover, the use of such emotion words could have been shaped by further individual differences. A higher frequency of negative affective labels was associated with more severe depression symptoms (Mariani et al., 2020, 2025).

Previous research about unique emotion words suggests that using higher variety of emotion words is associated with maternal-high elaborativeness and individuation (Fivush et al., 2006; Fivush, 2007, Şahin-Acar & Leichtman, 2015). Çeviker (2022) in her study found that mothers' higher scores in schema domains, specifically in impaired autonomy, were related to their lesser usage of unique emotion words. She also found a gender effect in 48-60 months of children: daughters used more unique emotion words than sons (Çeviker, 2022).

Before moving on the details of each study, one last major topic needs to be covered.

### 1.10. Early Maladaptive Schemas and Schema Domains

Piaget (1936/1952) introduced the term *schemas* to describe the cognitive models children use to conceptualize, and predict events in their environment. Beck (1967) extensively elaborated on this construct in the context of cognitive therapy. Subsequently, Young et al. (2003) coined the term *Early Maladaptive Schemas* (*EMSs*) to describe dysfunctional or maladaptive core beliefs that develop from childhood into adulthood. Schema, within this context, defined as underlying cognitive structures that mediate, and organize an individual's experience of the world, while EMSs rooted as a consequence of core emotional needs go unmet (Rafaeli et al., 2011). With inspiration from attachment theory (Bowlby, 1977), essential and universal emotional needs of human beings were outlined, acknowledging that the intensity of these needs can vary among individuals: "needs for safety, stability, nurturance, and acceptance, for autonomy, competence, and a sense of identity, for the freedom to express one's needs and emotions, for spontaneity and play, and for a world with realistic limits which fosters the emergence of self-control" (Rafaeli et al., 2011, p. 7). Emotional needs are at their most intense during childhood. Given this, the core goal of a child's development is the fulfillment of these needs, as true psychological health stems from the ability to address them in an adaptive, beneficial manner (Rafaeli et al., 2011).

To provide a clearer context, the primary components that form the basis of Schema Therapy Model will be defined. The model identifies four key concepts to explain these patterns: EMSs, Schema Domains, Coping Styles, and Schema Modes.

Young and his colleagues (2003) defined EMS as a broad, pervasive theme or pattern that is significantly dysfunctional. EMSs encompass memories, emotions, cognitions, and bodily sensations (Young et al., 2003), and begin developing early in life and crystallize towards the end of adolescence (Muris, 2006; Young et al., 2003). Schema domains, on the other hand, represent broad categories of unmet emotional needs, serving as an organizational framework that clusters specific EMSs based on their shared developmental themes. While the concept of coping styles describes how individuals cope with their EMSs to handle negative experiences, schema modes are shifting emotional states triggered by life events that echo the past (Young et al., 2003). While the Schema Therapy Model comprises these four frameworks alongside a wealth of additional details, the current investigation centers primarily on schema domains, and therefore EMSs.

EMSs are self-defeating emotional and cognitive patterns that emerge early in development and repeat throughout life. The primary function of schemas is to establish cognitive consistency, providing a predictable (if not controllable) view of the world (Rafaeli et al., 2011). Within this framework, EMSs create a distorted reality where dysfunctional behaviors and emotions serve as logical responses. Cognitively, schemas filter the information we receive (Beck et al., 2004; Young et al., 2003), and filter our attention toward consistent information shaping our memories to align with our existing beliefs (Rafaeli et al., 2011). This distorted perspective and responses increases the risk of developing psychopathology (Jovev & Jackson, 2004; Rafaeli et al., 2011; Young et al., 2003).

Rafaeli et al. (2011) defined four types of early life experiences that foster the acquisition of schemas: The first is the toxic frustration of needs. It's described as the child's environment lacking something crucial, and that lack becomes a permanent presence in the child's mind. The second is traumatization, in which the child is harmed or victimized, and develops schemas that reflect the presence of danger, pain, or threat. The third is when the child experiences *too much of a good thing* and is coddled or indulged. The parents may be overly involved in the life of a child or may give a child an excessive degree of freedom and autonomy, without any limits. The fourth type of life experience creating schemas is selective internalization or

identification with significant others through modeling. In this process, schemas develop when the internalized learning fails to meet the child's core emotional needs, leading to an indirect sense of deprivation. Beyond early life experiences, other factors such as the child's emotional temperament, cultural context, and harsh life circumstances may play a role in the acquisition of schemas. Schemas ultimately emerge from the interaction of a child's temperament with the environment.

Young and his colleagues (2003) identified 18 EMSs organized into five overarching schema domains, representing broad categories of unmet emotional needs from early in life. Following the Turkish adaptation by Soygüt et al. (2009), which established the reliability of these domains, the current study centers on these broader constructs as its primary framework.

The first schema domain is *Disconnection and Rejection* that is related to violations of the "basic universal needs for security, safety, stability, nurturance, empathy, sharing of feelings, acceptance, and respect" (Rafaeli et al., 2011, p. 19). Schemas in this domain frequently develop when an early family environment is detached, withholding, cold, rejecting, violent, explosive, unpredictable, or abusive (Rafaeli et al., 2011, p. 19).

The second schema domain is *autonomy and performance* that is related to violations of the basic universal needs for autonomy and competence (Rafaeli et al., 2011). Schemas in this domain frequently develop when an early family environment is enmeshed, undermines a child's confidence, is excessively protective, or fails to reinforce a child's competence outside the family (Rafaeli et al., 2011).

The third schema domain of *impaired limits* is characterized by deficiencies in internal limits, responsibility towards others, and/or long-term goal-orientation. Schemas in this domain often cause difficulties in respecting others, cooperating, and achieving personal goals. These patterns often stem from an early environment marked by overindulgence, a lack of clear limits, appropriate confrontation, discipline or limit setting (Rafaeli et al., 2011).

The fourth schema domain is *other-directedness* that is related to violations of the basic universal needs for self-directness. Schemas in this domain often develop when love and attention are conditional, forcing the child to hide their true identity in order to be accepted or valued (Rafaeli et al., 2011).

The fifth and last schema domain is *overvigilance and inhibition* that is related to violations of the basic universal needs for spontaneity and playfulness. Schemas in this domain often develop when the family atmosphere that is grim, demanding, and sometimes punitive. In these families, performance and duty often take precedence over play and relaxation. Children are typically expected to suppress their emotions and strive for perfection while strictly avoiding mistakes (Rafaeli et al., 2011).

EMSs are found to be associated with various adverse outcomes, including heightened vulnerability for psychopathology (Calvete et al., 2013; Nicol et al., 2020) such as depression (Bishop et al., 2022), and obsessive-compulsive disorders (Dostal & Pilkington, 2023). Longitudinal studies indicate that EMSs positively predict the development of depression later in life (Calvete, 2014; Calvete et al., 2013). A recent study by Li et al. (2025) reported that all temperamental features were longitudinally related to later EMSs. However, most of the links between temperament and EMSs disappeared after controlling for attachment, except for some limited correlations between EMSs and *negative affect* and *effortful control* (Li et al., 2025). Since EMSs are characterized by strongly held relational themes, previous studies found that EMSs of parents influence the parenting behaviors differently. Mącik et al. (2016) found that daughters develop corresponding and complementary EMSs of their mothers, while Gibson and Francis (2019) reported that mothers' schemas in all domains were significantly linked to higher levels of daughter *other-directedness* schema domain. Moreover, Şahin-Acar (2024) found that mothers' and fathers' higher scores in schema domains, specifically *disconnection* and *impaired limits*, significantly predicted child's internalizing and externalizing problems, reflecting parental styles rooted in deeply held beliefs that, in turn, may contribute to the development of internalizing problems in their children.

### 1.11. Current Studies

In accordance with the existing literature, the primary goal of the current studies is to explore the characteristics of both personal and vicarious shame memories of female university students and their mothers. To accomplish this goal, three interrelated studies were conducted.

The first study was designed as a pilot study. Online semi-structured interviews with 21 dyads were conducted separately for their narration of personal shame memories, and their narratives were applied to two separate thematic analyses. Among participants, 10 of the dyads identified as having a lower socioeconomic status (SES), and 11 as having a middle to high SES. All interviews consisted of two main parts: the first part involved an autobiographical memory (AM) narrative of the participant, and the second part focused on the collection of AM characteristics.

The aim was to explore whether the relational context and the content of themes of shame memories differed depending on participant type (university students and mothers) and SES (low and. middle-to-high).

The second study was designed to extend the findings of the first study. In the second study, separate online semi-structured interviews were conducted with 69 mother-daughter dyads for their both personal shame memories and vicarious shame memories. As in the first study, all interviews consisted of two main parts: the first part involved an AM narrative of the participant including personal shame memories and vicarious shame memories, and the second part focused on collecting phenomenological characteristics of AM. Narratives of personal shame memories were coded for thematic coherence, and subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive words); vicarious shame memories were coded for thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive words), identity connection, relationships/social interaction, and reasons. After the narration part was over, participants received questionnaires for the collection of phenomenological characteristics of their AM. The questionnaires included self-report measures of self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related measures (external shame, internal shame, and shame-guilt proneness). Narrative characteristics for the personal

and vicarious shame memories were aimed to be predicted via self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables for university students and their mothers.

In the third study, 188 mother-daughter dyads were asked to engage in a memory conversation in an online setting about their shame memories together. To maintain a naturalistic setting, the dyads were physically co-located while the researcher connected to the session virtually. Each member of the dyad member was requested to select one personal shame memory and have a conversation together without the presence of the researcher. All online interviews, again, consisted of two main parts: the first part involved an AM conversation, and the second part focused on collecting phenomenological characteristics of AM separately. Memory conversations that the dyad constructed were coded according to their AM characteristics, such as volume, total emotion words used, unique emotion words, shame-related words, and conversational turn-taking. As in the second study, a questionnaire package was sent to the participants after the online interviews, including measures of the self-report form of self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables (external shame, internal shame, and guilt shame tendency). Memory conversation characteristics were aimed to be investigated via self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables.

# CHAPTER 2

# STUDY 1: PILOT STUDY

## 2.1. Aim

Study 1 had an exploratory nature, and our initial aim was to explore whether the participants would narrate their personal shame memories or not.

Online semi-structured interviews were conducted separately with a sample of 21 dyads, consisting of university students and their mothers, to explore their personal shame memories. Out of the 21 dyads, 10 of the dyads identified themselves as low socioeconomic status (SES), and 11 as middle-to-high SES. 2 different thematic analyses were applied to the narratives to explore the *relational context* and the *content* of personal shame memories. The frequencies of the themes were examined based on the participant type (university student and mother) SES (low and middle-to-high).

Given this study's exploratory nature, we did not propose any hypotheses but explored the following research questions:

*Research question 1:* Are participants able to (and choose to) narrate their shame memories to the researcher?

*Research question 2a:* If the answer to research question 1 is yes, what are the similarities and differences in the *relational context* of shame memory themes regarding participant type (university students and their mothers)?

*Research question 2b:* If the answer to research question 1 is yes, what are the similarities and differences in the *relational context* of shame memory themes regarding socioeconomic status (low and middle-to-high SES groups)?

*Research question 3a:* If the answer to research question 1 is yes, what are the similarities and differences in the *content* of shame memory themes regarding participant type (university students and their mothers)?

*Research question 3b:* If the answer to research question 1 is yes, what are the similarities and differences in the *content* of shame memory themes regarding socioeconomic status (low and middle-to-high SES groups)?

## 2.2. Method

Each interview consisted of two parts: the first part involved the autobiographical memory (AM) narrative of the participant, and the second part involved the collection of phenomenological characteristics of AM. The participants were guided through the first part of the interview according to the instruction provided (see Section 2.2.3.2), and their narrations were carefully attended to. The researcher listened attentively without interrupting and non-verbally encouraged the narrators to continue. After the narration was over, the researcher asked, "Would you like to add anything?". If their answer was yes, then the participants continued their narration; if no, their narration was considered complete. Then the second part of the interview which was the post-narrative questions section had begun (see Section 2.2.3.3). All interviews were audio-recorded with the permission of participants.

To analyze the personal shame memories of participants, two separate thematic analyses, following the approach of Braun and Clarke (2006), were conducted to identify themes related to relational context and the content of narrated shame memories.

### 2.2.1. Participants

21 mother-daughter dyads participated in Study 1, including 10 from low SES backgrounds and 11 from middle-high SES backgrounds. Female university students (age range 19-24, $M$ = 20.86, $SD$ =1.53), and their mothers (age range 38-57, $M$ = 48.76, $SD$ = 4.57) were invited to participate. A convenience sampling method was employed by the students from Middle East Technical University Psychology

Department who enrolled in the "PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology" course in 2023-2024 Spring Semester. A total of 25 students took this course. From this point onward, those who took the course will be referred to as *collaborating students* to distinguish them from the university student participants. Each collaborating student was required to refer at least four mother–daughter dyads to the researcher for participation in online semi-structured interviews to fulfill the class requirement. The referral procedure was based on the *first contact form*, which included both a demographic information form and the contact details of the university student, who may be considered a prospective participant for the study. The researcher contacted all prospective participants directly, provided general information about the study, and informed them that they would participate in separate online interviews with their mothers, which would be audio-recorded. Participants were asked to confirm their agreement with these conditions before scheduling the interviews.

The data collection process started in February 2024 and was completed in April 2024. Additional information regarding participant characteristics across participant types is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

| | University Student ($n$ = 21) | | Mother ($n$ = 21) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *SD* | *Mean* | *SD* |
| Age | 20.86 | 1.53 | 48.76 | 4.57 |
| Number of siblings | 2.05 | 0.59 | 3.71 | 1.68 |
| | *f* | *%* | *f* | *%* |
| Education Level | | | | |
| Middle school | | | 1 | 4.8 |
| High school | | | 7 | 33.3 |
| University student | 21 | 100 | | |
| Associate degree | | | 5 | 23.8 |
| Bachelor's degree | | | 5 | 23.8 |
| Master's degree | | | 3 | 14.3 |
| Perceived SES when childhood | | | | |
| Very low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 4 | 19.1 | 2 | 9.5 |
| Middle | 11 | 52.4 | 10 | 47.6 |

**Table 1** (continued)

| | *f* | % | *f* | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very high | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 |
| Current Perceived SES | | | | |
| Very low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low | 7 | 33.3 | 2 | 9.5 |
| Middle | 10 | 47.6 | 10 | 47.6 |
| High | 4 | 19.0 | 9 | 42.9 |
| Very high | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (Participant's) Mother's education | | | | |
| Primary School | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19.0 |
| Middle School | 0 | 0 | 14 | 66.7 |
| High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate Degree | 1 | 4.8 | 2 | 9.5 |
| Bachelor's | 8 | 38.1 | 1 | 4.8 |
| Master's | 10 | 47.6 | 0 | 0 |
| PhD | 2 | 9.5 | 0 | 0 |
| (Participant's) Father's education | | | | |
| Primary School | 0 | 0 | 15 | 71.4 |
| Middle School | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14.3 |
| High School | 1 | 4.8 | 2 | 9.5 |
| Associate Degree | 3 | 14.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Bachelor's | 13 | 61.9 | 1 | 4.8 |
| Master's | 3 | 14.3 | 0 | 0 |
| PhD | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 |

### 2.2.2. Procedure

The current research received ethical approval from Middle East Technical University's Human Subjects Ethics Committee with the protocol number 0448 and 0474-ODTUİAEK-2023 (See Appendix A). Female university students and their mothers were invited to participate in an autobiographical memory study by collaborating students who enrolled in the "PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology" class. Female university students were provided with an application form where participants first filled out the consent form, followed by the demographic information form and their contact information (first contact form). The researcher

contacted the university student who filled out the first contact form and provided brief information about how the interview would be conducted.

The target sample size for the pilot study was set at 10 low SES and 10 middle-high SES dyads. Data collection for middle-high SES participants in Study 1 was over rapidly. Subsequently, eligible middle-high SES participants were directed to Study 2, while recruitment for low SES participants continued for Study 1. Once the target of 10 low SES dyads was met, data collection for Study 1 was concluded.

The researcher sent a Doodle form to schedule the online interviews. The female university student was informed to choose a time for herself and was informed that after her interview, the mother's interview would be scheduled automatically for the following half an hour. Therefore, the university student was advised to discuss the reservation time with her mother before selecting it. Once the university student completed the doodle form to schedule the appointment, the interview link of the university student was sent to both the university student participants' e-mail address that they provided to the website and the researcher. The online semi-structured interviews of university students and their mothers were held separately and consecutively. After the first interview with the university student was over, for the next interview, the researcher created the mother's link manually and requested the university student to forward it to her mother. Prior to the mother's interview, consent was obtained from the mother.

As previously mentioned, each interview consisted of two parts: the first part involved the autobiographical memory (AM) narrative of the participant, and the second part involved the collection of phenomenological characteristics of narrated AM. Post-narrative questions were directed by the researcher. Each interview per participant took approximately 10 minutes.

All the interviews were audio recorded, and Microsoft Teams generated a raw transcript for each interview. All collaborating students who took the class edited the transcripts of their partners. For each participant whose transcript was edited by the students, it was confirmed that the *collaborating student* did not know the participant personally. Subsequently, a final review of all the transcripts was conducted by a team

of three undergraduate scholarship holders, specifically appointed as part of a project funded for this thesis.

### 2.2.3. Measures

#### 2.2.3.1. Demographic Information Form

The researcher created a link on Qualtrics called *first contact form*. This form included the consent form and the contact information of female university students who could be prospective participants in the study, as well as a demographic information form. Collaborating students shared this link to the prospective participants of the study; each of whom were assigned a specific participant code. The contact information of the female university students included their telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, and participant codes.

For the mothers, their demographic information was collected after the semi-structured interviews. No contact information for the mothers was collected.

The demographic forms included consent forms and the questions regarding participants' age, education level, occupation, city(ies) they have spent most of their lives in; romantic status, whom they live with, the number of siblings and birth order, who raised them during the first five years of their lives, their income and their parents' education level.

#### 2.2.3.2. Interviews

Online interviews with university students and their mothers were conducted separately. All interviews consisted of two main parts: the first part involved an autobiographical memory (AM) narrative of the participant, and the second part focused on the collection of phenomenological characteristics of AM.

The instruction for the shame memory was as follows:

> Today I would like you to think about a shame memory, a memory when you felt shame. It could have occurred at any time when other people were present,

> in a social setting, or perhaps when you were alone. Now I would like you to tell me about this memory in as much detail as possible.

The researcher listened attentively without interrupting and non-verbally encouraged the narrators to continue. After each narration, the researcher asked participants if they would like to add anything. If their answer was yes, then the participants continued their narration; if no, their narration was considered complete. Then the second part of the interview which was the post-narrative questions section had begun to collect phenomenological characteristics of narrated AM.

#### 2.2.3.3. Post-Narrative Questions

Post narrative questions were collected using measures adapted from prior research (Boyacıoğlu & Akfırat, 2015; Sutin & Robins, 2007). The questions can be found in Appendix C.

The post-narrative questions included the followings: the time of the narrated event, the intensity of emotions experienced at the time of the event (shame, anxiety, anger, humiliation, disgrace, sadness, and guilt) and in the present (same emotions). Additionally, participants reported how they coped with the incident and whether any witnesses noticed their feelings of shame in an open-ended format. If so, they were asked to speculate on what the witnesses might have felt.

Participants also rated how frequently they thought about the incident in the following four weeks, whether they experienced flashbacks, and whether they shared the incident with anyone. If they did, they specified with whom, when, and how frequently they recounted the event. Furthermore, they rated the importance, valence, accessibility, clarity, temporal distance, emotional intensity, and vividness of the narrated memory.

### 2.2.4. Data Analysis

#### 2.2.4.1. Thematic Analyses

In order to gain a deeper understanding about the nature of personal shame memories of mother-daughter dyads, two different analyses using the Thematic Analysis (TA)

approach were conducted: (1) *the relational contexts*, and (2) the *contents* of the narratives. The same method was followed for each analysis. The transcripts of the narratives were transferred to MAXQDA24 following the steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006): (1) Familiarizing yourself with your data, (2) Generating initial codes, (3) Searching for themes, (4) Reviewing themes, (5) Defining and naming themes, and (6) Producing the report.

As a first step in the coding process, the researcher meticulously read each narrative multiple times to enhance her familiarity with the data. After several rounds of reading the same narratives, the researcher began to take notes for potential initial codes. As the third step, the researcher revisited the initial codes and tried to reveal emerging themes and sub-themes. As the fourth step, the researcher reviewed the emerging themes and sub-themes and read all the narratives employing the draft code system. As the fifth step, after several rounds of reading the narratives with the draft code system and making necessary corrections, the themes and sub-themes become clearer as the final version with the definitions of each. In the sixth and final step, the report was written.

The entire process is repeated twice to explore the *relational context* (in which environment the shame memory emerged) and the *memory content* of personal shame memories.

## 2.3. Results

### 2.3.1. Preliminary Findings

The first research question of the current study addressed whether the participants are able to (and choose to) narrate their shame memories to the researcher or not. Results revealed that, while all university students narrated a personal shame memory ($n$ = 21), 19 of the 21 mothers narrated a personal shame memory. Similarly, while all middle-to-high SES participants narrated a personal shame memory ($n$ = 22), 18 of the 20 of low SES participants narrated a personal shame memory (see Table 2). These results indicated that, apart from individual incidents, participants could and choose to narrate their personal memory of shame.

**Table 2.** Frequencies for the Occurrence of Personal Shame Memory across Participant Type and Socioeconomic Status

| Occurrence of narrate personal shame memory | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No |
| Participant type | | |
| University Student (*n* = 21) | 21 | 0 |
| Mother (*n* = 21) | 19 | 2 |
| Socioeconomic status | | |
| Low SES (*n* = 20) | 18 | 2 |
| Middle-to-High SES (*n* = 22) | 22 | 0 |

#### 2.3.1.1. Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Questions

A series of independent samples t-tests were performed to examine whether participants' post-narrative evaluations differed based on participant type (university students vs. their mothers) or socioeconomic status (SES; low vs. middle-to-higher SES). Detailed descriptive statistics (*M*, *SD*, and range) and comparative statistical results (*t* and *p* values) for all variables are presented in Table 3.

Regarding participant type, significant differences were observed in two areas; the first one was on current felt disgraced: Students reported significantly higher levels of current disgrace compared to their mothers ($t = 3.48$, $p = .002$). And the second one on vividness: Mothers reported their memories significantly more vivid than university students ($t = -2.56$, $p = .014$).

In contrast, the analysis revealed that SES-based comparisons yielded no significant impact on any of the post-narrative measures. No statistically significant results were found across all SES comparisons (all *p*s > .05), indicating that these subjective evaluations were consistent regardless of socioeconomic background.

The answers of participants were shown in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Statistics of Post-Narrative Questions of Participants in Study 1

| | University Student | | | Mother | | | Comparison by Participant Type | | Comparison by Socioeconomic Status | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *M* | *SD* | Min Max | *M* | *SD* | Min Max | *t* | *p* | *t* | *p* |
| Age at Memory | 14.00 | 5.72 | 3-23 | 27.50 | 14.71 | 7.50-52 | | | | |
| Memory Characteristics | | | | | | | | | | |
| Past Shame | 4.43 | 0.75 | 3-5 | 4.42 | 0.84 | 3-5 | 0.03 | .976 | 0.96 | .345 |
| Past Anxiety | 3.98 | 1.29 | 2-5 | 3.29 | 1.52 | 1-5 | 1.55 | .131 | -0.82 | .418 |
| Past Anger | 2.69 | 1.57 | 1-5 | 2.90 | 1.70 | 1-5 | -0.40 | .695 | -1.23 | .228 |
| Past Humiliation | 3.52 | 1.29 | 1-5 | 3.13 | 1.75 | 1-5 | 0.80 | .429 | -0.22 | .825 |
| Felt disgraced | 4.17 | 1.20 | 1-5 | 3.82 | 1.64 | 1-5 | 0.78 | .442 | 0.33 | .742 |
| Past Sad | 3.83 | 1.15 | 2-5 | 4.50 | 1.07 | 1-5 | -1.90 | .066 | -0.06 | .957 |
| Past Guilt | 3.14 | 1.65 | 1-5 | 2.84 | 1.70 | 1-5 | 0.57 | .574 | 1.56 | .127 |
| Current Shame | 2.43 | 1.06 | 1-5 | 1.68 | 1.34 | 1-5 | 1.96 | .058 | 0.29 | .773 |
| Current Anxiety | 2.10 | 1.18 | 1-4 | 1.45 | 1.19 | 1-5 | 1.73 | .092 | 0.21 | .832 |
| Current Anger | 2.29 | 1.68 | 1-5 | 2.05 | 1.28 | 1-5 | 0.50 | .622 | -0.67 | .508 |
| Current Humiliation | 1.95 | 1.36 | 1-5 | 1.34 | 0.67 | 1-3 | 1.83 | .078 | 0.59 | .562 |
| Current felt disgraced | 2.25 | 1.13 | 1-5 | 1.26 | 0.56 | 1-3 | 3.48** | .002 | 1.32 | .194 |
| Current Sad | 2.29 | 1.27 | 1-5 | 2.16 | 1.47 | 1-5 | 0.30 | .77 | -0.01 | .991 |
| Current Guilt | 1.83 | 1.28 | 1-5 | 1.44 | 1.29 | 1-5 | 0.94 | .352 | 1.31 | .201 |
| Importance | 4.45 | 1.88 | 1-7 | 4.55 | 2.55 | 1-7 | -0.14 | .889 | 0.87 | .391 |
| Valence | 3.10 | 1.54 | 1-6 | 3.55 | 1.96 | 1-7 | -0.82 | .415 | 0.61 | .546 |
| Easiness | 5.38 | 1.88 | 1-7 | 4.63 | 2.47 | 1-7 | 1.09 | .285 | -0.50 | .622 |
| Clear | 5.55 | 1.16 | 4-7 | 6.24 | 1.45 | 2-7 | -1.67 | .103 | 1.01 | .317 |
| Temporal Closeness | 3.13 | 1.81 | 1-6 | 3.67 | 2.34 | 1-7 | -0.49 | .633 | - | - |
| Intensity | 4.19 | 1.20 | 2-7 | 4.24 | 2.38 | 1-7 | 0.88 | .401 | 2.00 | .102 |
| Vividness | 4.33 | 1.68 | 2-7 | 5.76 | 1.84 | 2-7 | -2.56* | .014 | 0.55 | .587 |

| | n | | | n | | | Comparison by Participant Type | | Comparison by Socioeconomic Status | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | t | p | t | p |
| Have the participant told anyone before | No | 6 | | No | 4 | | .16 | .877 | .73 | .468 |
| | Yes | 15 | | Yes | 15 | | | | | |

*Note.* $N = 40$ ($N_{Student} = 21$, $N_{Mother} = 19$). For variables violating the homogeneity of variance assumption, results for "Equal variances not assumed" are reported. $p < .05$*, $p < .01$ ** . *Temporal closeness* cannot be computed because at least one of the group is empty.

### 2.3.2. Main Findings: Two-Dimensional Analysis: Relational Context and Memory Content

Two separate thematic analyses were conducted for the narrated shame memories. While the first analysis focused on revealing the contexts in which the shame memories occurred, the second analysis aimed to identify the themes within the narrated shame memories.

#### 2.3.2.1. Relational Context of Memories

A total of 40 memories were narrated by 42 participants ($N$ = 42). Two mothers from low SES backgrounds stated that they were unable to recall any memories; therefore, all statistical analyses were based on the 40 narrated memories, following the approach of Braun and Clarke (2006). MAXQDA24 and SPSS 31.0.0 were used for analyses and cross-tabulations. Results revealed that narrated memories were classified into six different relational contexts (with occurrence frequencies in parentheses): (1) Family context (40%), (2) Education environment (22.5%), (3) Peer Contexts (12.5%), (4) Professional Setting (12.5%), (5) Public Setting (10%), and (6) Intrapersonal Context (2.5%).

See Table 4 for relational context of narrated shame memories in Study 1.

**Table 4.** Frequency Table for Participants regarding the Relational Context of Memories

| Comparison Group Participant Type | University Student | Mother |
|---|---|---|
| Family Contexts | 23.8% (2) | 57.9% (1) |
| Peer Contexts | 19% (3) | 5.3% (4)* |
| Education Environment | 38.1% (1) | 5.3% (4)* |
| Public Setting | 9.5% (4) | 10.5% (3) |
| Professional Setting | 4.8% (5)* | 21.1% (2) |
| Intrapersonal Contexts | 4.8% (5)* | 0% (5) |
| *n* | 21 | 21 |
| Comparison Group Socioeconomic Status | Low | Middle-to-High |
| Family Contexts | 50% (1) | 31.8% (1) |
| Peer Contexts | 5.6% (4)* | 18.2% (3)* |
| Education Environment | 16.7% (3) | 27.3% (2) |

**Table 4** (continued)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public Setting | | 0% (5) | 18.2% (3)* |
| Professional Setting | | 22.2% (2) | 4.5% (4) |
| Intrapersonal Contexts | | 5.6% (4)* | 0% (5) |
| | *n* | 20 | 22 |

*Note.* Ranks are based on the occurrence frequency. The frequency order of the themes was stated in parentheses for sub-groups. An asterisk (*) indicates that two themes had the same frequency and therefore share the same rank.

#### 2.3.2.1.1. Family context

The *family context* theme, as a relational context, includes shame memories that involve close family members, including first-degree relatives (such as spouses, parents and children), and more distant relatives (such as cousins). Participants narrated diverse experiences involving family members, highlighting the complex and relational nature of shame.

A total number of 16 participants (40%) reported experiencing their shame memory in a family context. Of those, 31.3% were university students ($n$ = 5), and 68.8% were mothers ($n$ = 11). Among the university students, 25% ($n$ = 4) were from a low SES background, and 6.3% ($n$ = 1) were from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, 31.3% ($n$ = 5) were from a low SES background, and 37.5% ($n$ = 6) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the family context based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 5.80$, $p = .122$.

#### 2.3.2.1.2. Education environment

The *education environment* theme, as a relational context, includes shame memories that involve experiences that occurred in an educational setting (such as in classrooms, during sports practices, at auditions, or on school buses).

A total number of 9 participants (22.5%) mentioned their shame memory in an education environment. Of those, 88.9% were university students ($n$ = 8), and 11.1% were mothers ($n$ = 1). Among the university students, 33.3% ($n$ = 3) were from a low

SES background, and 55.6% ($n$ = 5) were from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, no participant was from a low SES background, and 11.1% ($n$ = 1) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Among all relational contexts, a significant difference was found only in the education environment based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 7.93$, $p = .047$, with a large effect size (Cramer's $V = .44$). A notably higher proportion of high-SES university students (55.6%, $n$ = 5/11) reported shame memories emerged in educational environments compared to low-SES university students (33.3%, $n$ = 3/10), low-SES mothers (0%, $n$ = 0), and high-SES mothers (11.1%, $n$ = 1/11). The standardized residual for this group was $z = 2.26$, indicating a stronger-than-expected association (Sharpe, 2015).

#### 2.3.2.1.3. Peer Contexts

Shame memories, categorized under the *peer context*, involve peers of the participants. In this relational context, there is no hierarchical structure; instead, the events happen through the interactions between peers. What distinguishes this category from the previous theme of *education environment* is that, even though a peer may be present at times within the education environment, the focus is not on a specific peer but rather on the nature of the educational setting, which inherently involves a certain degree of hierarchy (such as coach-athlete or teacher-student). In the peer context, on the other hand, peers are central even when the events take place in an educational environment.

A total number of 5 participants (12.5%) mentioned their shame memory in a peer context. Of those, 80% were university students ($n$ = 4), and 20% were mothers ($n$ = 1). Among the university students, 20% ($n$ = 1) were from a low SES background, and 60% ($n$ = 3) were from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, no participant was from a low SES background, and 20% ($n$ = 1) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the peer context based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 3.95$, $p = .267$.

#### 2.3.2.1.4. Professional Setting

Shame memories, categorized under the *professional setting*, involve experiences that occurred in professional settings, such as those of a patient in a hospital or an individual working in a workplace. In this relational context, there is some sort of hierarchical structure.

A total number of 5 participants (12.5%) mentioned their shame memory in a professional setting. Of those, 20% were university students ($n$ = 1), and 80% were mothers ($n$ = 4). Among the university students, 20% ($n$ = 1) were from a low SES background, and no participant was from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, 60% ($n$ = 3) were from a low SES background, and 20% ($n$ = 1) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the professional setting based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 4.73$, $p = .193$.

#### 2.3.2.1.5. Public Settings

Shame memories, categorized under the *public setting*, involve experiences that occurred in public settings, such as in a store or on a train.

A total number of 4 participants (10%) mentioned their shame memory in a public setting. Of those, 50% were university students ($n$ = 2), and 50% were mothers ($n$ = 2). All the university students ($n$ = 2) and the mothers ($n$ = 2) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the public setting based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 4.02$, $p = .259$.

#### 2.3.2.1.6. Intrapersonal Context

In the *intrapersonal context*, the shame memory does not manifest in a particular setting or individual but rather arises from the formation of internal constructs within the mind, despite being alone.

Only one participant (2.5%) who is a low-SES university student reported a shame memory in an intraindividual context. Due to this single observation, this specific category did not provide sufficient frequency for a meaningful chi-square comparison.

#### 2.3.2.2. Synthesis of Relational Contexts across Participant Groups

In order to investigate the differences regarding participant type and socioeconomic status (SES) cross-tabulations via MAXQDA24 were applied (see Table 5).

Among university students some differences are worth noting: In general, the most frequent theme identified was the *education environment* for university students. However, when viewed through the lens of socioeconomic status (SES), a different frequency pattern emerges among university students: For lower SES university students, their personal shame memories took place within the family context (40%) most frequently, followed by the educational environment (30%). In contrast, for their higher SES counterparts, the educational environment was the most frequent context (45.5%), followed by the peer context (27.3%). Higher SES university students appear to engage more with socio-academic landscape in their personal shame memories. Regarding the mothers, the highest percentage of personal shame memories occurred within the family context for both groups; specifically, 62.5% for low SES mothers and a similar proportion of 54.5% for their higher SES counterparts. Interestingly, the remaining personal shame memories of low SES mothers were condensed within professional settings, while higher SES mothers reported a broader range of diverse contexts in their personal shame memories.

**Table 5.** Relational Contexts across Participant Groups

| Themes | Low SES Students | Higher SES Students | Low SES Mothers | Higher SES Mothers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Family Contexts | 40% | 9.1% | 62.5% | 54.5% | 40% |
| Education Environment | 30% | 45.5% | 0% | 9.1% | 22.5% |
| Peer Contexts | 10% | 27.3% | 0% | 9.1% | 12.5% |
| Professional Setting | 10% | 0% | 37.5% | 9.1% | 12.5% |
| Public Setting | 0% | 18.2% | 0% | 18.2% | 10% |
| Intrapersonal Contexts | 10% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2.5% |
| *n* | 10 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 42 |

### 2.3.2.3. Content of Memories

A total of 40 memories were narrated by 42 participants ($N$ = 42). Two mothers from low SES backgrounds stated that they were unable to recall any memories; therefore, all statistical analyses were based on the 40 narrated memories, following the approach of Braun and Clarke (2006), based on their content. MAXQDA24 and SPSS 31.0.0 were used for analyses and cross-tabulations. Results revealed that narrated memories were classified into five main themes (with occurrence frequencies and the number of sub-themes in parentheses if applicable): (1) Mishaps and Missteps (42.5%; with three sub-themes), (2) Aggression (25%; with three sub-themes), (3) Performance-related (22.5%; with three sub-themes), (4) Sexuality (5%), and (5) Body Image-related (5%) (see Table 6).

**Table 6.** Frequency Table for Participants regarding the Content of Memories

| Comparison Group Participant Type | University Student | Mother |
|---|---|---|
| 1.Mishaps and Missteps | 42.9% (1) | 42.1% (1) |
| Behavioral/Physical Mishaps | 38.1% | 15.8% |
| Verbal Missteps | 4.8% | 15.8% |
| Missed Mental Steps | 0% | 10.5% |
| 2.Aggression | 14.3% (3) | 36.8% (2) |
| Physical aggression | 4.8% | 5.3% |
| Verbal aggression | 9.5% | 21.1% |
| Concealed/Indirect aggression | 0% | 10.5% |
| 3.Performance related | 28.6% (2) | 15.8% (3) |
| Poor Performance | 28.6% | 5.3% |
| Overreaction to Perceived Underachievement | 0% | 5.3% |
| Professional Inadequacy | 0% | 5.3% |
| 4.Sexuality | 9.5% (4) | 0% (5) |
| 5.Body image related | 4.8% (5) | 5.3% (4) |
| *n* | 21 | 21 |
| Comparison Group Socioeconomic Status | Low | Middle-to-High |
| Mishaps and Missteps | 38.9% (1) | 45.5% (1) |
| Behavioral/Physical Mishaps | 33.3% | 22.7% |
| Verbal Missteps | 5.6% | 13.6% |
| Missed Mental Steps | 0% | 9.1% |
| Aggression | 16.7% (3) | 31.8% (2) |
| Physical aggression | 5.6% | 4.5% |

**Table 6** (continued)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Verbal aggression | 11.1% | 18.2% |
| Concealed/Indirect aggression | 0% | 9.1% |
| Performance related | 27.8% (2) | 18.2% (3) |
| Comparison Group Socioeconomic Status | Low | Middle-to-High |
| Poor Performance | 16.7% | 18.2 |
| Overreaction to Perceived Underachievement | 5.6% | 0% |
| Professional Inadequacy | 5.6% | 0% |
| Sexuality | 11.1% (4) | 0% (5) |
| Body image related | 5.6% (5) | 4.5% (4) |
| *n* | 20 | 22 |

*Note.* Ranks are based on the occurrence frequency. The frequency order of the themes was stated in parentheses for sub-groups. An asterisk (*) indicates that two themes had the same frequency and therefore share the same rank.

#### 2.3.2.3.1. Mishaps and Missteps

Shame memories, categorized under the *mishaps and missteps* theme as a type of memory content, involve memories of the shame caused by the presence of others in certain situations that one gets into without realizing it, and that can happen to anyone.

A total of 17 participants (42.5%) had the mishaps and missteps theme in their shame memories. Of those, 52.9% were university students ($n$ = 9), and 47.1% of those were mothers ($n$ = 8). Among the university students, 23.53% ($N$ = 4) were from a low SES background, and 29.41% ($n$ = 5) were from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, 17.7% ($n$ = 3) were from a low SES background, and 29.4% (n = 5) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the *mishaps and missteps* theme based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 0.68$, $p = .877$.

There were three sub-themes of *mishaps and missteps* theme: (a) Behavioral/Physical Mishaps, (b) Verbal Missteps, and (c) Missed Mental Steps.

Here are the explanations and examples of each sub-theme, respectively:

(a) Behavioral/Physical Mishaps: Any behavioral or physical mishap that led to feelings of shame. Example for (a):

> There were eggs that had been set aside for hatching. I took a basket and, thinking the hens had just laid them, gathered all the eggs and brought them to my mother. That's a memory I have, I felt ashamed at the time because the homeowner told me those were eggs being incubated for hatching (not for eating). (Low SES, Mother)

(b) Verbal Missteps: Any verbal misstep that led to feelings of shame. Example for (b):

> … I was with some friends, including one whom I actually knew had lost her father. Everyone was sharing some random memories or stories at that moment. I guess Father's Day was coming up and people were asking each other questions about it. I turned to her and asked, 'What are you going to do on Father's Day for your father?' The moment I said it, I felt deeply ashamed for asking that question. I wished I could turn back time, disappear, or undo what I had just said. (Middle-High SES, University Student)

(c) Missed Mental Steps: Any instance where a participant later realized they neglected to consider something or act, leading to feelings of shame. Example for (c):

> I was at the bus stop waiting for the bus when it started snowing. Another man who was also waiting at the bus stop hailed a taxi and turned to me. He said, 'We've been waiting for half an hour, the bus won't come apparently. If you'd like, we can share the ride.' So I got in the taxi and sat in the back seat. … Later that evening, when I told my husband what had happened, he responded, 'This is a very risky thing. Why did you get in a taxi with a guy you don't know? Anything could have happened, you shouldn't have.' At that moment, I felt a sense of shame. (Middle-High SES, Mother)

#### 2.3.2.3.2. Performance-related

Shame memories, categorized under the *performance-related* theme as a type of memory content, involve memories of the shame caused by any performance of the protagonist that was evaluated and/or perceived as inadequate, poor etc.

A total of 9 participants (22.5%) had the performance-related theme in their shame memories. Of those, 66.67% were university students ($n$ = 6), and 33.3% of those were mothers ($n$ = 3). Among the university students, 22.2% ($n$ = 2) were from a low SES background, and 44.4% ($n$ = 4) were from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, all of them were from a low SES background ($n$ = 3).

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the performance-related theme based on participant type and SES levels, $\chi^2(3) = 4.91$, $p = .179$.

There were three sub-themes of the performance-related theme: (a) Poor performance, (b) Overreaction to Mistakes, and (c) Feeling Professionally Inadequate.

Here are the explanations and examples of each sub-theme, respectively:

(a) Poor performance: Any instance of poor performance the participant perceived as such, which led to feelings of shame. Example for (a):

> When I was in middle school... I played football well... But I had never been a goalkeeper, and I was actually afraid of the ball. But one day, my teammates made me play as the goalkeeper. After that, I felt completely stuck in the position... At one point, they noticed that I couldn't catch the ball. They started scoring a lot of goals, and... I was so embarrassed. (Middle-High SES, University Student)

(b) Overreaction to Perceived Underachievement: Any instance in which the participant perceived their reaction to a perceived underachievement as excessive, which led to feelings of shame. Example for (b):

> It was about my older daughter; I wasn't satisfied with her success. But... her success was actually very good, really very good... Even though she ranked in the top 3000 in the exam, I used to ask her, 'Why didn't you make it into the top 1000 or top 100?' Later, I deeply regretted it... (Low SES, Mother)

(c) Feeling Professionally Inadequate: Any instance in which the participant perceived themselves as professionally inadequate, which led to feelings of shame. Example for (c):

> I went to a Qur'an memorization school (until I got graduated from high school). … After I got married, I didn't want to work. After spending so much time in dormitories (during that Qur'an school), being at home felt really good. Then I had children, and before I knew it, I realized I had actually forgotten most of what I had memorized... Still, when people asked about my profession, I would say my profession even though I had actually forgotten it. If this is what shame is, then yes, I have felt that shame... (Low SES, Mother)

#### 2.3.2.3.3. Aggression

Shame memories, categorized under the *aggression* theme as a type of memory content, involve memories of the shame, including any kind of aggression.

A total of 10 participants (25%) had the aggression theme in their shame memories. Of those, 30% were university students ($n$ = 3), and 70% were mothers ($n$ = 7). Among the university students, 10% ($n$ = 1) were from a low SES background, and 20% ($n$ = 2) were from a middle-to-high SES background. Among the mothers, 20% ($n$ = 2) were from a low SES background, and 50% ($n$ = 5) were from a middle-to-high SES background.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the aggression theme based on SES and participant type levels, $\chi^2(3) = 5.63$, $p = .466$.

There were three sub-themes of the aggression theme: (a) Physical aggression, (b) Verbal aggression, and (c) Concealed/Indirect aggression.

Here are the explanations and examples of each sub-theme, respectively:

(a) Physical aggression: Any physical aggression the participant was subjected to that led to feelings of shame. Example for (a):

> My father was a very conservative and religious man. When I was in primary school, he would constantly tell my mother he wanted me to cover my head. But my mother didn't take it very seriously, and she didn't really tell me much (about his request). From time to time, she would say, 'Cover your head, dear... your father is coming,' and that was it. … One day, during a summer evening, we were sitting in the courtyard with some close relatives, drinking tea. I had just taken a shower and came downstairs (to join the guests). My hair was down and uncovered, and I was brushing my hair. When my father saw me like that in front of everyone... he grabbed me by my hair, wrapped it around his hand, and said, 'Didn't I tell you? You will cover your head! You're not going to go around like this... like bad women.' (Low SES, Mother)

(b) Verbal aggression: Any verbal aggression the participant engaged in led to feelings of shame. Example for (b):

> My grandfather had suffered a heart attack and was in the hospital. His condition was very serious, but his brother started talking about funeral

> arrangements... However, everyone was focused on my grandfather's recovery, and no one else was discussing such things (as his death). At that moment, in front of everyone, especially the elders, I cursed my grandfather's brother. I think that was the moment of deepest shame of my life. (Low SES, University Student)

(c) Concealed/Indirect aggression: Any concealed or indirect aggression the participant was subjected to, such as witnessing aggressive behaviors (e.g., a parent's violent actions or selfish behavior) that led to feelings of shame. Example for (c):

> When I was a child... there were times when my father would be violent towards my mother, and these are the things that come to my mind when I think of shame. … When someone else would say something about it, my mother would hide it (at that times). Even if there were bruises on her face or eyes, she would say she bumped into something. I remember feeling ashamed during those times. It felt like my mother was lying, and I felt like the person she was talking to knew she was lying, but it was something that had to be hidden... (Middle-High SES, Mother)

**2.3.2.3.4. Sexuality**

Shame memories, categorized under the *sexuality* theme as a type of memory content, involve memories of the shame, including any kind of sexuality.

A total of 2 participants (5%) had the sexuality theme in their shame memories. Of those, 100% were university students from low SES ($n$ = 2), and none of those were mothers.

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in sexuality theme based on SES and participant type levels, $\chi^2(3) = 6.72$, $p = .081$.

Here is an example of the sexuality theme:

> One time, I contracted a sexually transmitted disease... Maybe the shame I felt was because of social expectations, but... I think I remember feeling ashamed mainly because it was the first time I talked to my mother about my sexual life... (Low SES, University Student)

#### 2.3.2.3.5. Body Image-related

Shame memories, categorized under the *body image-related* theme as a type of memory content, involve memories of the shame, caused by one's entire body or specific body parts.

A total of 2 participants (5%) had the body image-related theme in their shame memories. 50% of those were university students from low SES ($n = 1$), and 50% were mothers from high SES ($n = 1$).

Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in body image-related theme based on SES and participant type levels, $\chi^2(3) = 2.11$, $p = .550$.

Here is an example of the body image-related theme:

> When I was in high school... There was a friend who liked me. Even though he liked me, he said something like, 'You're too fat.' ... Before that, I didn't have that kind of perception of myself, I didn't see people as fat or thin. But after being seen that way, I also started to see myself like that over time. (Low SES, University Student)

### 2.3.2.4. Synthesis of Content of Memories across Participant Groups

In order to investigate the differences regarding participant type and socioeconomic status (SES) cross-tabulations via MAXQDA24 were applied (see Table 7).

Across all the groups, the most frequently chosen memory content is *mishaps and missteps*, which remained relatively stable and emerged as the dominant theme across all participant groups. However, the *aggression* theme emerged as a competing theme among higher SES mothers, appearing with the same frequency as mishaps and missteps (45.5%). This theme in this specific group did not involve physical sub-categories but was instead limited to verbal and indirect forms of aggression (27.3% and 18.2%, respectively). Regarding low SES mothers, *performance-related* themes were present within their personal shame memories (37.5%), whereas no higher SES mothers narrated any personal shame memories under this category.

When examining the results for university students, it is noteworthy that themes related to *sexuality* and *body image* emerged exclusively among low SES students ($n$ = 5).

**Table 7.** Memory Contents across Participant Groups

| Themes | Low SES Students | Higher SES Students | Low SES Mothers | Higher SES Mothers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Mishaps and Missteps | 40% | 45.5% | 37.5% | 45.5% | 42.5% |
| Behavioral/Physical Mishaps | 40% | 36.4% | 25% | 9.1% | 27.5% |
| Verbal Missteps | 0% | 9.1% | 12.5% | 18.2% | 10% |
| Missed Mental Steps | 0% | 0% | 0% | 18.2% | 5% |
| 2. Aggression | 10% | 18.2% | 25% | 45.5% | 25% |
| Physical aggression | 0% | 9.1% | 12.5% | 0% | 5% |
| Verbal aggression | 10% | 9.1% | 12.5% | 27.3% | 15% |
| Concealed/Indirect aggression | 0% | 0% | 0% | 18.2% | 5% |
| 3. Performance related | 20% | 36.4% | 37.5% | 0% | 22.5% |
| Poor performance | 20% | 36.4% | 12.5% | 0% | 17.5% |
| Overreaction to Perceived Underachievement | 0% | 0% | 12.5% | 0% | 2.5% |
| Feeling Professionally Inadequate | 0% | 0% | 12.5% | 0% | 2.5% |
| 4. Sexuality | 20% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% |
| 5. Body image related | 10% | 0% | 0% | 9.1% | 5% |
| *n* | 10 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 42 |

### 2.4. Discussion

In this qualitative study, we utilized an exploratory approach to investigate personal shame memories. Through online semi-structured interviews with 21 dyads of university students and their mothers, the study successfully addressed its primary inquiry. Regarding research question 1, the findings confirm the narratability of shame memories; participants were indeed able to narrate their personal shame memories during the interviews (research question 1).

To further analyze the data, thematic analyses were conducted to explore the relational context (research question 2) and the specific content (research question 3) of personal

shame memories across participant types and socioeconomic status (SES). While quantitative measures, such as t-tests and chi-square analyses, were employed to examine specific similarities and differences, it is important to note that within this qualitative framework, the absence or presence of statistical significance was not the ultimate objective. These statistical attempts, rather than being the sole tool, served as a complementary resource to provide a more comprehensive and detailed map of the data. The primary goal remained the exploration of the perceived experience of shame and how personal shame memories would be narrated by different groups.

In line with the two separate thematic analyses conducted, the results will accordingly be discussed under the relational context (research question 2) and the content of personal shame memories (research question 3).

### 2.4.1. Discussion Regarding Relational Context

The first thematic analysis focused on revealing the relational contexts in which the personal shame memories emerged. Relational context analysis yielded that personal shame memories occurred in six different relational contexts (with the overall percentages among N = 40): (1) *Family context* (40%), (2) *Education environment* (22.5%), (3) *Peer Context* (12.5%), (4) *Professional Setting* (12.5%), (5) *Public Setting* (10%), and (6) *Intrapersonal Context* (2.5%).

Overall framework of relational context by participant type showed that university students narrated most frequently personal shame memories that took place in an educational environment (38.1%), following family context (23.8%) and peer context (19%). The least frequent relational contexts that university students' narrations occurred were the public setting (9.5%) and professional and intrapersonal contexts (each constituting 4.8%). The cross-tabulation results based on the interaction of participant type and SES yielded that only the educational environment theme in high-SES university students is statistically more frequent compared to other groups. For the mothers, the most frequent relational context was family context (57.9%), following professional setting (21.1%) and public setting (10.5%). The least frequent relational contexts that mothers' narrations occurred were the education and peer

contexts (each constituting 5.3%) while there was no narration occurring in intrapersonal context.

On the other hand, SES-based results showed that low-SES participants narrated most frequently personal shame memories that took place in a family context (50%), following professional setting (22.2%) and education environment (16.7%). The least frequent relational context that low-SES participants' narrations occurred were the peer and intrapersonal contexts (each constituting 5.6%), while there was no narration from low-SES participants in the public setting. For the middle-to-high-SES participants, the most frequent relational context was, again, the family context (31.8%), following the education environment (27.3%), and the peer contexts and the public setting (each constituting 18.2%). The least frequent relational context that middle-to-high-SES participants' narrations occurred were in a professional setting (4.5%), while there was no narration in intrapersonal context.

The cross-tabulation results based on the interaction of participant type and SES yielded that only the educational environment theme in high-SES university students was statistically more frequent compared to other groups. Despite the lack of statistically significant differences among groups (with one exception of the educational environment theme), the distribution of frequencies across groups suggests certain emerging trends that warrant further investigation in larger-scale studies.

Turning to the participant type-based analysis, as previously mentioned, the most frequent theme for university students in their shame memories was *education environment* (38.1%) and this theme was one of the lowest frequencies among mothers' (5.3%). Given that education constitutes a significant portion of emerging adults' lifetime (Arnett, 2023), it is plausible for university students that their shame memory narration took place most frequently in the educational environment alongside the *peer context* (19%). These two relational themes constitute close to 60% in total of the narrated shame memories among students, while it is one of the least frequent themes for mothers among emerged themes (just over 10%). Several factors likely contributed to the difference between students' and their mothers' shame memories.

University students' mean age at the time of the narrated shame memory was 13.95 (*SD* = 5.68; range 3-23) with a median of 16 and a mode of 17. These ages indicated that the narrated shame memories primarily originated from the typical age range associated with middle and high school attendance. The students narrated on *education* and *peer contexts* not only because it occupies a high proportion of their lives, but also because their *working self* is currently organized around educational goals (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). Unsurprisingly, students seemed to narrate their shame memories most proximal to their current developmental and environmental stage, a finding consistent with the Self-Memory System (SMS) model, which suggests that autobiographical narrations are shaped by working self (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). Besides, 38.1% of mothers in the current study held a graduate degree or more referring to a lower educational attainment percentage compared to their daughters, all of whom were expected to be at least university graduates. Moreover, given their longer life course and wider variety of goals, mothers have experienced a broader range of life domains; thus, currently, education and peers related memories likely occupy a smaller proportional space in their overall life history. Therefore, the findings that mothers' personal shame memories are less frequently emerged in *educational* and *peer contexts* compared to their daughters are not surprising.

When we examine the same themes from a SES-based perspective, the pattern changes, especially for low SES participants. For higher SES participants, the *education environment* and *peer context* themes were the themes that emerged approximately half of the time among all narrated shame memories (45.5%). For the low SES participants, on the other hand, while these themes occupied nearly 20%, *family context* emerged as the dominant relational theme with 50%. Although the years of education completed by low-SES and middle-to-higher-SES individuals were similar in this study (*M* = 12.44 years, *SD* =2.96; *M* = 13.73 years, *SD* =2.05, respectively), the difference in the proportion of relational themes among narrated shame memories appeared to indicate that their *working selves* could prioritize distinct goals (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000), perhaps reflecting their socioeconomic realities.

When we have a closer look at *family context*, it emerged as the second most frequent theme for students with 23.8% and the dominant theme for mothers with 57.9%. From a SES-based level, on the other hand, *family context* is the most frequent theme for both low and middle-to-high SES participants (50% and 31.8%, respectively). The high prevalence of *family-related* themes within the shame memories might have been expected for two primary reasons. First, the development of shame-proneness is closely linked to emotional socialization during childhood (Loader, 1998; Mills, 2003a; Mukherjee & Bhattacharjee, 2023); parental criticism or general caregiving attitudes often serve as a significant source of shame, leading students to prioritize these memories. Second, given that all student participants in this study resided with their families, although approximately half of them ($n$ = 9; 42.9%) resided independently during the academic year. Arnett (2024) highlighted that emerging adults maintain frequent contact with their families. For the mothers, on the other hand, the *family context* was the dominant theme, representing the vast majority of their narrated shame memories with 57.9%. Further analysis in the mothers' narrations revealed that 54.5% ($n$ = 6) of the narrated memories within this theme originated from their family of origin. Within this subset, the majority of the mothers' shame memories centered on the participants' own mothers, while 33.3% involved their fathers, thereby reflecting a maternal-centric focus in their family-of-origin shame memories. The remaining 45.5% of the mothers' family-context narratives ($n$ = 5) related to their family of procreation, with 80% of these memories centering on their spouses and 20% on their daughters. In university students' narration the family context theme includes wider variety of members (e.g. parents, elder relatives, cousins). Moreover, mothers' narrations have similar patterns with similar individuals in their narrations (in family of origin either their mother or father; in family of procreation mostly their spouses emerged as in the shamer role). McLean (2008) reported that younger adults' life stories were still in the process of constructing and their more recent life events were still in flux and older adults has more stability. The frequency results suggest that the mothers' memories are centered on relatively consistent life figures, which may be attributed to their greater life stability in contrast to the developmental shifts experienced by their daughters. In addition, because the use of shaming by the primary caregiver plays a significant role in controlling a child's behavior (Maggi et al., 2022;

Potter & Hepburn, 2020), it is expected to be occurred close family members in daughter's shame memories.

In order to get a nuanced understanding so far, the cross-tabulation results based on the interaction participant type and SES was conducted. The interaction of participant type and SES would yield clearer patterns, although with the caution of the small sample size of this pilot study. In terms of *educational environment* and *peer context* themes, the difference among low SES and higher SES students is worth noting. Lower SES students demonstrated a greater tendency to carry *family context* into their personal shame memories compared to their higher SES counterparts (40% for low SES vs. 9.1% for higher SES). While the *education environment* was the most prominent theme for higher-SES students (45.5%), the contrast becomes even more striking when combined with *peer contexts*. Together, these two areas account for nearly three-quarters of the responses in the higher-SES group (72.8%), whereas they represent 40% for low-SES students. This suggested that while higher-SES individuals were more centered on academic and social circles, their lower-SES counterparts prioritize different realities, such as family and professional responsibilities, which account for half of their narrated shame memories (50%). Such differences reflect the broader impact of economic disadvantage. Specifically, financial stress on parents often reshapes the family environment (Oftedal et al., 2025; Osher et al., 2020), keeping the family dynamic at the forefront of the low-SES students' lived experience.

Apart from these dominant themes, other categories emerged with lower overall prevalence, yet they highlighted significant group-specific differences. For instance, the *professional setting* was the second most frequent theme in mothers' narrated shame memories (21.1%). This theme encompasses environments beyond the participants' immediate workplaces and reflects the hierarchical nature of professional interactions, such as those between a patient and a doctor. In the study, 30% of the mother participants ($n$ = 6) identified themselves as homemakers, while 70% ($n$ = 14) were employed in various other professions. Consequently, it is not surprising that after the dominance of *family context*, mothers' second most frequent relational context was in a *professional setting*. For students, because the most frequent professional setting that they spent their time is their schools which reflected itself in

high occurrence of *education environment* theme. Since only 14.3% ($n$ = 3) of the student participants declared holding professional jobs during their university education, it is expected to have less frequent narrations in *professional setting*. On the other hand, an SES-based approach reveals that the higher prevalence of the *professional setting* theme among low-SES participants (22.2%), compared to its relative rarity in the higher-SES group (4.5%), may reflect differences in lived experiences. From a broader perspective on SES-based analyses, a subtle pattern appeared to emerge regarding how hierarchy is integrated into the relational context. It is possible that the prevalence of frequencies may reflect the extent to which a thematic hierarchy is rooted in social reality, particularly in domains where formal structures are more prevalent. Family, education, and professional settings typically involve a degree of hierarchy where in their personal shame memories participants represent the subordinate party, such as a child, student, or employee, relative to a more powerful figure, such as a parent, teacher, or employer. These themes occurred close to 90% in low-SES participants' personal shame memories, whereas this was approximately 60% in their middle-to-high SES counterparts. Consistent with this pattern, low-hierarchy contexts, such as peer and public settings, accounted for only about 5% among low-SES participants' personal shame memories, while it was approximately 40% of middle-to-high SES participants' personal shame memories.

One way to explain these patterns that might be related to hierarchy is through the concept of *perceived control*. Research suggests that individuals from low SES backgrounds generally report lower levels of perceived control, which serves as a key psychological resource that can buffer the negative effects of low SES on health and well-being (Gallo et al., 2005; Johnson & Krueger, 2006; Kraus et al., 2009; Lachman & Weaver, 1998; Qiang et al., 2021). In hierarchical settings, individuals with higher perceived control tend to experience more positive emotional and psychological outcomes, whereas lower perceived control can intensify feelings of constraint and stress.

Thus, SES-based differences in perceived control may partly explain the observed differences in the salience of hierarchical context themes (including family, professional, and educational settings) across groups. The cross-tabulation results

based on the interaction of participant type and SES analyses also supports these results: While for low SES students 80% of the themes includes some level of hierarchy (the sum of family, education and professional setting), this percentage is roughly 55% for their higher SES counterparts. For mothers on the other hand, all shame memories were under the *family context* (62.5%) and *professional setting* (37.5%) in low-SES mothers, while it was around 70% for higher SES mothers. Ultimately, these patterns suggested that socioeconomic disadvantage may be linked to how frequently shame is narrated within hierarchical relationships. For lower-SES individuals, hierarchical contexts appeared to dominate their shame narratives. While this may suggest a higher frequency of such experiences in daily life, it primarily reflects what participants choose to remember and share. In contrast, higher-SES participants may be more likely to recall shame within egalitarian environments, such as peer-based or public settings. Since the literature suggests that parents from low-income families face a wide range of difficulties (Ho et al., 2022), these two domains, family and work, likely represented the most salient sources of distress that dominate the narratives of low SES-mothers.

While less prevalent across the entire sample, the *public setting* theme also emerged as a distinct context, involving events that occur in public places, such as stores or public vehicles. Results offered that sharing personal shame memories in a public place without a specific relational context (like family, education, or friends) emerged less common compared to other contexts, especially for participants from lower backgrounds. Therefore, the frequency of this theme in shame memories of participants were similar for all participants from higher SES (9.5% for university students and 10.5% for mothers).

Lastly, the *intrapersonal context* was the least frequent, yet conceptually significant, relational theme among university students' shame memories ($n$ = 1), whereas it was entirely absent from the mothers' narrations. This relational theme was characterized not by a particular setting or interaction with others, but by the development of internal constructs within the mind, even when the individual was alone. Unlike the other themes, this theme's frequency was not related to how often it was experienced or how significant it was. Rather than reflecting a lack of importance, the pattern in the

intrapersonal context was likely shaped by its internal and meta-emotional dynamics. Although there was only one narration under this main-theme, I believe it warrants recognition as a distinct theme due to its unique features. I consider the intrapersonal context is the least common because these memories tend to be deeper and more private. This narration of the participant included privately held self-views (Pasupathi, 2001) that she clearly expressing the contradiction she experienced while narrating: "… (Because she had difficulties speaking) Oops, I'm sorry. I feel shame, but at the same time, I want to share this (pushing herself to continue speaking)…" (Low SES, university student participant). The reason such memories were encountered only once out of the 40 may be either a hesitation or reluctance to share such private experiences with a researcher during recording, or that these memories were less accessible during recall. Since narrating such aversive shame memories is inherently difficult and shame often leads individuals to perceive themselves as unattractive, unpleasant, inadequate, and flawed (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996), the act of sharing might have been driven by a different motivation: the participant may have utilized the interview setting as a form of self-exposure, viewing it as an opportunity to confront and overcome the distressing content she narrated because she knew that the researcher was also a psychologist. Looking beyond this specific instance, it is plausible to consider that the mere act of narration provided a broader benefit for participants. Regardless of the content, the process of narrating their shame memory may be interpreted as offering space for psychological working-through for the participants. Furthermore, mothers might be expected to be more conservative regarding the disclosure of such profound meta-emotional experiences.

To sum up, the relational context of narrated shame memories might reflect the environments to which the participants have been exposed and the significance these domains hold throughout their lives. Inevitably SES had some effects on those exposure and significance for daughters and mothers. Nevertheless, these results should be viewed as tentative patterns of memory and narration rather than direct evidence of lived reality.

### 2.4.2. Discussion Regarding Memory Content

The second analysis aimed to identify content of the narrated shame memories. Memory content analysis yielded that personal shame memories classified under five different content themes ($N$ = 40): (1) *Mishaps and Missteps* (42.5%; with three sub-themes), (2) *Aggression* (25%; with three sub-themes), (3) *Performance-related* (22.5%; with three sub-themes), (4) *Sexuality* (5%), and (5) *Body Image-related* (5%).

Overall framework of memory content by participant type shows that both university students and mothers narrated most frequently shame memories within the theme of *mishaps and missteps* (42.9% and 42.1%, respectively). For students, the second most frequent theme was *performance-related* (28.6%), followed by the *aggression* theme (14.3%). The least frequent themes among university students were *sexuality* (9.5%) and *body image-related* (4.8%). Among mothers, the most frequent memory content, the *mishaps and missteps theme* (42.1%), was followed by the *aggression* theme (36.8%). *Performance-related* memories (15.8%) were among the least frequent, while *body image-related* memories (5.3%) were the least common theme. No mothers narrated any shame memories under the *sexuality* theme in this study.

The results of the SES-based analysis match those of the participant type-based one, showing an identical order of frequency for students in the low-SES group and mothers in the higher-SES group. Both low and higher SES participants most frequently narrated personal shame memories within the theme of *mishaps and missteps* (38.9% and 45.5%, respectively). For low SES participants, the second most frequent theme was *performance related* (27.8%), followed by the *aggression* theme (16.7%). The least frequent themes among low SES participants were *sexuality* (11.1%), and *body image related* (5.6%). Among higher SES participants, the most frequent memory content, the *mishaps and missteps* theme (45.5%), was followed by the *aggression* theme (31.8%). *Performance-related* memories (18.2%) were among the least frequent, while *body image-related* memories (4.5%) were the least common theme. No higher SES participants narrated any shame memories under the *sexuality* theme in this study.

Despite the lack of statistically significant differences among groups, the concentration of frequencies across groups suggests certain emerging trends that warrant further investigation in larger-scale studies.

In the current study, regardless of their participant type and SES, participants' most frequently narrated shame memories falling under the theme of *mishaps and missteps*. This suggests that they tended to remember and chose to narrate memories which shame arose from being observed by others in unforeseen circumstances, often of a kind that could happen to anyone. Shame often leads individuals to perceive themselves as unattractive, unpleasant, inadequate, and flawed (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996), and in this study participants were asked to narrate memories in which they experienced such self-perceptions. Choosing memories within the *mishaps and missteps* theme may represent a safer way to manage the stress of self-disclosing these vulnerable aspects of the self.

Although for university students the *aggression* theme was the third most frequent memory content (14.3%), for mothers it is the second frequent theme (36.8%). In all narrated shame memories of mothers, they were the recipients of some kind of aggression (i.e., physical, verbal, or indirect), with 5.3% involving physical aggression, 21.1% verbal aggression, and 10.5% indirect aggression, accounting for 36% of all memories. In contrast, university students narrated memories including physical aggression at a rate of 4.8%, while verbal aggression accounted for 9.5% of all aggression incidents. Notably, in the students' narrated shame memories, half of the verbal aggression memories involved the participant as the initiator, whereas in the other half, the participant was the recipient of the aggression. It is worth noting that when the cross-tabulation results based on the interaction of participant type and SES were investigated, *aggression* theme (45.5%), especially with the verbal (27.3%) and indirect aggression (18.2%) sub-themes, emerged as a competing one for middle-high SES mothers, appearing with the same frequency as mishaps and missteps. For low-SES groups 12.5% of the mothers narrated personal shame memories under the sub-theme of physical aggression (other 12.5% was for verbal aggression) compared to none for their higher-SES counterparts. Those numbers are not high because of the small sample size but may reflect of the participants lived reality. Until the early 2000s,

physical punishment of children was widely accepted as a legitimate way to ensure compliance, distinct from abuse. Some sources suggest that if corporal punishment is normative within a culture, children may interpret it as a deliberate strategy in their best interests, potentially buffering its negative effects (Avezum et al., 2023; Durrant & Ensom, 2012). Conversely, if it is non-normative, children might perceive it as a sign of parental rejection, exacerbating maladjustment (Lansford, 2010). In the case of mothers who are now parents themselves, even if they initially experienced corporal punishment as normative, their retrospective evaluation may have shifted, as physical punishment is no longer widely accepted and is now considered inappropriate. Thus, memories with this content may have appeared more frequently among mothers as shame memories, whereas the lower frequency of this theme among university students could be due to their having been less often recipients of aggression.

The second most frequent memory content among university students was *performance-related* (28.6%), while it is the third frequent theme for mothers (15.8%). The cross-tabulation results based on the interaction between participant type and SES, yielding relatively homogenous distribution for university students regardless of SES; while showing that all the mothers who narrated this theme as their personal shame memories belong to low SES. Peterson (2019) indicated that young people tend to set high standards for themselves and feel responsible for their own successes and failures, experiencing constant pressure to perform at a high level across multiple arenas of their everyday lives. This persistent striving for excellence often leads to feelings of stress and inadequacy in young adults (Petersen, 2019), and, when these self-imposed standards are not met, may contribute to the formation of shame memories. Consequently, it is plausible that this dynamic partially accounts for the high prevalence of performance-related shame memories among university students. Research indicates that older adults tend to report and express greater empathy when observing the performances of individuals (Richter & Kunzmann, 2011). Therefore, it is plausible that mothers may exhibit a higher degree of self-compassion or empathy toward their own perceived performance failures compared to their daughters. It is noteworthy that the *performance-related* theme was predominantly absent among the personal shame memories shared by mothers, all of whom belonged to a lower SES

background. This suggests that the subjective evaluation of performance was more apparent in lower SES individuals, and these evaluations seemed to change as a factor of SES. While the literature indicated a potential link between lower SES and heightened levels of self-criticism, which might intuitively suggest more *performance-related* shame, the empirical relationship between these variables remains multifaceted and complex. Nevertheless, some findings suggest that socioeconomic constraints can exacerbate self-evaluative tendencies (Kopala-Sibley et al., 2013; Wendel et al., 2021) this dynamic may serve as an explanatory framework for the pronounced differences identified between low and higher SES mothers in this study.

The second least frequent memory content was *sexuality* in university students (9.50%), while no mother mentioned any shame memory under this theme. Similarly, the least frequent memory content among university students was *body-image related* (4.80%), while for mothers it was also the least frequent among the reported themes (5.30%). The cross-tabulation results based on the interaction between participant type and socioeconomic status yielded all the students who narrated personal shame memories under the themes of *sexuality* and *body-image related* are from low-SES. One narrative from each theme involved memoires of experiencing abuse. The low frequency rates of those themes do not necessarily imply that such incidents are equally rare. Rather, it is possible that these kind of events, especially if they include *abuse*, were either forgotten (Joslyn et al., 1997), or intentionally withheld due to participant reluctance, or perhaps both.

These two themes of *sexuality* and *body-image related* may represent the most sensitive dimensions of memory content (as in the interpersonal relational context, which requires a deeper level of insight and maybe courage). Therefore, it's understandable, and may even be considered a functional boundary, to not share the most intimate shame memories with an unfamiliar researcher within a brief ten-minute interview. The most prevalent theme across all groups, regardless of participant-type, SES, and interaction based on the cross-tabulation results, was *mishaps and missteps*. This aligned with a general tendency to disclose milder memories in a research setting. Followed by the *aggression* and *performance-related*, which are more heterogenous themes. As noted in the previous section, since narrating such an aversive emotion as

shame is inherently challenging, those participants who choose to share relatively intense memories may have viewed the interview as a form of self-exposure, viewing it as an opportunity to confront and overcome the distressing content they narrated because they knew that the researcher was a psychologist.

# CHAPTER 3

# STUDY 2: PERSONAL AND VICARIOUS MEMORY

## 3.1. Introduction

After the first study confirmed that university students and their mothers could (and choose to) narrate their personal shame memories, the second study designed to investigate whether participants of mother-daughter dyads would narrate both personal and vicarious shame memories.

Sharing memories is a crucial part of autobiographical memory, helping us affirm and validate our experiences (Fivush, 2019). Studies indicate that vicarious narratives of others' experiences can also shape narrative identity (McLean, 2016; Merrill & Fivush, 2016; Pillemer et al., 2015; Thomsen et al., 2025; Thomsen & Pillemer, 2017). Narrators may integrate vicarious narratives of individuals into their own narrative identities, which may serve as highly effective tools for personal transformation (Pillemer et al., 2024). Both personal and vicarious memories serve as the foundation for the development of valuable frameworks that facilitate the understanding of oneself and others (Pillemer et al., 2024).

Literature suggests that different memories may serve different functions (McLean & Lilgendahl, 2008; Pasupathi et al., 2002; Rasmussen & Berntsen, 2009) and parents share different memories for different underlying goals (Fivush, 2007). Fivush (2007) suggested that sharing positive memories would serve to create emotional bonds through sense of shared history; while reminiscing about negative experiences may help children understand and resolve negative affect. Rasmussen and Bernsten (2009) argued negative memories were mostly in directive function. However, the impact of shared narratives on children may vary depending on the style (elaborative vs.

repetitive) and the content (traumatic vs. non-traumatic). From the child's perspective, listening to parents' adverse experiences may feed into vulnerable narrative identities (Thomsen et al., 2025).

Pillemer and his colleagues' pioneering study (2015) revealed that personal memories of firsthand experiences and vicarious memories had similar phenomenological qualities, similar patterns of intercorrelations between memory qualities, and served many of the same functions. Given the inherent connection between self and memory (Conway, 2005), and tendency of humans to remember self-related information (Klein & Loftus, 1988; Markus, 1977), it is worth noting that some robust differences between personal and vicarious memories are also highlighted. For instance, Thomsen and Pillemer (2017) found participants rated personal memories higher on phenomenological qualities than vicarious memories. Moreover, although Pond and Peterson (2020) reported that phenomenological qualities for personal and vicarious memories were correlated positively, personal memories were rated more vivid, personally significant, and emotionally charged compared to vicarious memories.

The primary aim of the current study is to investigate the narrative characteristics of *personal* and *vicarious shame memory* of university students and their mothers. Moreover, thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms, identity connections, relationships/social interaction, and reasons of the shared memories were examined for the first time with a sample of daughter-mother dyads and within a non-WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) context. In addition, due to the inherently threatening nature of shame (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996), participants were expected to find it easier to narrate vicarious shame memories compared to personal ones. This distinction was central to our second study, as we expected that processing someone else's shame would allow for greater psychological distance (Trope & Liberman, 2010), thereby reducing the immediate threat to the self.

In the interest of model parsimony, the predictor variables included in the hierarchical regression analyses for both university students and their mothers were selected based on preliminary correlational findings. Among the variables of self-construals (*individuation and relatedness*), schema domains (*impaired autonomy, disconnection,*

*unrelenting standards, impaired limits, other directedness*), and shame-related variables (*external shame level, shame proneness, guilt proneness, guilt repair, shame negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt negative behavior-evaluation*) only those exhibiting significant bivariate associations the dependent variables were retained. This approach allowed for the identification of the most relevant candidate predictors of narrative characteristics, which would subsequently serve as the foundational variables for Study 3.

Based on this refined structure, three-step hierarchical regression models were established for the university students. It was hypothesized that thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms (*affective* and *cognitive* words), identity connections and relationships/social interaction scores would be predicted incrementally by: (1) *individuation* in the first step, (2) schema domains of *impaired limits* in the second step, and (3) shame-related variables (*shame negative self-evaluation* and *guilt negative behavior-evaluation*) in the third step, across both personal and vicarious memories.

For mothers, on the other hand, two-step hierarchical regression models were established. It was hypothesized that their thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms (*affective* and *cognitive* words), identity connections and relationships/social interaction scores would be predicted incrementally by: (1) schema domains (*unrelenting standards, impaired limits* and *other directedness*) in the first step, and (2) shame-related variables (*shame negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt negative behavior-evaluation*) in the second step, across both personal and vicarious memories.

Lastly, it was hypothesized that there would be a statistically significant difference of *reason* coding between students and their mothers.

### 3.2. Method

For Study 2, online semi-structured interviews were conducted separately with 69 mother-daughter dyads. This study was exploratory in nature, aiming to replicate whether dyads could narrate personal shame memories while extending the scope to

include vicarious shame memories. Furthermore, the study sought to examine the narrative characteristics of both personal and vicarious shame memories.

Each interview consisted of two parts: the first part involved the autobiographical memory (AM) narrative of the participant, and the second part involved the collection of phenomenological characteristics of AM. This procedure was then repeated for both personal shame memories and vicarious shame memories in each participant.

### 3.2.1. Participants

69 mother-daughter dyads participated in Study 2. Female university students (age range 18-25, *M* = 21.31, *SD* = 1.52), and their mothers (age range 40-60, *M* = 48.98, *SD* = 4.95) were invited to participate. A convenience sampling method was employed, by the students from Middle East Technical University (METU) Psychology Department who enrolled in the "PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology" course in 2023-2024 Spring Semester. A total of 25 students took this course. From this point onward, those who took the course will be referred to as *collaborating students* to distinguish them from the university student participants. Each collaborating student was required to refer at least four mother–daughter dyads to the researcher for participation in online semi-structured interviews to fulfill the class requirement. The referral procedure was based on the *first contact form*, which included both a demographic information form and the contact details of the university student. Additional referrals were encouraged.

The researcher directly contacted all prospective participants who filled out the first contact form, provided general information about the study, and informed them that they would participate in online separate interviews with their mothers, which would be audio-recorded. Participants were asked to confirm their agreement with these conditions before scheduling the interviews.

The data collection process started in March and was completed in June 2024.

### 3.2.2. Procedure

The current research received ethical approval from Middle East Technical University's Human Subjects Ethics Committee with the protocol number 0448 and 0474-ODTUİAEK-2023 (See Appendix A). Female university students with their mothers were invited to an autobiographical memory study through collaborating students enrolled in the "PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology" class. After completing data collection for middle-high SES participants in Study 1, those with middle-high SES were included as the participants in Study 2, while low SES participants were recruited for Study 1. Once the target of 10 low SES dyads for Study 1 was reached, data collection for Study 2 continued until the required number of participants was obtained.

The same procedure as Study 1 was applied with female university students. Female university students were provided with an application form including their demographic information and their contact information (first contact form). The researcher contacted the university student who filled out the first contact form and provided brief information about how the interview would be conducted. The researcher sent a Doodle form to schedule the interview. The female university student was informed to choose a time for herself and was informed that after her interview; the mother's interview would be scheduled automatically for the following hour. Therefore, the university student was advised to discuss the reservation time with her mother before selecting it. Once the university student completed the form to schedule the appointment, the interview link was sent to both the university student participant and the researcher. The online semi-structured interviews of university student and their mothers were held separately and consecutively. After the first part of the dyad's interview was over, for the next interview, the researcher created the mother's link manually and requested the university student to forward it to the mother. Prior to the mother's interview, consent was obtained from the mother.

Interviews had two main parts: the first part included the personal shame memory narrative of the participant and the collection of AM characteristics of personal shame memory. The second part included vicarious shame memory narrative of the

participant (for university students it was their mothers' shame memory, and for the mothers' it was their daughters' shame memory), and the collection of AM characteristics of vicarious shame memory.

Post-narrative questions were directed to the participant by the researcher. Each interview took approximately 20 minutes. After semi-structured interviews were completed, both mothers and their daughters were sent a questionnaire package named *post-interview questionnaire package*, including questionnaires to measure their self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables.

All the interviews were audio-recorded, and Microsoft Teams generated a transcript for each interview. All collaborating students who took the class edited the transcripts of their partners. For each participant whose transcript was edited by the students, it was confirmed that the student did not know the participant personally. Subsequently, a final review of all the transcripts was conducted by a team of three undergraduate scholarship holders, specifically appointed as part of a project funded for this thesis.

### 3.2.3. Meausures

All measures and their sub-scales the reliability scores are summarized in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Reliability Scores for all the Measures in Study 2

| | University Students | Mothers |
|---|---|---|
| Balanced-Integration Differentiation Scale | | |
| Interpersonal orientation | .62 | .67 |
| Intrapersonal orientation | .87 | .83 |
| Young Schema Domains | | |
| D1: Impaired autonomy | .93 | .92 |
| D2: Disconnection | .90 | .89 |
| D3: Unrelenting standards | .80 | .73 |
| D4: Impaired limits | .80 | .71 |
| D5: Other directedness | .74 | .84 |
| OAS – External Shame | .90 | .90 |
| Guilt and Shame Scale - Total | .81 | .92 |
| Guilt sub-scale | .76 | .91 |
| Shame sub-scale | .76 | .84 |

**Table 8** (continued)

| | University Students | Mothers |
|---|---|---|
| Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale | | |
| Guilt–Negative Behavior Evaluations [NBE] | .64 | .61 |
| Guilt-Repair | .51 | .71 |
| Shame–Negative Self Evaluations [NSE] | .71 | .69 |
| Shame–Withdraw | .32 | .59 |

### 3.2.3.1. Demographic Information Form

The researcher created a link on Qualtrics called *first contact form*. This form included the contact information of female university students who could be prospective participants in the study, and her demographic information form. Collaborating students distributed this link to the prospective participants, assigning a unique participant code to each of them. The contact information of the female university students included their telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses.

For the mothers, their demographic information form was included in the questionnaire package provided after the semi-structured interviews. No contact information for the mothers was collected.

The demographic forms included the questions regarding participants' age, education level, occupation, city(ies) where they have spent most of their lives, romantic status, whom they live with, the number of siblings and birth order, who raised them during the first five years of their lives, their income, and their parents' education level.

### 3.2.3.2. Balanced-Integration Differentiation Scale

The Balance Scale was developed by İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) to measure self-construals addressed in the Balance Integration-Differentiation (BID) Model.

The items in the scale are scored from 1 to 5 (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). The scale consists of two subscales: interpersonal orientation, which is measured with 16 items (high scores indicate high relatedness), and intrapersonal orientation, which is measured with 13 items (high scores indicate high individuation).

There are two poles of each orientation valued as high or low. The high end of interpersonal orientation is called *related*, whereas the low end of this orientation is called *separated*. The high end of intrapersonal orientation is called *individuated*, whereas the low end is called *normative patterning*. By crossing these two poles of each orientation, four self-contruals are formed: related-individuated (balanced), related-normative patterning, separated-individuated, and separated-normative patterning (unbalanced). The current study used total scores separately for interpersonal (*relatedness*) and intrapersonal (*individuation*) orientation subscales. İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) reported the Cronbach's alpha coefficients between .80 and .91 for the interpersonal orientation, and between .71 and .82 for the intrapersonal orientation. In Study 2, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the interpersonal orientation subscale was found to be $\alpha = .62$ for university students and $\alpha = .67$ for their mothers; for the intrapersonal orientation subscale, it was $\alpha = .87$ for university students and $\alpha = .83$ for their mothers.

#### 3.2.3.3. Young Schema Questionnaire

Jeffrey Young developed the Young Schema Questionnaire – Short Form, Version 3 (YSQ-S3; Young & Brown, 2005) based on schema therapy (Young, 1990; Young et al., 2003), which is an adaptation of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy with insights from Attachment Theory, experiential approaches, and concepts of emotional core needs. These 90 items in the questionnaire are clustered into 5 different schema domains, including 18 separate early maladaptive schemas (EMS). The items in the scale are scored from 1 to 6 (*1 = completely untrue of me, 6 = describes me perfectly*). Higher values indicate a stronger presence of the respective schema. These 18 EMS are grouped into five schema domains: (1) Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain, (2) Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain, (3) Impaired Limits Schema Domain, (4) Other-Directedness Schema Domain, and (5) Over vigilance and Inhibition Schema Domain. The Turkish adaptation of the form was conducted by Soygüt et al. (2009). Five schema domains, as in the original questionnaire, and 14 of the originally proposed 18 factors were determined in the Turkish adaptation (Soygüt et al., 2009). These 14 schemes, specifically identified in the Turkish adaptation, are

as follows: (1) Emotional Deprivation, (2) Failure to Achieve, (3) Pessimism, (4) Social Isolation/ Mistrust, (5) Emotional Inhibition, (6) Approval-Seeking, (7) Enmeshment/ Dependence, (8) Entitlement/ Insufficient Self-Control, (9) Self-Sacrifice, (10) Abandonment, (11) Punitiveness, (12) Defectiveness, (13) Vulnerability to Harm, (14) Unrelenting Standard. These 14 interpretable factors and 5 schema domains in the Turkish adaptation were in tune with the original version of the questionnaire (Soygüt et al., 2009). In the Turkish adaptation, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the factors were reported as appropriate and found between .53 - .81 (Soygüt et al., 2009). In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the schema domains were found to be α = .74 -.93 and α = .71 - .92 for university students and their mothers, respectively.

#### 3.2.3.4. The Other As Shamer-2 Questionnaire

The Other As Shamer-2 (OAS-2) is a self-report scale that focuses on beliefs about how other people evaluate oneself and measures trait shame (Matos et al., 2015). It was adapted into Turkish by Yıldırım et al. (2021) and is scored on a 5-point Likert scale (*0 = never, 4 = almost always*), with higher scores indicating higher levels of external shame. The seven items with a single-factor form of the original instrument were retained, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient α = .85 was found for the Turkish adaptation (Yıldırım et al., 2020). In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the OAS-2 was found to be α = .90 for both university students and their mothers.

#### 3.2.3.5. The Guilt and Shame Scale

The Guilt and Shame Scale (GSS) was developed by Şahin and Şahin (1992) to measure guilt and shame under various conditions. GSS includes a total of 24 items that are 12 shame-related and 12 guilt-related items with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *not at all* to 5 *extremely*. Higher scores indicate higher levels of guilt and shame. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was α = .89 for the total scale, α = .81 for the guilt subscale, and α = .80 for the shame subscale. The current study used total scores separately for guilt and shame subscales. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the subscales were found to be α = .76, and α = .91 for the guilt sub-

scale and α = .76, and α = .84 for the shame sub-scale for the university students and their mothers, respectively.

### 3.2.3.6. Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale

Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale is a 16-item scale developed by Cohen et al. (2011) to measure the tendency to experience shame and guilt. The Turkish adaptation of the scale was conducted by Topçu (2019), and its psychometric properties were reported as appropriate. Consisting of four subscales (Guilt-Negative Behavior Evaluations [NBE], Guilt-Repair, Shame-Negative Self Evaluations [NSE], Shame–Withdraw), the measurement tool is 7-point Likert type (*1 = very unlikely, 7 = very likely*). Guilt-NBE items describe feelings of shame about one's actions (e.g., "you would feel that your actions were pathetic."). Guilt-repair items describe tendencies to correct or compensate for the transgression (e.g., "you would try to be more considerate towards your friends."). Shame-NSE items describe feelings of shame about oneself (e.g., "you would feel like a bad person"). Shame-withdraw items describe tendencies to hide or withdraw from public (e.g., "you would isolate yourself from guests until they have left"). High scores on the subscales indicate a high tendency. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the subscales were found to be α = .32 - .69, and α = .59 - .71, for the university students and their mothers, respectively.

### 3.2.3.7. Interview

Online interviews with university students and their mothers were conducted separately. All interviews consisted of two main parts: the first part included the narration of a personal shame memory and the collection of autobiographical memory (AM) characteristics, while the second part included the narration of a vicarious shame memory and the collection of AM characteristics.

The instructions for the personal shame memory were the same as in Study 1, which was:

> Today I would like you to think about a shame memory- a memory when you felt shame. It could have occurred at any time when other people were present,

> in a social setting, or perhaps when you were alone. Now I would like you to tell me about this memory in as much detail as possible.

Once this first part was completed, the instructions for the vicarious shame memory were provided:

> Now I would like you to think about a shame memory of your partner- a memory that she felt shame and shared with you. This should be an event you did not witness yourself, but rather one she told you about. It could have occurred at any time when other people were present, in a social setting, or perhaps when she was alone. Now I would like you to think about it and tell me about this memory in as much detail as possible.

In both parts, the researcher listened attentively without interrupting and non-verbally encouraged the narrators to continue. After each narration, the researcher asked participants if they would like to add anything. If their answer was yes, then the participants continued their narration; if no, their narration was considered complete. Then the second part of the interview which was the post-narrative questions section had begun to collect phenomenological characteristics of narrated AM.

#### 3.2.3.8. Post Narrative Questions

After participants (both for students and their mothers) declared their narrative was over, post-narrative questions were asked to collect AM characteristics of the narrated shame memories (both personal and vicarious shame memories). The following data were collected: the time of the event, the intensity of emotions experienced at the time of the event (shame, anxiety, anger, humiliation, disgrace, sadness, and guilt) and in the present (shame, anxiety, anger, humiliation, disgrace, sadness, and guilt), the perceived percentage of responsibility for the incident, and the perceived percentage of intentionality in the incident. Additionally, participants reported how they coped with the incident and whether any witnesses noticed their feelings of shame. If so, they were asked to speculate on what the witnesses might have felt.

Participants also rated how frequently they thought about the incident in the following four weeks, whether they experienced flashbacks, and whether they shared the incident with anyone. If they did, they specified with whom, when, and how frequently they recounted the event. Furthermore, they rated how frequently they thought about the

incident, as well as its importance, valence, accessibility, clarity, temporal distance, emotional intensity, and vividness.

Finally, participants rated how frequently they shared their shame memories with their mother/daughter and the perceived closeness of their relationship with their mother/daughter.

For the vicarious memory of the mother or daughter, participants were asked to report the mother's/daughter's age at the time of the incident, the participant's age when the incident occurred, and the participant's age when they learned about the incident. Participants also rated the memory's importance, valence, accessibility, clarity, temporal distance, emotional intensity, and vividness. Furthermore, they rated how frequently they recounted the incident and how frequently they thought about it. Additionally, they were asked how many times this vicarious memory had been shared with them, with responses provided in an open-ended format.

The questions can be found in Appendix C.

### 3.2.4. Coding Schemes

Personal shame memories were coded for *thematic coherence* and *subjective perspective terms* (affecttive, cognitive and total words). Vicarious shame memories, on the other hand, were coded for *thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms* (affecttive, cognitive and total words), *identity connection* and r*elationships/social interaction*. Lastly, narrators were asked why they thought the vicarious memory was shared with them, and their answers were coded for *reasons*.

To assess inter-rater reliability, Cohen's kappa and intraclass correlation (ICC) were employed. The summary of interrater reliability values between the main coder and the second coder can be seen in Table 9. The master coder's scores were used for all analyses.

**Table 9.** Interrater Reliability Scores for Coding Schemes of Study 2

| Coding Schemes | Interrater Reliability Type | Interrater Reliability Scores |
|---|---|---|
| Thematic Coherence (Personal Memories) | Weighted Kappa's Cohen | .79 |
| Thematic Coherence (Vicarious Memories) | Weighted Kappa's Cohen | .65 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective Words (Personal Memories) | Intraclass Correlation | .98 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive Words (Personal Memories) | Intraclass Correlation | .96 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Total Words (Personal Memories) | Intraclass Correlation | .99 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective Words (Vicarious Memories) | Intraclass Correlation | .98 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive Words (Vicarious Memories) | Intraclass Correlation | .96 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Total Words (Vicarious Memories) | Intraclass Correlation | .99 |
| Identity Connections | Intraclass Correlation | .84 |
| Social Interactions/Relationships | Weighted Kappa's Cohen | .91 |
| Reasons | Unweighted Kappa's Cohen | .91 |

#### 3.2.4.1. Thematic Coherence

Thematic coherence is a coding which the overall structure of the central theme is coded (Reese et al., 2011; Reese, Fivush, et al., 2017; Reese, Myftari, et al., 2017). The researchers coded the degree to which the narrator developed a central theme in the narration (her personal story and vicarious story) on a 5-point scale (adapted from the studies by Reese, Fivush et al., 2017; Reese et al., 2011; Reese, Myftari et al., 2017). We extended the 4-point Likert scale used in the original study to more effectively capture the distinctions between stories that might receive scores of 2 or 3, as previous studies had applied (Bakır-Demir, 2021; Bakır-Demir et al., 2021, 2023).

A score of 0 meant that the topic of the story was not clear and/or was not identifiable. An example of a score 0 from the current study is “Well... Let's just say someone she didn’t want to approach her in a way she didn't want. ...That's all.”

A score of 1 indicated that the story had a clear but underdeveloped topic. The participant either didn’t specifically mention an incident or, if they did, it was very low in elaboration, providing insufficient detail for the reader to form a mental image of the event. An example of a score 1 is:

> I’m not someone who is prone to feeling shame, but the most vivid one I remember is from kindergarten... I had an accident (wetting myself). I remember going to the bathroom and telling one of the ladies working in the cafeteria because I felt close to her. Then my family came, I think, but I don't remember those parts very well.

A score of 2 meant that the story was elaborated but did not contain a resolution. An example of a score 2 is:

> I think I was around five years old. ...A friend of my mother’s and her family came over. Her husband was wearing the same color t-shirt as my father. I left the room for a moment, and when I came back, his back was turned... Because of the color of the shirt, I thought he was my father and ran up to him calling out ‘Dad!’ When he turned around, I realized it wasn't him. My grandfather was sitting there and laughed so hard at my excitement... I felt so embarrassed for calling him as my father.

A score of 3 meant that the story was developed and elaborated but all the loose ends were not neatly tied up. Often these stories included only a wrap-up sentence at the end, rather than a resolution that might have brought closure by references to internal states, self-concept, identity links, and future occurrences. An example of a score 3 is:

> A very recent memory comes to mind... There was a home-style restaurant we used to visit for the holidays. This year, it was nominated for a Michelin star, so it was much more crowded. We started waiting in a long line out front, it was going to take nearly an hour. The restaurant owner and his wife were sitting by the door, welcoming people. While we were waiting, my father suddenly went up to them and started saying things like, ‘We’ve been coming here since last year, we’d like to host you sometime...’ At first, the owners were friendly, but then my father started insisting on taking photos etc. ...Being part of something like that, especially with a huge line of people watching, made me feel quite ashamed.

A score of 4 indicated that the story was not only developed through interpretations, causal linkages, and/or elaborations of actions but also included a resolution that provided new information such as future experiences and self-concept (See Table 9 for examples). An example of a score 4 is:

> This happened on my birthday... I was with my family; my parents, my elder sister, her husband, and some distant relatives. We were all eating at a restaurant for my birthday... It was a milestone of sorts for me. Apparently, my sister's husband was paying the bill, though I didn't know it then. I was about 9 years old. I asked for some grapes, and then someone started making jokes like, 'Are you going to drink *rakı* (a traditional alcoholic drink of Türkiye) that you're asking for grapes?' My father, I think, felt a sense of shame through me. We ended up getting into an argument. ...I didn't understand why he was so angry. He kept telling me not to want it. ...After a few times, I eventually said, 'Fine, I don't want it, it's okay.' Then the waiter came and started serving grapes to those who wanted it. My father suddenly grabbed a bunch of grapes with his hand and threw it at me. ...I haven't been able to eat grape since then. That's a memory I have.

The weighted Cohen's kappa scores were between .65 - .79, indicated good level of agreement between two coders (Cicchetti, 1994) (see Table 9 for interrater reliability scores of Study 2).

#### 3.2.4.2. Subjective Perspectives

Subjective perspectives is a coding which the affective and cognitive terms in the story is coded (Reese, Fivush et al., 2017). Words indicating affective states, such as general evaluations (e.g., important, stressful, and enjoyable), emotions and emotional behaviors (e.g., shy, like, and cry), and cognitive states (e.g., know, think, and wish), were coded and summed up (Reese, Fivush et al., 2017) for personal and vicarious memories.

Examples for affective and cognitive terms can be found as bolds in the following memory:

> One **came to mind**, I can tell it. ...I don't **remember** exactly how old I was, maybe around 13 or 14. A friend and I were making and selling bracelets and necklaces... Something every kid is **eager** to do. I **liked** my friend, and they **liked** me too. ...We had to divide the total money by three because my friend's sibling was also involved. When we were distributing the money, I ended up

> with more than I should have, it just happened randomly, the math probably got mixed up. I **was aware** of it right then. I **was aware** that I got more, but I didn't say anything. ...After going home, I **was still aware**, and I **started feeling very uneasy**. I should have received, say, 10 lira, but I got 30. I **felt so uneasy**. It started with that **uneasiness**; I could have gone to my friend and told them, but I didn't. When I got home, I **started feeling very bad** and I **felt very ashamed** of my behavior. I **know** it, for example—I'm saying to myself, 'This extra 20 lira isn't mine.' I **could think about** going and giving it back, but I just couldn't. I didn't use that money for myself. My sister **wanted** something from the market, and she **had no idea** about the situation. I used that 20 lira for her; I never spent it on myself because I **felt so ashamed**. At the same time, I **felt so guilty**. A couple of days passed, and because of that delay, I couldn't bring myself to tell my friend what happened. I didn't use it for myself, but I **was so, so ashamed**. Even now, I sometimes **remember** it, and I still **feel very ashamed** of it.

The intraclass correlations were .96 - .99, indicated excellent level of agreement between two coders (Cicchetti, 1994) (see Table 9).

#### 3.2.4.3. Identity Connections

Instances that the participant made a direct connection between their own and their partner's identities (parents'/daughters') were coded (Reese et al., 2017) in vicarious shame memories. These identity links included comparison between circumstances, physical attributes, identities, behaviors, cultures, lessons (Reese et al., 2017). Frequencies of separate subcategories were combined and totaled to get a total *identity connections* score for each narrative.

Examples for identity connection can be found in the following memory:

> So, I think it was back when my mom was in college. She went on a trip (like a skiing trip or something) with a family friend. Well, she really had to go to the bathroom, but she couldn't find a place in time and ended up having an accident. She said it was one of her most embarrassing moments ever. I would've never known if she hadn't told me. Honestly, if that happened to me, I'd be beyond embarrassed too...

The intraclass correlations was .88, indicated excellent level of agreement between two coders (Cicchetti, 1994) (see Table 9).

### 3.2.4.4. Relationships/Social Interaction

Relationships coding was adapted by Reese et al. (2011) in McAdams et al.'s (1996) communion coding scheme and is primarily coded on a four-point scale. Social interaction scheme is aimed to explore the extent to which narrator expresses about relationships within each narrative. Social interactions in the stories were coded on a four-point scale (Reese et al., 2017; adapted from the study by McAdams et al., 1996).

A score of 0 is used for narratives that includes no interaction between the protagonist and others in the story. An example for score 0 is:

> Once, before I was born, my mom was supposed to meet a friend and get into their car. There were two identical cars parked there, and she accidentally got into the wrong one! There were two men sitting inside, and she was so ashamed. She apologized profusely and hopped out immediately.

A score of 1 includes minimal interaction in the story. An example for score 1 is:

> Back in her (mother's) university days, she went on a skiing trip, with a family friend. She really had to go to the bathroom, but since she couldn't find a place in time, she ended up having an accident. She says it's one of her most embarrassing memories. I'd never have known if she hadn't told me. Honestly, if I were in her shoes, I'd be just as mortified.

A score of 2 indicated that a meaningful interaction is mentioned, but the reference didn't provide insight into the relationship's meaning or importance. An example for score 2 is:

> A couple of years ago, my mom was at work and needed to message a colleague named M. It turns out my twin sister's boyfriend has the exact same name! She accidentally messaged him instead and didn't realize it for quite a while. Even when he (the sister's boyfriend) replied saying, 'I didn't quite get that', she just kept the conversation going. Eventually, he told my twin, and when my sister asked her what she meant, she finally realized she'd messaged the wrong person. She tells it as a 'cute' kind of embarrassment now.

A score of 3 indicated that the interaction's meaning was clearly stated, and emotional expressions like enjoyment, seeking comfort, perspective-taking, and empathy also earned a score of 3. It is important to note that the core of the memory should be a meaningful interaction, regardless of the emotional valence. An example for score 3 is:

> My mom and my paternal grandmother never got along... My mom married very young, at 17, and moved into a small house with my father's nine siblings, where she often felt belittled and unaccepted. She always felt like an outsider compared to my father's side of the family. About five or six years ago, ... My parents and the grandmother were leaving my aunt's house by car. My mom offered the front seat to my grandmother, who told her to sit there instead. But when my father got in, he started shouting at my mom in front of all the relatives and neighbors... He made her get out and move to the back seat so his mother could sit in front. My mom still cries when she remembers the humiliation of being treated that way in public.

The weighted Cohen's kappa scores was .91, indicated excellent level of agreement between two coders (Cicchetti, 1994) (see Table 9).

#### 3.2.4.5. Reasons

Reasons coding reflects the narrators' opinions on why their partners shared the vicarious story with them. In this study, partners of the mothers were their daughters, and this was their mothers for the daughters. The answers of the narrators on why they think their partner told them their personal past experiences (vicarious memory) were coded into six mutually exclusive categories by two coders as previously recommended (Bakir-Demir et al., 2023; adapted from the study by Reese et al., 2017): (1) for no reason, (2) to share family stories, (3) for teaching purposes, (4) just for joy, (5) because the narrator asked, and (6) since the story was emotionally charged.

The unweighted Cohen's kappa score was .91 indicated excellent level of agreement between two coders (Cicchetti, 1994) (see Table 9).

## 3.3. Results

### 3.3.1. Data Screening

Prior to the main analyses, the data were screened to ensure the fundamental assumptions of hierarchical regression were met. All screening procedures and assumption checks were conducted separately for the university student and mother groups.

Univariate normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis values, which fell well within the acceptable limits of ± 3 and ± 10, respectively (Kline, 2016). Although initial screening identified a few potential univariate and multivariate outliers, no participants were excluded from the dataset. In this line of research, since the frequency of certain words or phrases is included in the calculation of dependent variables, extreme values represent natural variations in personal narratives rather than measurement errors.

Furthermore, multicollinearity did not pose a threat to the models in either group, as Variance Inflation Factor values (ranging from 1.07 to 3.07) and Tolerance statistics (all > .20) were well within acceptable thresholds. Finally, the independence of residuals was confirmed using the Durbin-Watson statistic, with values generally falling within the acceptable range. Visual inspections of Normal P-P plots and scatterplots also generally supported the assumptions of normality of residuals and homoscedasticity, as the majority of the models displayed residuals following the diagonal line and showing a random distribution despite minor deviations observed in a few models. Consequently, the data were deemed appropriate for hierarchical regression analyses.

### 3.3.2. Preliminarily Findings

After Study 1 demonstrated that individuals could and choose to narrate their personal shame memories, we aimed to explore whether participants could narrate vicarious shame memories. Results of the Study 2 revealed that while all university students narrated a personal shame memory ($n$ = 69, 100%), 55 of them (79.7%) could narrate a vicarious shame memory. For mothers, 64 of them (92.8%) narrated a personal shame memory, whereas only 40 mothers (58.0%) were able to provide a vicarious narrative.

Due to the ceiling effect in the university students' personal shame condition, a statistical comparison for that category was not applicable. However, an exact McNemar's test (using the binominal distribution) was performed to compare the presence of vicarious narratives between students and their mothers, which yielded a significant difference. These results indicate that students are significantly more likely

to narrate vicarious shame memories (79.7%) compared to their mothers (58%), $p$ = .011.

**Table 10.** Occurrence of Personal and Vicarious Shame Memory Narratives by Participant Group

| Participant type | Personal Shame Memory | | Vicarious Shame Memory | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| University Student ($n$ = 69) | 69 | 0 | 55 | 14 |
| Mother ($n$ = 69) | 64 | 5 | 40 | 29 |

#### 3.3.2.1. Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Characteristics

Descriptive statistics for the study variables were summarized in Table 11, bivariate correlations for university students and mothers can be found in Table 12 and 13.

### 3.3.3. Main Findings

### 3.3.4. Results for University Students

Given the exploratory nature of this study, being the first to examine shame memories in this context, we prioritized parsimonious models. Therefore, predictors for each group (university students and their mothers) were selected based on their significant correlations with the outcome variables (see Tables 12 and 13, for students and their mothers, respectively). A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to predict the outcome variables of university students' in narrating their shame memories. In the first models, the *individuation* variable was entered, while in the second models, the *impaired limits* schema domain was added to the models. Finally in the third models, shame-related variables (*shame-negative self-evaluation* and *guilt-negative behavior evaluation*) were added to the models.[1]

[1] Although variable *shame-withdrawal* was correlated with the dependent variables and initially considered for inclusion, it was excluded from the models of university students due to its low reliability score ($\alpha$ = .32) within this group.

**Table 11.** Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Questions of Participants in Study 2

| University Students | | | | Mothers | | | | Comparison by Participant Type | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | *t* | *p* |
| Age at Memory | 13.57 | 5.12 | 4-23 | Age at Memory | 23.63 | 14.34 | 5.50-57.50 | -5.31*** | <.001 |
| Personal Shame Memories | | | | | | | | | |
| Past Shame | 4.47 | 0.61 | 2.5-5 | Past Shame | 4.43 | 0.88 | 2-5 | 0.27 | .785 |
| Past Anxiety | 3.75 | 1.06 | 1-5 | Past Anxiety | 3.73 | 1.39 | 1-5 | 0.11 | .912 |
| Past Anger | 2.66 | 1.37 | 1-5 | Past Anger | 3.46 | 1.53 | 1-5 | -3.19** | .002 |
| Past Humiliation | 2.95 | 1.44 | 1-5 | Past Humiliation | 3.17 | 1.63 | 1-5 | -0.82 | .414 |
| Felt disgraced | 3.78 | 1.30 | 1-5 | Felt disgraced | 3.36 | 1.54 | 1-5 | 1.75 | .083 |
| Past Sad | 3.71 | 1.31 | 1-5 | Past Sad | 4.02 | 1.23 | 1-5 | -1.43 | .155 |
| Past Guilt | 3.04 | 1.43 | 1-5 | Past Guilt | 2.94 | 1.58 | 1-5 | 0.40 | .689 |
| Responsibility % | 58.90 | 33.32 | 0-100 | Responsibility % | 44.08 | 38.02 | 0-100 | 2.33* | .021 |
| Purpose % | 29.97 | 38.37 | 0-100 | Purpose % | 16.64 | 29.31 | 0-100 | 2.21* | .029 |
| Current Shame | 2.24 | 1.17 | 1-5 | Current Shame | 2.10 | 1.33 | 1-5 | 0.63 | .533 |
| Current Anxiety | 1.57 | 0.88 | 1-4 | Current Anxiety | 1.48 | 0.97 | 1-5 | 0.60 | .552 |
| Current Anger | 2.05 | 1.26 | 1-5 | Current Anger | 2.19 | 1.46 | 1-5 | -0.58 | .562 |
| Current Humiliation | 1.64 | 1.03 | 1-5 | Current Humiliation | 1.37 | 0.87 | 1-5 | 1.60 | .113 |
| Current felt disgraced | 1.94 | 0.98 | 1-5 | Current felt disgraced | 1.49 | 1.01 | 1-5 | 2.58* | .011 |
| Current Sad | 1.99 | 1.13 | 1-5 | Current Sad | 2.42 | 1.34 | 1-5 | -1.98 | .051 |
| Current Guilt | 1.80 | 1.14 | 1-5 | Current Guilt | 1.56 | 1.01 | 1-5 | 1.28 | .202 |
| Importance | 3.99 | 1.45 | 1-7 | Importance | 3.93 | 2.03 | 1-7 | 0.21 | .838 |
| Valence | 3.40 | 1.12 | 1-6 | Valence | 3.69 | 1.76 | 1-7 | -1.19 | .266 |
| Easiness | 5.54 | 1.32 | 2-7 | Easiness | 5.11 | 2.09 | 1-7 | 1.42 | .158 |
| Clear | 5.53 | 1.20 | 2-7 | Clear | 6.27 | 1.08 | 3-7 | -3.72*** | <.001 |
| Temporal Closeness | 3.49 | 1.76 | 1-7 | Temporal Closeness | 2.45 | 2.10 | 1-7 | 3.13** | .002 |
| Intensity | 4.11 | 1.47 | 1-7 | Intensity | 3.69 | 2.06 | 1-7 | 1.35 | .181 |

**Table 11** (continued)

| | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | *t* | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vividness | 5.09 | 1.28 | 1-7 | Vividness | 4.78 | 2.12 | 1-7 | 1.01 | .317 |
| How frequently telling shame memories to mothers | 4.27 | 1.45 | 1-7 | How frequently telling shame memories to the daughter | 4.25 | 1.88 | 1-7 | 0.39 | .969 |
| Closeness with mother | 5.64 | 1.07 | 3-7 | Closeness with the daughter | 6.38 | 0.88 | 4-7 | -4.42*** | <.001 |
| Vicarious Shame Memories | | | | | | | | | |
| Age of the mother when vicarious memory happened | 32.14 | 15.27 | 6-62 | Age of the daughter when vicarious memory happened | 14.33 | 4.23 | 5.50-22 | 8.08*** | <.001 |
| Age of the daughter when vicarious memory was told | 17.27 | 3.78 | 9.50-23 | Age of the mother when vicarious memory was told | 38.85 | 9.46 | 15-53 | -11.97*** | <.001 |
| How many times you were told | 5.59 | 13.52 | 1-100 | How many times you were told | 3.56 | 6.51 | 1-35 | 0.80 | .429 |
| Importance | 3.85 | 1.85 | 1-7 | Importance | 5.33 | 1.97 | 1-7 | -3.62*** | <.001 |
| Remember frequency | 2.55 | 1.39 | 1-6 | Remember frequency | 3.08 | 1.87 | 1-7 | -1.40 | .167 |
| Recount frequency | 1.56 | 1.04 | 1-6 | Recount frequency | 1.39 | 0.99 | 1-5.5 | 0.72 | .474 |
| Valence | 2.82 | 1.45 | 1-6 | Valence | 3.47 | 2.09 | 1-7 | -1.62 | .111 |
| Easiness | 5.06 | 1.85 | 1-7 | Easiness | 4.39 | 2.40 | 1-7 | 1.41 | .163 |
| Clear | 3.92 | 1.73 | 1-7 | Clear | 5.67 | 2.15 | 1-7 | -4.24*** | <.001 |
| Temporal Closeness | 2.92 | 2.10 | 1-7 | Temporal Closeness | 3.60 | 2.06 | 1-7 | -1.51 | .134 |

*Note.* In university students, *N* ranges 66 to 69 for personal shame memories and 49-54 for vicarious shame memories. In mothers, *N* ranges 60 to 66 for personal shame memories and 33-36 for vicarious shame memories. For variables violating the homogeneity of variance assumption, results for *Equal variances not assumed* are reported.*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

**Table 12.** Bivariate Correlations for University Students

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Age | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Relatedness | .194 (.114) | — | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Individuation | -.138 (.261) | .256* (.035) | — | | | | | | | |
| 4.External shame | -.118 (.340) | -.587*** (<.001) | .001 (.995) | — | | | | | | |
| 5.Guilt | .032 (.794) | .334** (.006) | .063 (.616) | -.302* (.014) | — | | | | | |
| 6.Shame | -.135 (.273) | .027 (.828) | -.125 (.315) | .050 (.690) | .352** (.003) | — | | | | |
| 7.Guilt Repair | -.092 (.455) | .272* (.025) | .210 (.085) | .005 (.968) | .249* (.044) | .123 (.323) | — | | | |
| 8.Shame NSE | .011 (.930) | .085 (.492) | .066 (.593) | -.004 (.975) | .255* (.039) | .162 (.189) | .390*** (.001) | — | | |
| 9.Shame Withdraw | -.102 (.414) | -.168 (.174) | -.130 (.295) | .096 (.438) | .049 (.700) | .325** (.008) | .115 (.353) | .114 (.358) | — | |
| 10.Guilt NBE | .076 (.538) | .114 (.355) | -.029 (.817) | -.016 (.900) | .264* (.032) | .182 (.141) | .437*** (<.001) | .635*** (<.001) | .132 (.287) | — |
| 11.Impaired Autonomy D1 | -.127 (.301) | -.416*** (<.001) | -.168 (.171) | .609*** (<.001) | -.202 (.103) | .401*** (<.001) | -.109 (.374) | -.042 (.733) | .304* (.012) | -.053 (.668) |
| 12.Disconnection D2 | -.142 (.248) | -.716*** (<.001) | -.165 (.180) | .740*** (<.001) | -.293* (.017) | .121 (.328) | -.168 (.170) | .029 (.813) | .100 (.423) | .018 (.886) |

**Table 12** (continued)

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13.Unrelenting St. D3 | -.192 (.116) | -.316* (.009) | .180 (.142) | .405*** (<.001) | -.126 (.315) | .388** (.001) | -.091 (.462) | -.020 (.873) | .192 (.119) | -.160 (.191) |
| 14.Impaired Limits D4 | -.001 (.995) | -.182 (.136) | .245* (.044) | .260* (.032) | -.055 (.664) | .120 (.335) | -.106 (.388) | -.045 (.717) | .275* (.025) | -.227 (.062) |
| 15.Other Dir. D5 | -.112 (.361) | -.191 (.118) | .052 (.675) | .506*** (<.001) | .275* (.026) | .376** (.002) | -.050 (.686) | .058 (.641) | .091 (.462) | .148 (.230) |
| 16.Thematic coh. (P) | -.066 (.595) | .013 (.920) | .331** (.006) | -.082 (.507) | .120 (.338) | .081 (.512) | .183 (.138) | .223 (.070) | -.157 (.207) | .187 (.130) |
| 17.Thematic coh. (V) | -.002 (.991) | .140 (.313) | .290* (.034) | -.010 (.945) | .134 (.339) | -.076 (.590) | -.071 (.607) | -.379* (.005) | -.125 (.372) | -.344* (.011) |
| 18.Sub. Pers. Aff. (P) | -.070 (.571) | .169 (.171) | .346** (.004) | -.075 (.545) | .170 (.172) | .058 (.641) | .105 (.398) | .136 (.274) | -.029 (.818) | .128 (.301) |
| 19.Sub. Pers. Cog. (P) | -.029 (.814) | .104 (.401) | .223 (.069) | -.116 (.349) | .164 (.187) | -.089 (.474) | .001 (.997) | .151 (.222) | -.193 (.120) | .072 (.564) |
| 20.Sub. Pers. Tot. (P) | -.055 (.658) | .150 (.227) | .311* (.010) | -.102 (.412) | .180 (.147) | -.012 (.923) | .060 (.627) | .154 (.213) | -.114 (.362) | .110 (.377) |
| 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) | -.231 (.093) | .064 (.646) | .187 (.175) | -.011 (.934) | .003 (.986) | -.220 (.114) | .007 (.957) | -.205 (.138) | -.216 (.120) | -.316* (.020) |
| 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) | -.221 (.108) | -.032 (.820) | .166 (.231) | .011 (.940) | .162 (.246) | -.115 (.412) | -.126 (.363) | .108 (.436) | -.286* (.038) | -.028 (.842) |
| 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) | -.271* (.048) | .025 (.857) | .212 (.123) | -.002 (.989) | .088 (.529) | -.206 (.139) | -.063 (.652) | -.077 (.581) | -.296* (.032) | -.223 (.106) |
| 24.Social Interaction | -.055 (.693) | .045 (.745) | .072 (.606) | -.039 (.781) | .184 (.187) | -.185 (.184) | .026 (.850) | -.200 (.148) | -.066 (.640) | -.200 (.148) |
| 25.Identity Con. | -.015 (.914) | .021 (.880) | .068 (.626) | .109 (.433) | .049 (.727) | -.077 (.586) | -.021 (.879) | .194 (.159) | .076 (.587) | .093 (.503) |

**Table 12** (continued)

| Variable Names | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.Impaired Autonomy D1 | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.Disconnection D2 | .640*** (<.001) | — | | | | | | | | |
| 13.Unrelenting St. D3 | .386** (.001) | .439*** (<.001) | — | | | | | | | |
| 14.Impaired Limits D4 | .331** (.006) | .227 (.062) | .507*** (<.001) | — | | | | | | |
| 15.Other Dir. D5 | .576*** (<.001) | .593*** (<.001) | .379** (.001) | .247* (.042) | — | | | | | |
| 16.Thematic coh. (P) | -.211 (.087) | -.102 (.413) | -.011 (.930) | -.249* (.043) | -.112 (.368) | — | | | | |
| 17.Thematic coh. (V) | -.034 (.807) | -.111 (.422) | -.002 (.989) | .343* (.011) | .070 (.615) | .145 (.294) | — | | | |
| 18.Sub. Pers. Aff. (P) | -.152 (.220) | -.136 (.271) | .188 (.127) | .078 (.530) | .004 (.971) | .530*** (<.001) | .414** (.002) | — | | |
| 19.Sub. Pers. Cog. (P) | -.146 (.240) | -.170 (.170) | .024 (.846) | -.130 (.293) | -.102 (.413) | .558*** (<.001) | .257 (.060) | .718*** (<.001) | — | |
| 20.Sub. Pers. Tot. (P) | -.161 (.194) | -.164 (.185) | .120 (.333) | -.021 (.864) | -.049 (.694) | .586*** (<.001) | .360** (.007) | .936*** (<.001) | .917*** (<.001) | — |
| 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) | -.082 (.553) | -.115 (.406) | -.029 (.836) | .139 (.316) | -.090 (.518) | .230 (.094) | .587*** (<.001) | .398** (.003) | .307* (.024) | .377** (.005) |
| 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) | -.063 (.651) | .086 (.536) | -.038 (.785) | -.037 (.790) | -.010 (.941) | .203 (.141) | .222 (.106) | .275* (.045) | .384** (.004) | .350** (.009) |
| 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) | -.088 (.526) | -.030 (.830) | -.039 (.777) | .072 (.607) | -.065 (.642) | .260 (.057) | .506*** (<.001) | .409** (.002) | .408** (.002) | .436*** (<.001) |
| 24.Social Interaction | .010 (.942) | -.099 (.475) | -.065 (.639) | .291* (.033) | .057 (.684) | .159 (.251) | .606*** (<.001) | .419** (.002) | .234 (.089) | .351** (.009) |

**Table 12** (continued)

| Variable Names | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25.Identity Con. | .057 (.681) | .014 (.918) | .051 (.713) | .142 (.305) | .163 (.239) | -.070 (.615) | .027 (.848) | .032 (.817) | .128 (.357) | .084 (.545) |

| Variable Names | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) | — | | | | |
| 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) | .396** (.003) | — | | | |
| 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) | .870*** (<.001) | .796*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 24.Social Interaction | .573*** (<.001) | .167 (.227) | .467*** (<.001) | — | |
| 25.Identity Con. | .203 (.140) | -.098 (.482) | .082 (.558) | -.012 (.929) | — |

*Note. N* ranges from 54 to 69. Values in parentheses are *p*-values. Variables are 1.Age = Current age of the participant, 2.Relatedness = Interpersonal orientation, 3.Individuation = Interpersonal orientation, 4.External shame, 5.Guilt, 6.Shame, 7.Guilt Repair, 8.Shame NSE = Shame Negative Self-Evaluation, 9.Shame Withdraw, 10.Guilt NBE = Guilt Negative Behavior Evaluation, 11. Impaired Autonomy D1 = Impaired Autonomy Domain 1, 12.Disconnection D2 = Disconnection Domain 2, 13.Unrelenting St. D3 = Unrelenting Standarts Domain 3, 14.Impaired Limits D4 = Impaired Limits Domain 4, 15.Other Dir. D5 = Other Directedness Domain 5, 16.Thematic coh. (P) = Thematic coherence in personal shame memories, 17.Thematic coh. (V) = Thematic coherence in vicarious shame memories, 18.Sub. Pers. Aff. (P) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective terms in personal shame memories, 19.Sub. Pers. Cog. (P) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive terms in personal shame memories, 20.Sub. Pers. Tot. (P) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Total terms in personal shame memories, 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective terms in vicarious shame memories, 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive terms in vicarious shame memories, 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Total terms in vicarious shame memories, 24.Social Interaction, 25.Identity Con. = Identity Connection *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

**Table 13.** Bivariate Correlations for Mothers

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Age | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Relatedness | .119 (.349) | — | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Individuation | .261* (.037) | .197 (.119) | — | | | | | | | |
| 4.External shame | -.051 (.689) | -.408*** (<.001) | -.108 (.398) | — | | | | | | |
| 5.Guilt | -.031 (.880) | .406*** (<.001) | .244 (.054) | -.261* (.041) | — | | | | | |
| 6.Shame | -.013 (.922) | .057 (.658) | .076 (.556) | .009 (.943) | .734*** (<.001) | — | | | | |
| 7.Guilt Repair | .090 (.481) | .064 (.616) | .082 (.522) | -.133 (.302) | .523*** (<.001) | .397** (.001) | — | | | |
| 8.Shame NSE | .150 (.240) | -.042 (.741) | .063 (.621) | -.073 (.575) | .320* (.010) | .275* (.029) | .593*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 9.Shame Withdraw | -.317* (.011) | -.281* (.026) | -.205 (.106) | -.015 (.909) | -.065 (.613) | .139 (.277) | -.190 (.136) | -.050 (.699) | — | |
| 10.Guilt NBE | .102 (.425) | .084 (.512) | .167 (.192) | -.140 (.277) | .533*** (<.001) | .400** (.001) | .798*** (<.001) | .695*** (<.001) | -.214 (.093) | — |
| 11.Impaired Autonomy D1 | -.078 (.546) | -.497*** (<.001) | -.196 (.124) | .628*** (<.001) | -.349** (.005) | -.117 (.364) | -.090 (.484) | -.017 (.893) | .234 (.067) | -.109 (.398) |
| 12.Disconnection D2 | -.115 (.369) | -.651*** (<.001) | .057 (.655) | .572*** (<.001) | -.377** (.002) | -.188 (.142) | -.083 (.522) | .015 (.908) | .234 (.067) | -.095 (.460) |
| 13.Unrelenting St. D3 | -.145 (.256) | -.352** (.005) | -.122 (.339) | .141 (.271) | -.069 (.592) | .012 (.925) | .140 (.279) | .080 (.535) | -.003 (.983) | .191 (.137) |

**Table 13** (continued)

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14.Impaired Limits D4 | -.008<br>(.953) | -.264*<br>(.037) | .060<br>(.642) | .172<br>(.178) | -.232<br>(.070) | -.240<br>(.061) | .082<br>(.528) | .052<br>(.688) | .003<br>(.982) | .128<br>(.321) |
| 15.Other Dir. D5 | -.038<br>(.766) | -.344**<br>(.006) | .054<br>(.676) | .325**<br>(.009) | .009<br>(.943) | .079<br>(.541) | .209<br>(.103) | .093<br>(.471) | -.007<br>(.959) | .204<br>(.113) |
| 16.Thematic coh. (P) | .245<br>(.055) | .178<br>(.178) | -.216<br>(.100) | -.101<br>(.422) | -.002<br>(.991) | -.054<br>(.687) | -.084<br>(.533) | .112<br>(.403) | -.251<br>(.057) | -.057<br>(.669) |
| 17.Thematic coh. (V) | .045<br>(.792) | -.068<br>(.702) | .102<br>(.564) | -.019<br>(.919) | .034<br>(.849) | .215<br>(.222) | .124<br>(.485) | .191<br>(.280) | .062<br>(.729) | .202<br>(.251) |
| 18.Sub. Pers. Aff. (P) | .104<br>(.420) | .005<br>(.973) | .031<br>(.817) | -.127<br>(.309) | .039<br>(.769) | .048<br>(.719) | .115<br>(.388) | -.012<br>(.930) | -.284*<br>(.031) | -.016<br>(.902) |
| 19.Sub. Pers. Cog. (P) | .164<br>(.202) | .145<br>(.274) | -.117<br>(.054) | .030<br>(.822) | .039<br>(.770) | .043<br>(.746) | .231<br>(.080) | .265*<br>(.044) | -.183<br>(.170) | .103<br>(.440) |
| 20.Sub. Pers. Tot. (P) | .140<br>(.278) | .058<br>(.661) | -.021<br>(.874) | .155<br>(.245) | .044<br>(.741) | .052<br>(.696) | .174<br>(.192) | .092<br>(.494) | -.281*<br>(.033) | .027<br>(.842) |
| 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) | -.036<br>(.831) | -.075<br>(.673) | -.110<br>(.537) | .033<br>(.854) | .141<br>(.426) | .242<br>(.168) | .249<br>(.155) | .305<br>(.080) | .093<br>(.601) | .311<br>(.073) |
| 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) | -.076<br>(.657) | -.184<br>(.296) | -.220<br>(.211) | -.159<br>(.378) | -.099<br>(.577) | .111<br>(.532) | -.109<br>(.541) | .073<br>(.680) | .362*<br>(.035) | -.085<br>(.631) |
| 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) | -.054<br>(.753) | -.123<br>(.490) | -.162<br>(.361) | -.031<br>(.865) | .073<br>(.683) | .224<br>(.202) | .152<br>(.391) | .258<br>(.140) | .199<br>(.259) | .207<br>(.239) |
| 24.Social Interaction | .076<br>(.657) | -.079<br>(.659) | .034<br>(.850) | .151<br>(.403) | .022<br>(.902) | .104<br>(.559) | .199<br>(.258) | .534**<br>(.001) | .021<br>(.906) | .348*<br>(.043) |
| 25.Identity Con. | .157<br>(.354) | -.018<br>(.919) | .111<br>(.532) | .051<br>(.776) | .050<br>(.779) | .048<br>(.788) | .184<br>(.299) | .136<br>(.444) | -.039<br>(.828) | .229<br>(.193) |

**Table 13** (continued)

| Variable Names | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.Impaired Autonomy D1 | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.Disconnection D2 | .714*** (<.001) | — | | | | | | | | |
| 13.Unrelenting St. D3 | .486** (<.001) | .390*** (<.001) | — | | | | | | | |
| 14.Impaired Limits D4 | .483*** (<.001) | .471*** (<.001) | .639*** (<.001) | — | | | | | | |
| 15.Other Dir. D5 | .500*** (.000) | .412*** (<.001) | .688** (<.001) | .514*** (<.001) | — | | | | | |
| 16.Thematic coh. (P) | -.165 (.216) | -.243 (.067) | -.344** (.008) | -.356** (.006) | -.297* (.023) | — | | | | |
| 17.Thematic coh. (V) | -.064 (.724) | -.141 (.434) | -.198 (.269) | -.229 (.199) | -.007 (.970) | .152 (.384) | — | | | |
| 18.Sub. Pers. Aff. (P) | -.023 (.864) | .069 (.609) | -.197 (.138) | -.073 (.584) | -.109 (.417) | .478*** (<.001) | .185 (.287) | — | | |
| 19.Sub. Pers. Cog. (P) | .006 (.965) | -.122 (.362) | -.059 (.660) | -.166 (.214) | -.010 (.943) | .508*** (<.001) | .395* (.019) | .532*** (<.001) | — | |
| 20.Sub. Pers. Tot. (P) | -.015 (.911) | .005 (.969) | -.169 (.204) | -.117 (.381) | -.085 (.528) | .549*** (<.001) | .276 (.108) | .947*** (<.001) | .776*** (<.001) | — |
| 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) | -.116 (.522) | -.071 (.695) | -.329 (.061) | -.196 (.274) | -.183 (.307) | .099 (.572) | .677*** (<.001) | .492* (.003) | .373* (.027) | .492** (.003) |
| 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) | -.146 (.419) | -.218 (.223) | -.409* (.018) | -.465** (.006) | -.407* (.019) | .190 (.275) | .503** (.001) | .192 (.268) | .362* (.033) | .269 (.118) |
| 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) | -.139 (.439) | -.131 (.467) | -.396* (.023) | -.314 (.075) | -.284 (.110) | .140 (.422) | .687*** (<.001) | .440** (.008) | .407* (.015) | .465** (.005) |

**Table 13** (continued)

| Variable Names | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24.Social Interaction | .067 (.713) | .127 (.480) | -.090 (.620) | -.026 (.885) | .038 (.834) | .073 (.676) | .657*** (<.001) | .318 (.063) | .390* (.021) | .371* (.028) |
| 25.Identity Con. | .107 (.554) | .145 (.421) | .091 (.613) | .182 (.312) | .144 (.425) | -.041 (.813) | .267 (.105) | .394* (.019) | .343* (.044) | .410* (.015) |

| Variable Names | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) | — | | | | |
| 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) | .584*** (<.001) | — | | | |
| 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) | .961*** (<.001) | .786*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 24.Social Interaction | .737*** (<.001) | .416** (.009) | .703** (<.001) | — | |
| 25.Identity Con. | .362* (.025) | -.089 (.593) | .246 (.137) | .384* (.017) | — |

*Note. N* ranges from 38 to 68. Values in parentheses are *p*-values. Variables are 1.Age = Current age of the participant, 2.Relatedness = Interpersonal orientation, 3.Individuation = Interpersonal orientation, 4.External shame, 5.Guilt, 6.Shame, 7.Guilt Repair, 8.Shame NSE = Shame Negative Self-Evaluation, 9.Shame Withdraw, 10.Guilt NBE = Guilt Negative Behavior Evaluation, 11. Impaired Autonomy D1 = Impaired Autonomy Domain 1, 12.Disconnection D2 = Disconnection Domain 2, 13.Unrelenting St. D3 = Unrelenting Standarts Domain 3, 14.Impaired Limits D4 = Impaired Limits Domain 4, 15.Other Dir. D5 = Other Directedness Domain 5, 16.Thematic coh. (P) = Thematic coherence in personal shame memories, 17.Thematic coh. (V) = Thematic coherence in vicarious shame memories, 18.Sub. Pers. Aff. (P) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective terms in personal shame memories, 19.Sub. Pers. Cog. (P) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive terms in personal shame memories, 20.Sub. Pers. Tot. (P) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Total terms in personal shame memories, 21.Sub. Pers. Aff. (V) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective terms in vicarious shame memories, 22.Sub. Pers. Cog. (V) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive terms in vicarious shame memories, 23.Sub. Vic. Tot. (V) = Subjective Perspective Terms – Total terms in vicarious shame memories, 24.Social Interaction, 25.Identity Con. = Identity Connection *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

The results related to the three-stage hierarchical multiple regressions of university students can be seen in Table 14.

**Table 14.** Hierarchical Regressions for University Students: Thematic Coherence (PSM & VSM), Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective & Cognitive & Total words (PSM & VSM), Identity Connections and Relationships/Social Interaction

| Thematic Coherence (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.07 | 0.03 | .33 | 2.82 | .006** | [0.02, 0.13] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.09 | 0.03 | .40 | 3.55 | <.001*** | [0.04, 0.14] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.06 | 0.02 | -.34 | -2.95 | .004** | [-0.11, -0.02] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.09 | 0.03 | .39 | 3.45 | .001** | [0.04, 0.14] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.06 | 0.02 | -.32 | -2.76 | .008** | [-0.10, -0.02] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.06 | 0.05 | .18 | 1.25 | .218 | [-0.04, 0.16] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.00 | 0.04 | .01 | 0.05 | .962 | [-0.07, 0.07] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .11 | .11 | 7.97 | 1, 65 | .006** | .006** |
| Model 2 | .22 | .11 | 8.72 | 1, 64 | .004** | <.001*** |
| | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 3 | .25 | .03 | 1.39 | 2, 62 | .256 | .001** |
| Thematic Coherence (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.07 | 0.03 | .29 | 2.18 | .034* | [0.01, 0.14] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.05 | 0.03 | .22 | 1.63 | .110 | [-0.01, 0.12] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.05 | 0.03 | .29 | 2.17 | .035* | [0.00, 0.10] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.07 | 0.03 | .27 | 2.21 | .032* | [0.01, 0.13] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.05 | 0.02 | .25 | 1.98 | .054 | [-0.00, 0.09] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | -0.12 | 0.05 | -.36 | -2.36 | .022* | [-0.22, -0.02] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.02 | 0.04 | -.08 | -0.51 | .610 | [-0.10, 0.06] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .08 | .08 | 4.76 | 1, 52 | .034* | .034* |
| Model 2 | .16 | .08 | 4.69 | 1, 51 | .035* | .011* |
| Model 3 | .33 | .16 | 5.94 | 2, 49 | .005** | <.001*** |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.53 | 0.18 | .35 | 2.97 | .004** | [0.17, 0.88] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.52 | 0.18 | .35 | 2.87 | .005** | [0.16, 0.89] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.01 | 0.16 | .01 | 0.4 | .972 | [-0.30, 0.32] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |

**Table 14** (continued)

| | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individuation | 0.51 | 0.18 | .34 | 2.80 | .007** | [0.15, 0.88] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.04 | 0.16 | .03 | 0.26 | .793 | [-0.28, 0.36] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.11 | 0.35 | .05 | 0.32 | .751 | [-0.59, 0.82] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.18 | 0.26 | .11 | 0.69 | .491 | [-0.34, 0.70] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .12 | .12 | 8.84 | 1, 65 | .004** | .004** |
| Model 2 | .12 | .00 | 0.00 | 1, 64 | .972 | .017* |
| Model 3 | .14 | .02 | 0.74 | 2, 62 | .481 | .049* |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.30 | 0.16 | .22 | 1.85 | .069 | [-0.02, 0.63] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.35 | 0.17 | .26 | 2.15 | .035* | [0.03, 0.68] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.21 | 0.14 | -.19 | -1.53 | .132 | [-0.49, 0.07] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.34 | 0.17 | .25 | 2.06 | .044* | [0.01, 0.67] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.22 | 0.15 | -.19 | -1.52 | .133 | [-0.51, 0.07] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.36 | 0.32 | .18 | 1.14 | .260 | [-0.27, 1.00] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.12 | 0.23 | -.08 | -0.51 | .614 | [-0.59, 0.35] |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .05 | .05 | 3.42 | 1, 65 | .069 | .069 |
| Model 2 | .08 | .03 | 2.33 | 1, 64 | .132 | .062 |
| Model 3 | .10 | .02 | 0.69 | 2, 62 | .506 | .144 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Total (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.83 | 0.31 | .31 | 2.64 | .010* | [0.20, 1.45] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.88 | 0.32 | .33 | 2.73 | .008** | [0.24, 1.52] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.21 | 0.27 | -.09 | -0.76 | .449 | [-0.75, 0.34] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.86 | 0.32 | .32 | 2.64 | .011* | [0.21, 1.50] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.18 | 0.28 | -.08 | -0.63 | .531 | [-0.74, 0.39] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.47 | 0.62 | .12 | 0.76 | .449 | [-0.77, 1.71] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.06 | 0.46 | .02 | 0.13 | .895 | [-0.85, 0.97] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .10 | .10 | 6.97 | 1, 65 | .010* | .010* |
| Model 2 | .11 | .01 | 0.58 | 1, 64 | .449 | .029* |
| Model 3 | .12 | .02 | 0.62 | 2, 62 | .540 | .083 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.16 | 0.12 | .19 | 1.38 | .175 | [-0.07, 0.40] |

**Table 14** (continued)

| Model 2 | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individuation | 0.14 | 0.12 | .16 | 1.15 | .257 | [-0.11, 0.39] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.07 | 0.10 | .10 | 0.69 | .496 | [-0.13, 0.26] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.16 | 0.12 | .18 | 1.31 | .195 | [-0.08, 0.40] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.03 | 0.09 | .04 | 0.29 | .773 | [-0.16, 0.22] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | -0.07 | 0.20 | -.06 | -0.36 | .720 | [-0.48, 0.33] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.24 | 0.16 | -.27 | -1.56 | .124 | [-0.56, 0.07] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .04 | .04 | 1.89 | 1, 52 | .175 | .175 |
| Model 2 | .04 | .01 | 0.47 | 1, 51 | .496 | .318 |
| Model 3 | .14 | .09 | 2.65 | 2, 49 | .081 | .117 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.12 | 0.10 | .17 | 1.21 | .231 | [-0.08, 0.31] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.13 | 0.10 | .19 | 1.32 | .193 | [-0.07, 0.33] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.05 | 0.08 | -.09 | -0.60 | .551 | [-0.20, 0.11] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.12 | 0.10 | .17 | 1.15 | .254 | [-0.09, 0.32] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.06 | 0.08 | -.10 | -0.69 | .492 | [-0.22, 0.11] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.17 | 0.17 | .18 | 0.99 | .328 | [-0.17, 0.51] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.11 | 0.13 | -.15 | -0.85 | .399 | [-0.38, 0.15] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .03 | .03 | 0.23 | 1, 52 | .231 | .231 |
| Model 2 | .03 | .01 | 0.55 | 1, 51 | .551 | .410 |
| Model 3 | .06 | .02 | 0.59 | 2, 49 | .589 | .587 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Total (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.28 | 0.18 | .21 | 1.57 | .123 | [-0.08, 0.63] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.27 | 0.19 | .21 | 1.47 | .149 | [-0.10, 0.64] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.02 | 0.14 | .02 | 0.13 | .898 | [-0.27, 0.31] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.28 | 0.19 | .21 | 1.48 | .146 | [-0.10, 0.65] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.08 | 0.16 | .07 | 0.48 | .633 | [-0.32, 0.26] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.09 | 0.31 | .05 | 0.27 | .785 | [-0.53, 0.72] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.25 | 0.25 | -.18 | -0.97 | .340 | [-0.85, 0.13] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .05 | .05 | 2.46 | 1, 52 | .123 | .123 |
| Model 2 | .05 | .00 | 0.02 | 1, 51 | .898 | .306 |
| Model 3 | .10 | .05 | 1.38 | 2, 49 | .262 | .282 |
| Relationships/Social Interaction | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |

**Table 14** (continued)

| | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individuation | 0.02 | 0.03 | .07 | 0.52 | .606 | [-0.05, 0.08] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.00 | 0.03 | -.00 | -0.02 | .982 | [-0.06, 0.06] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.05 | 0.02 | .29 | 2.10 | .041* | [0.00, 0.10] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.00 | 0.03 | .02 | 0.16 | .872 | [-0.06, 0.07] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.05 | 0.03 | .27 | 1.91 | .063 | [-0.00, 0.10] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | -0.05 | 0.05 | -.16 | -0.93 | .357 | [-0.16, 0.06] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.01 | 0.04 | -.05 | -0.30 | .766 | [-0.10, 0.07] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .01 | .01 | 0.27 | 1, 52 | .606 | .606 |
| Model 2 | .08 | .08 | 4.42 | 1, 51 | .041* | .106 |
| Model 3 | .12 | .04 | 1.05 | 2, 49 | .357 | .164 |
| Identity Connection | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.02 | 0.04 | .07 | 0.49 | .626 | [-0.06, 0.09] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.01 | 0.04 | .03 | 0.23 | .816 | [-0.07, 0.09] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.03 | 0.03 | .13 | 0.93 | .356 | [-0.03, 0.09] |
| Model 3 | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.00 | 0.04 | .00 | 0.03 | .980 | [-0.08, 0.08] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.03 | 0.03 | .15 | 1.02 | .314 | [-0.03, 0.09] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.07 | 0.06 | .20 | 1.13 | .263 | [-0.06, 0.20] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.00 | 0.05 | -.00 | -0.02 | .984 | [-0.10, 0.10] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .01 | .01 | 0.24 | 1, 52 | .626 | .626 |
| Model 2 | .02 | .02 | 0.87 | 1, 51 | .356 | .578 |
| Model 3 | .06 | .04 | 1.02 | 2, 49 | .370 | .540 |

*Note*. PSM = Personal shame memory, VSM = Vicarious shame memory. Shame-Neg. Self Eva. = Shame-Negative Self-Evaluation, Guilt-Neg. Behavior = Guilt-Negative Behavior. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

### 3.3.4.1. Results of Thematic Coherence of Personal Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict thematic coherence in the personal memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 65) = 7.97$, $p = .006$, accounting for 11% of the variance ($R^2 = .11$). Individuation positively predicted thematic coherence in personal shame memories (β = .33, $p = .006$), indicating that

students with higher levels of individuation tended to produce more thematically coherent narratives in their personal shame memories.

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable resulted in a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 8.72$, $p = .004$. This step accounted for an additional 11% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .11$), increasing the total explained variance to 22% ($R^2 = .22$), while the model remained statistically significant, $F(2, 64) = 8.82$, $p < .001$. Both individuation ($\beta = .40$, $p < .001$) and impaired limits ($\beta = -.34$, $p = .004$) were significant predictors; specifically, impaired limits showed a negative relationship with thematic coherence, indicating that individuals who have higher scores in the impaired limits schema domain tend to produce less thematically coherent personal shame memory narratives.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not result in a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 62) = 1.39$, $p = .256$. This step accounted for an additional 3% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .03$), bringing the total explained variance to 25% ($R^2 = .25$). Although the overall model remained statistically significant, $F(4, 62) = 5.16$, $p = .001$, none of the variables added in the third step made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of thematic coherence (all $p$s > .05). Consequently, in the final model, individuation ($\beta = .39$, $p = .001$) and impaired limits ($\beta = -.32$, $p = .008$) remained significant predictors of thematic coherence in personal shame memories, indicating that students who have higher scores in individuation and lower scores in impaired limits schema domain tended to produce more thematically coherent narratives in their personal shame memories.

#### 3.3.4.2. Results of Thematic Coherence of Vicarious Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict thematic coherence in the vicarious memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 52) = 4.76$, $p = .034$, accounting for 8% of the variance ($R^2 = .08$). Individuation positively predicted thematic coherence in vicarious shame memories ($\beta = .29$, $p = .034$), indicating that students with higher levels of individuation tended to produce more thematically coherent narratives in their personal shame memories.

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable resulted in a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 51) = 4.69$, $p = .035$. This step accounted for an additional 8% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .08$), increasing the total explained variance to 16% ($R^2 = .16$), while the model remained statistically significant, $F(2, 51) = 4.90$, $p = .011$. In this step, individuation's unique contribution fell below the significance threshold ($\beta = .22$, $p = .110$), while impaired limits emerged as a significant positive predictor ($\beta = .29$, $p = .035$), indicating that students who have higher scores in the impaired limits schema domain tended to produce more thematically coherent narratives in their vicarious shame memories.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables resulted in a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 49) = 5.94$, $p = .005$. This step accounted for an additional 16% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .16$), bringing the total explained variance to 33% ($R^2 = .33$). The final model was statistically significant $F(4, 49) = 5.89$, $p < .001$. In this last model, individuation, again was as a significant predictor ($\beta = .27$, $p = .032$), shame-negative self-evaluation variable emerged as a significant negative predictor ($\beta = -.36$, $p = .022$), while impaired limits variable fell below the significance threshold ($\beta = .25$, $p = .054$), indicating that students who have higher scores in individuation and lower scores in shame negative self-evaluation tended to produce more thematically coherent narratives in their vicarious shame memories.

### 3.3.4.3. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Affective words) of Personal Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the use of affective subjective perspective terms in the personal shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 65) = 8.84$, $p = .004$, accounting for 12% of the variance ($R^2 = .12$). Individuation positively predicted the use of affective terms ($\beta = .35$, $p = .004$), indicating that students with higher levels of individuation tended to use more affective terms when narrating their personal shame memories.

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in the model fit, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 0.00$, $p = .972$. This step accounted for no additional variance ($\Delta R^2 = .00$) with the total explained variance remained unchanged at ($R^2 = .12$), while the model remained statistically significant, $F(2, 64) = 4.35$ , $p = .017$. In this stage, individuation remained a significant positive predictor ($\beta = .35$, $p = .005$), whereas impaired limits did not make a significant contribution to the model ($\beta = .00$, $p = .972$).

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 62) = 0.74$, $p = .481$. This step accounted for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02$), bringing the total explained variance to 14% ($R^2 = .14$). Although the overall final model was remained statistically significant, $F(4, 62) = 2.53$, $p = .049$, none of the variables added in the third step made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of affective word usage while narrating personal shame memories (all *p*s> .05). However, individuation remained the only significant predictor in the final analysis ($\beta = .34$, $p = .007$), indicating that students with higher levels of individuation tended to use more affective terms when narrating their personal shame memories.

### 3.3.4.4. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Cognitive words) of Personal Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the use of cognitive subjective perspective terms in the personal shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 65) = 3.42$, $p = .069$, $R^2 = .05$. Individuation did not significantly predict the use of cognitive terms in personal narratives ($\beta = .22$, $p = .069$).

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in the model fit, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 2.33$, $p = .132$, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, with the total explained variance reaching 8% ($R^2 = .08$). Although the overall model remained non-significant, $F(2, 64) = 2.91$, $p = .062$, the predictor of individuation reached statistical significance ($\beta = .26$, $p = .035$), whereas impaired limits did not make a significant contribution to the model ($\beta = -.19$, $p = .132$).

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 62) = 0.69$, $p = .506$, accounting for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02$). In the final step, the model remained statistically nonsignificant, $F(4, 62) = 1.78$, $p = .144$, explaining 10% of the total variance ($R^2 = .10$). Although the individuation variable reached a statistically significant level ($\beta = .25$, $p = .044$), all other variables failed to reach statistical significance ($p$s > .05). Furthermore, given the lack of significance in the overall model, individuation cannot be interpreted as a reliable predictor of cognitive word usage.

To summarize, in contrast to the findings for affective word usage, the hierarchical regression analysis for cognitive word usage in personal shame narratives did not yield any significant predictors. The narrator's level of individuation, impaired limits

schemas, and propensities for shame or guilt (all *p*s > .05) did not significantly predict the degree of cognitive word usage while narrating personal shame memories.

### 3.3.4.5. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Total words) of Personal Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the use of total subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive words in total) in the personal shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 65) = 6.97$, $p = .010$, accounting for 10% of the variance ($R^2 = .10$). Individuation positively predicted the total use of subjective perspective words ($\beta = .31$, $p = .010$), suggesting that students with higher levels of individuation tended to use more subjective perspective terms overall (affective and cognitive words in total) when narrating their personal shame memories.

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 64) = 0.58$, $p = .449$. This step accounted for a negligible additional 1% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .01$), with the total explained variance reaching 11% ($R^2 = .11$), while the model remained statistically significant, $F(2, 64) = 3.75$, $p = .029$. In this stage, individuation remained a significant positive predictor ($\beta = .33$, $p = .008$), whereas impaired limits did not make a significant contribution to the model ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .449$).

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 62) = 0.62$, $p = .540$. This step accounted for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02$), bringing the total explained variance to 12% ($R^2 = .12$). The overall final model was not statistically significant, $F(4, 62) = 2.17$, $p = .083$. Consequently, neither of the variables added in the third step made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of total subjective perspective term usage while narrating personal shame

memories (all *p*s > .05). Although the individuation variable reached a statistically significant level (β = .32, *p* = .011), all other variables failed to reach statistical significance (*p*s > .05). Furthermore, given the lack of significance in the overall model, individuation cannot be interpreted as a reliable predictor of cognitive word usage.

To summarize, the hierarchical regression analysis indicates that individuation is a robust predictor of total word usage in personal shame memory narratives.

#### 3.3.4.6. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Affective words) of Vicarious Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the use of affective subjective perspective terms in the vicarious shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was not statistically significant, $F(1, 52) = 1.89$, $p = .175$, $R^2 = .04$. Individuation did not significantly predict the use of affective words in vicarious shame narratives (β = .19, $p = .175$).

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 51) = 0.47$, $p = .496$. This step accounted for a negligible additional 1% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .01$), with the total explained variance reaching 4% ($R^2 = .04$), while the model remained non-significant $F(2, 51) = 1.17$, $p = .318$. In this stage, neither individuation (β = .16, $p = .257$) nor impaired limits (β = .10, $p = .496$) were significant predictors.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 49) = 2.65$, $p = .081$. This step accounted for an additional 9% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .09$), bringing the total explained variance to 14% ($R^2 = .14$), $F(4, 49) = 1.95$, $p = .117$. In

the final model, none of the individual variables made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of affective word usage (all *p*s > .05).

To summarize, the hierarchical regression analysis reveals that none of the predictors significantly account for the variance in affective word usage for vicarious shame memory narratives. Unlike personal shame memories, where *individuation* played a key role, the use of affective terms while describing mothers' shame memories was not significantly predicted by the narrator's individuation level, impaired limits schemas, or shame-related variables (all *p*s > .05).

### 3.3.4.7. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Cognitive words) of Personal Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the use of cognitive subjective perspective terms in the vicarious shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was not statistically significant, $F(1, 52) = 1.47$, $p = .231$, $R^2 = .03$. Individuation did not significantly predict the use of cognitive words in vicarious shame narratives ($\beta = .17$, $p = .231$).

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 51) = 0.36$, $p = .589$. This step accounted for a negligible additional 1% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .01$), with the total explained variance reaching 3% ($R^2 = .03$), while the model remained non-significant $F(2, 51) = 0.91$, $p = .410$. In this stage, neither individuation ($\beta = .19$, $p = .193$) nor impaired limits ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .551$) were significant predictors.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 49) = 0.53$, $p = .589$. This step accounted for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02$), bringing the total explained variance to 6% ($R^2 = .06$), $F(4, 49) = 0.71$, $p = .587$. In the

final model, none of the individual variables made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of cognitive word usage (all *p*s > .05).

To summarize, similar to the previous findings on affective words, the hierarchical regression analysis reveals that none of the predictors significantly account for the variance in cognitive word usage for vicarious shame memory narratives (all *p*s > .05).

#### 3.3.4.8. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Total words) of Personal Memories

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the use of total subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive words in total) in the vicarious shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was not statistically significant, $F(1, 52) = 2.46$, $p = .123$, $R^2 = .05$. Individuation did not significantly predict the use of total words in vicarious shame narratives ($\beta = .21$, $p = .123$).

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 51) = 0.02$, $p = .898$. This step accounted for no additional variance ($\Delta R^2 = .00$), while the total explained variance remained unchanged at ($R^2 = .05$), and the model remained non-significant, $F(2, 51) = 1.21$, $p = .306$. In this step, neither individuation ($\beta = .21$, $p = .149$) nor impaired limits ($\beta = .02$, $p = .898$) were significant predictors.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 49) = 1.38$, $p = .262$. This step accounted for an additional 5% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .05$), bringing the total explained variance to 10% ($R^2 = .10$). None of the variables made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of the subjective perspective term total word usage (all *p*s > .05), and the final model remained non-significant, $F(4, 49) = 1.30$, $p = .282$.

To summarize, in contrast to personal shame memories where *individuation* emerged as a significant factor, the hierarchical regression analysis revealed that the use of subjective perspective terms in vicarious (mothers') shame narratives was not significantly predicted by the narrator's individuation level, impaired limits schemas, or shame-related propensities (all *p*s > .05).

### 3.3.4.9. Results of Relationships/Social Interaction Coding

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict social interaction scores in vicarious shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was not statistically significant, $F(1, 52) = 0.27$, $p = .606$, $R^2 = .01$. Individuation did not significantly predict social interaction in vicarious narratives ($\beta = .07$, $p = .606$).

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. While the inclusion of this variable resulted in a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 51) = 4.42$, $p = .041$, accounting for an additional 8% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .08$), the overall model remained statistically non-significant, $F(2, 51) = 2.35$, $p = .106$. Within this second model, impaired limits emerged as a significant positive predictor of social interaction ($\beta = .29$, $p = .041$), whereas individuation remained non-significant ($\beta = .00$, $p = .990$). However, the individual significance of impaired limits in the second model should be disregarded as the overall regression model failed to reach statistical significance.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 49) = 1.05$, $p = .357$. This step accounted for an additional 4% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .04$), bringing the total explained variance to 12% ($R^2 = .12$). None of the variables made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of the relationships level of the students (all *p*s > .05), and the final model remained non-significant, $F(4, 49) = 1.70$, $p = .164$.

### 3.3.4.10. Results of Identity Connection Coding

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict identity connection scores (the extent to which the narrator connects the mother's memory to their own identity) in vicarious shame memories of university students (daughters).

In the first model, the individuation variable was entered into the model. The results indicated that the model was not statistically significant, $F(1, 52) = 0.24$, $p = .626$, $R^2 = .01$. Individuation did not significantly predict identity connection in vicarious narratives ($\beta = .07$, $p = .626$).

In the second model, the impaired limits domain was added to the model. The inclusion of this variable did not result in a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(1, 51) = 0.87$, $p = .356$. This step accounted for an additional 2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02$), with the total explained variance reaching 2% ($R^2 = .02$), while the model remained non-significant, $F(2, 51) = 0.55$, $p = .578$.

In the final model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model. The inclusion of these variables did not lead to a statistically significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta F(2, 49) = 1.02$, $p = .370$. This step accounted for an additional 4% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .04$), bringing the total explained variance to 6% ($R^2 = .06$). The final model remained non-significant, $F(2, 49) = 0.79$, $p = .540$, and none of the variables made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of identity connection (all $p$s > .05).

### 3.3.5. Results for Mothers

Given the exploratory nature of this study, being the first to examine shame memories in this context, we prioritized parsimonious models. Therefore, predictors for each group (university students and their mothers) were selected based on their significant correlations with the outcome variables (see Tables 12 and 13, for students and mothers, respectively).

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to predict the outcome variables of mothers' in narrating their shame memories. In the first models,

three schema domains (*other-directedness, impaired limits,* and *unrelenting standards*) were entered as predictors while in the second models, shame-related variables (*shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal,* and *guilt-negative behavior evaluation*) were added to the models.

The results related to the two-stage hierarchical multiple regressions of mothers, can be seen in Table 15.

**Table 15.** Hierarchical Regressions for Mothers: Thematic Coherence (PSM & VSM), Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective & Cognitive & Total words (PSM & VSM), Identity Connections and Relationships/Social Interaction

| Thematic Coherence (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.02 | 0.03 | -.13 | -0.70 | .488 | [-0.08, 0.04] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.04 | 0.03 | -.23 | -1.44 | .157 | [-0.10, 0.02] |
| Other Directedness | -0.01 | 0.02 | -.10 | -0.59 | .559 | [-0.05, 0.03] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.02 | 0.03 | -.11 | -0.59 | .556 | [-0.07, 0.04] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.04 | 0.03 | -.24 | -1.54 | .130 | [-0.10, 0.01] |
| Other Directedness | -0.01 | 0.02 | -.09 | -0.53 | .598 | [-0.05, 0.03] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.11 | 0.06 | .30 | 1.80 | .079 | [-0.01, 0.24] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | -0.11 | 0.05 | -.29 | -2.30 | .026* | [-0.20, -0.01] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.09 | 0.06 | -.27 | -1.51 | .137 | [-0.21, 0.03] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .16 | .16 | 3.33 | 3, 53 | .026* | .026* |
| Model 2 | .27 | .11 | 2.53 | 3, 50 | .068 | .012* |
| Thematic Coherence (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Impaired Limits | -0.04 | 0.04 | -.28 | -1.13 | .267 | [-0.12, 0.03] |
| Other Directedness | 0.04 | 0.03 | .46 | 1.60 | .120 | [-0.01, 0.09] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.05 | 0.04 | -.41 | -1.32 | .198 | [-0.13, 0.03] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.04 | 0.04 | -.25 | -0.99 | .334 | [-0.11, 0.04] |
| Other Directedness | 0.04 | 0.03 | .44 | 1.51 | .144 | [-0.01, 0.09] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.02 | 0.10 | .04 | 0.18 | .861 | [-0.18, 0.21] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | 0.04 | 0.06 | .13 | 0.68 | .504 | [-0.08, 0.17] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.09 | 0.08 | .26 | 1.06 | .301 | [-0.08, 0.26] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .13 | .13 | 1.48 | 3, 29 | .242 | .242 |
| Model 2 | .21 | .07 | 0.79 | 3, 26 | .510 | .379 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |

**Table 15** (continued)

| | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.31 | 0.25 | -.26 | -1.26 | .214 | [-0.80, 0.18] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.09 | 0.24 | .07 | 0.38 | .708 | [-0.39, 0.57] |
| Other Directedness | 0.03 | 0.16 | .03 | 0.18 | .860 | [-0.29, 0.34] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.29 | 0.24 | -.25 | -1.21 | .232 | [-0.78, 0.19] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.08 | 0.24 | .06 | 0.35 | .731 | [-0.39, 0.56] |
| Other Directedness | 0.04 | 0.15 | .04 | 0.24 | .816 | [-0.27, 0.35] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.11 | 0.54 | .04 | 0.20 | .840 | [-0.97, 1.19] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | -0.83 | 0.39 | -.29 | -2.14 | .037* | [-1.60, -0.05] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.18 | 0.52 | -.07 | -0.35 | .728 | [-1.22, 0.86] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .04 | .04 | 0.76 | 3, 53 | .519 | .519 |
| Model 2 | .12 | .08 | 1.54 | 3, 50 | .216 | .341 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | 0.02 | 0.12 | .04 | 0.18 | .856 | [-0.23, 0.27] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.17 | 0.12 | -.23 | -1.34 | .187 | [-0.41, 0.08] |
| Other Directedness | 0.03 | 0.08 | .07 | 0.40 | .693 | [-0.13, 0.19] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | 0.03 | 0.12 | .05 | 0.25 | .807 | [-0.21, 0.27] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.17 | 0.12 | -.23 | -1.41 | .165 | [-0.40, 0.07] |
| Other Directedness | 0.03 | 0.08 | .07 | 0.41 | .685 | [-0.12, 0.18] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.58 | 0.27 | .40 | 2.18 | .034* | [0.05, 1.11] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | -0.30 | 0.19 | -.21 | -1.55 | .128 | [-0.68, 0.09] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.29 | 0.26 | -.22 | -1.14 | .260 | [-0.80, 0.22] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .04 | .04 | 0.68 | 3, 53 | .569 | .569 |
| Model 2 | .16 | .12 | 2.36 | 3, 50 | .083 | .184 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Total (PSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.29 | 0.33 | -.18 | -0.87 | .391 | [-0.95, 0.38] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.07 | 0.32 | -.04 | -0.22 | .825 | [-0.72, 0.58] |
| Other Directedness | 0.06 | 0.21 | .05 | 0.28 | .780 | [-0.36, 0.48] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.26 | 0.32 | -.17 | -0.82 | .419 | [-0.92, 0.39] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.08 | 0.32 | -.04 | -0.26 | .793 | [-0.72, 0.55] |
| Other Directedness | 0.07 | 0.21 | .06 | 0.33 | .746 | [-0.35, 0.48] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.69 | 0.72 | .18 | 0.96 | .343 | [-0.75, 2.13] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | -1.12 | 0.52 | -.30 | -2.17 | .035* | [-2.16, -0.08] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | -0.47 | 0.69 | -.13 | -0.68 | .498 | [-1.86, 0.92] |
| Model 1 | .03 | .03 | 0.55 | 3, 53 | .653 | .653 |
| Model 2 | .12 | .09 | 1.79 | 3, 50 | .160 | .331 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Affective (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |

**Table 15** (continued)

| | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.38 | 0.23 | -.48 | -1.61 | .119 | [-0.85, 0.10] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.02 | 0.23 | .02 | 0.08 | .940 | [-0.45, 0.48] |
| Other Directedness | 0.10 | 0.16 | .18 | 0.62 | .538 | [-0.22, 0.42] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.43 | 0.22 | -.55 | -1.97 | .060 | [-0.88, 0.02] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.07 | 0.21 | .08 | 0.33 | .744 | [-0.36, 0.50] |
| Other Directedness | 0.08 | 0.14 | .14 | 0.53 | .601 | [-0.22, 0.37] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.29 | 0.53 | .12 | 0.55 | .588 | [-0.80, 1.38] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | 0.40 | 0.34 | .21 | 1.20 | .241 | [-0.29, 1.10] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.85 | 0.47 | .41 | 1.81 | .082 | [-0.12, 1.82] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .12 | .12 | 1.34 | 3, 29 | .280 | .280 |
| Model 2 | .33 | .21 | 2.75 | 3, 26 | .063 | .079 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Cognitive (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.03 | 0.10 | -.09 | 0.32 | .753 | [-0.24, 0.18] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.14 | 0.10 | -.32 | -1.38 | .177 | [-0.34, 0.07] |
| Other Directedness | -0.03 | 0.07 | -.13 | -0.48 | .635 | [-0.17, 0.11] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.01 | 0.10 | -.03 | -0.11 | .917 | [-0.22, 0.19] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.14 | 0.10 | -.32 | -1.41 | .171 | [-0.33, 0.06] |
| Other Directedness | -0.04 | 0.07 | -.16 | -0.62 | .543 | [-0.18, 0.09] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.12 | 0.24 | .10 | 0.49 | .630 | [-0.38, 0.61] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | 0.33 | 0.15 | .36 | 2.12 | .044* | [0.01, 0.64] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.02 | 0.21 | .03 | 0.11 | .912 | [-0.42, 0.47] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .24 | .24 | 3.01 | 3, 29 | .046 | .046* |
| Model 2 | .36 | .12 | 1.64 | 3, 26 | .205 | .054 |
| Subjective Perspective Terms – Total (VSM) | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.41 | 0.30 | -.40 | 1.36 | .184 | [-1.02, 0.21] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.12 | 0.29 | -.10 | -0.41 | .686 | [-0.71, 0.48] |
| Other Directedness | 0.07 | 0.20 | .09 | 0.32 | .748 | [-0.35, 0.47] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.44 | 0.29 | -.43 | -1.53 | .137 | [-1.03, 0.15] |
| Impaired Limits | -0.07 | 0.28 | -.06 | 0.24 | .814 | [-0.63, 0.50] |
| Other Directedness | 0.04 | 0.19 | .05 | 0.19 | .851 | [-0.35, 0.43] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.41 | 0.70 | .13 | 0.59 | .562 | [-1.02, 1.84] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | 0.73 | 0.44 | .28 | 1.65 | .111 | [-0.18, 1.64] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.87 | 0.62 | .32 | 1.42 | .169 | [-0.40, 2.15] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .16 | .16 | 1.88 | 3, 29 | .155 | .155 |
| Model 2 | .33 | .17 | 2.22 | 3, 26 | .110 | .079 |

**Table 15** (continued)

| Relationship/Social Interaction | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.03 | 0.03 | -.31 | -0.97 | .339 | [-0.10, 0.04] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.00 | 0.03 | .01 | 0.03 | .978 | [-0.07, 0.07] |
| Other Directedness | 0.02 | 0.02 | .27 | 0.90 | .375 | [-0.03, 0.07] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.04 | 0.03 | -.33 | -1.15 | .262 | [-0.10, 0.03] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.01 | 0.03 | .08 | 0.33 | .743 | [-0.05, 0.07] |
| Other Directedness | 0.02 | 0.02 | .22 | 0.82 | .418 | [-0.03, 0.06] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | 0.17 | 0.08 | .48 | 2.22 | .035* | [0.01, 0.32] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | 0.03 | 0.05 | .12 | 0.68 | .500 | [-0.07, 0.13] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.03 | 0.07 | .09 | 0.38 | .709 | [-0.11, 0.16] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .04 | .04 | 0.38 | 3, 29 | .772 | .772 |
| Model 2 | .31 | .28 | 3.46 | 3, 26 | .031 | .107 |
| Identity Connection | *B* | *SE* | β | *t* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Model 1 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.10 | 0.02 | -.14 | -0.46 | .652 | [-0.05, 0.03] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.02 | 0.02 | .20 | 0.76 | .453 | [-0.03, 0.06] |
| Other Directedness | 0.01 | 0.01 | .13 | 0.42 | .679 | [-0.02, 0.03] |
| Model 2 | | | | | | |
| Unrelenting Standards | -0.01 | 0.02 | -.20 | -0.61 | .550 | [-0.06, 0.03] |
| Impaired Limits | 0.02 | 0.02 | .22 | 0.83 | .413 | [-0.03, 0.06] |
| Other Directedness | 0.01 | 0.01 | .12 | 0.37 | .714 | [-0.02, 0.04] |
| Shame-Neg. Self Eva. | -0.01 | 0.05 | -.03 | -0.10 | .918 | [-0.11, 0.10] |
| Shame-Withdrawal | 0.01 | 0.03 | .04 | 0.22 | .829 | [-0.06, 0.08] |
| Guilt-Neg. Behavior | 0.05 | 0.05 | .26 | 0.97 | .342 | [-0.05, 0.14] |
| Model Summary Statistics | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\Delta F$ | *df* | $p_{\Delta F}$ | $p_{Model}$ |
| Model 1 | .04 | .04 | 0.41 | 3, 29 | .745 | .745 |
| Model 2 | .09 | .05 | 0.47 | 3, 26 | .704 | .851 |

*Note*. PSM = Personal shame memory, VSM = Vicarious shame memory. Shame-Neg. Self Eva. = Shame-Negative Self-Evaluation, Guilt-Neg. Behavior = Guilt-Negative Behavior. $*p < .05$

### 3.3.5.1. Results of Thematic Coherence of Personal Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' thematic coherence scores in narrating their personal shame memories. In the first step, three schema domains (other-directedness, impaired limits, and unrelenting standards) were entered as predictors. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, containing only schema domains, was statistically significant and explained 16% of the variance ($R^2$ = .16) in thematic coherence, $F$(3, 53) = 3.33, $p$ = .026. However, an examination of the individual predictors revealed that none of the schema domains were significant independent predictors of thematic coherence: unrelenting standards (β = −.13, $p$ = .488), impaired limits (β = −.23, $p$ = .157), and other-directedness (β = −.10, $p$ = .559).

In the second step, the addition of shame-related variables explained an additional 11% of the variance ($\Delta R^2$ = .11). However, this increase in the explained variance was not statistically significant, $\Delta F$(3, 50) = 2.53, $p$ = .068. The final model remained statistically significant overall, $F$(6, 50) = 3.08, $p$ = .012, accounting for a total of 27% of the variance in thematic coherence. Within this final model, shame-withdrawal was a significant predictor (β = −.29, $p$ = .026); specifically, it showed a negative relationship with thematic coherence, indicating that individuals reporting higher levels of shame-withdrawal tended to produce less coherent personal shame memory narratives.

#### 3.3.5.2. Results of Thematic Coherence of Vicarious Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' thematic coherence scores in narrating vicarious shame memories. In the first step, schema domains (other-directedness, impaired limits, and unrelenting standards) were entered as predictors. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, containing only schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F$(3, 29) = 1.48, $p$ = .242, and explained 13% of the variance ($R^2$ = .13).

The addition of shame-related variables in the second model did not lead to a significant increase in the explained variance, $\Delta R^2$ = .07, $\Delta F$(3, 26) = 0.79, $p$ = .510. The final model remained non-significant, $F$(6, 26) = 1.12, $p$ =.379, $R^2$ =.21, with neither the schema domains nor the shame-related variables emerging as significant predictors of vicarious thematic coherence (all $p$s > .05).

### 3.3.5.3. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Affective words) of Personal Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' use of affective words in their personal shame memory narratives. In the first step, three schema domains (unrelenting standards, impaired limits, and other-directedness) were entered. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, containing only schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 53) = 0.76$, $p = .519$, and explained 4% of the variance ($R^2 = .04$).

In the second model, the addition of shame-related variables explained an additional 8.1% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .08$), $\Delta F(3, 50) = 1.54$, $p = .216$. Although the individual coefficient for shame-withdrawal reached statistical significance ($\beta = -.29$, $p = .037$), the overall model remained non-significant, $F(6, 50) = 1.16$, $p = .341$, $R^2 = .12$. Therefore, the individual significance of shame-withdrawal in the final model should be disregarded as the overall regression model failed to reach statistical significance. All other predictors remained non-significant (all $p$s > .05).

### 3.3.5.4. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Cognitive words) of Personal Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' use of cognitive words in their personal shame narratives. In the first step, three schema domains (unrelenting standards, impaired limits, and other-directedness) were entered. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, containing only schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 53) = 0.68$, $p = .569$, accounting for only 4% of the variance in cognitive word usage ($R^2 = .04$).

In the second model, the addition of shame-related variables explained an additional 12% of the variance ($\Delta R^2$ = .12), $\Delta F(3, 50) = 2.36$, $p$ = .083. Although the individual coefficient for shame-negative self-evaluation reached statistical significance (β = .40, $p$ = .034), the overall model remained non-significant, $F(6, 50) = 1.54$, $p$ =.184, $R^2$ = .16. Therefore, the individual significance of shame-negative self-evaluation in the final model should be disregarded as the overall regression model failed to reach statistical significance. All other predictors remained non-significant (all $p$s > .05).

#### 3.3.5.5. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Total words) of Personal Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' total use of subjective perspectives (the sum of affective and cognitive terms) in their personal shame narratives. In the first step, three schema domains (unrelenting standards, impaired limits, and other-directedness) were entered as predictors. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, which included only the schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 53) = 0.55$, $p$ = .653, and explained only 3% of the variance ($R^2$ =.03) in total subjective perspective usage. None of the individual schema domains were significant predictors.

In the second model, the addition of shame-related variables explained an additional 9% of the variance ($\Delta R^2$ = .09), $\Delta F(3, 50) = 1.79$, $p$ = .160. Although the individual coefficient for shame-withdrawal reached statistical (β = −.30, $p$ = .035), the overall model remained non-significant, $F(6, 50) = 1.18$, $p$ = .331, $R^2$ =.12. Therefore, the individual significance of shame-withdrawal in the final model should be disregarded as the overall regression model failed to reach statistical significance. All other predictors remained non-significant (all $p$s > .05).

### 3.3.5.6. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Affective words) of Vicarious Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' use of affective words in their vicarious shame narratives (narrating their daughters' shame memories). In the first step, three schema domains (unrelenting standards, impaired limits, and other-directedness) were entered. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, which included only the schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 29) = 1.34$, $p = .280$, and accounted for 12% of the variance in the use of vicarious affective words ($R^2 = .12$).

The addition of shame-related variables in the second model did not lead to a significant increase in the explained variance, $\Delta R^2 = .21$, $\Delta F(3, 26) = 2.75$, $p = .063$. The final model remained non-significant, $F(6, 26) = 2.17$, $p = .079$, $R^2 = .33$, with neither the schema domains nor the shame-related variables emerging as significant predictors of vicarious thematic coherence (all $p$s > .05).

### 3.3.5.7. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Cognitive words) of Vicarious Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' use of cognitive words in their vicarious shame narratives. In the first step, three schema domains (other-directedness, impaired limits, and unrelenting standards) were entered. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, including only schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 29) = 3.01$, $p = .046$, and explained 24% of the variance in vicarious cognitive word usage ($R^2 = .24$). However, an examination of the individual predictors revealed that none of the schema domains were significant independent predictors of cognitive

terms: unrelenting standards (β = −.09, $p$ = .753), impaired limits (β = −.32, $p$ = .177), and other-directedness (β = −.13, $p$ = .635).

In the second step, the addition of shame-related variables did not lead to a significant increase in the explained variance, $\Delta R^2$ = .12, $\Delta F(3, 26) = 1.64$, $p$ = .205. Although the individual coefficient for shame-withdrawal reached statistical significance (β =.36, $p$ = .044), the overall model remained non-significant, $F(6, 26) = 2.42$, $p$ = .054, $R^2$ = .36. Therefore, the individual significance of shame-withdrawal in the final model should be disregarded as the overall regression model failed to reach statistical significance. All other predictors remained non-significant (all $p$s > .05).

#### 3.3.5.8. Results of Subjective Perspective Terms (Total words) of Vicarious Memories

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' total use of subjective perspectives (affective and cognitive terms) in their vicarious shame narratives. In the first step, schema domains (other-directedness, impaired limits, and unrelenting standards) were entered as predictors. In the second step, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added to the model.

The first model, consisting only of the schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 29) = 1.88$, $p$ = .155, and accounted for 16% of the variance in total vicarious subjective perspectives ($R^2$ = .16). None of the individual schema domains significantly predicted the outcome.

The addition of shame-related variables in the second model did not lead to a significant increase in the explained variance, $\Delta R^2$ = .17, $\Delta F(3, 26) = 2.22$, $p$ = .110. The final model remained non-significant, $F(6, 26) = 2.17$, $p$ = .079, $R^2$ = .33, with neither the schema domains nor the shame-related variables emerging as significant predictors of vicarious thematic coherence (all $p$s > .05).

### 3.3.5.9. Results of Relationship/Social Interaction Coding

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' social interaction levels in their vicarious shame narratives. In the first model, three schema domains (other-directedness, impaired limits, and unrelenting standards) were entered as predictors. In the second model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added.

The first model, which included only the schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 29) = 0.38$, $p = .772$, and explained only 4% of the variance in vicarious shame memories' social interaction ($R^2 = .04$).

In the second model, the addition of shame-related variables explained an additional 28% of the variance, $\Delta R^2 = .28$, $\Delta F(3, 26) = 3.46$, $p = .031$. Although the explained variance was statistically significant, and individual coefficient for shame-negative self-evaluation reached statistical significance ($\beta = .48$, $p = .035$), the overall model remained non-significant, $F(6, 26) = 1.97$, $p = .107$, $R^2 = .31$. Therefore, the individual significance of shame-negative self-evaluation in the final model should be disregarded as the overall regression model failed to reach statistical significance. All other predictors remained non-significant (all $p$s $> .05$).

### 3.3.5.10. Results of Identity Connection Coding

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict mothers' identity connection scores (the extent to which the narrator connects the daughter's memory to their own identity) in their vicarious shame narratives. In the first model, three schema domains (other-directedness, impaired limits, and unrelenting standards) were entered as predictors. In the second model, shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were added.

The first model, which included only the schema domains, was not statistically significant, $F(3, 29) = 0.41$, $p = .745$, and accounted for only 4% of the variance in identity connection ($R^2 = .04$).

In the second model, the addition of shame-related variables did not lead to a significant increase in the explained variance, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F(3, 26) = 0.47$, $p = .704$. The final model remained non-significant, $F(6, 26) = 0.43$, $p = .851$, $R^2 = .09$, with neither the schema domains nor the shame-related variables emerging as significant predictors of identity connection (all *p*s > .05).

### 3.3.6. Reasons for Sharing Vicarious Shame Memories

Perceived reasons for the protagonist's sharing personal shame memory to her partner (vicarious shame memories) were coded into six mutually exclusive categories as previously employed (Bakır-Demir et al., 2020; Reese, Myftari, et al., 2017): 1) just for joy/entertainment, 2) because the narrator asked, 3) for teaching purposes, 4) to share family stories, 5) for no reason and 6) because the memory was emotionally charged.

A Chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between participant groups (daughters vs. mothers) and their perceptions of the primary reasons for sharing their partners' autobiographical memories. Due to the presence of cells with expected counts less than 5, the likelihood ratio was utilized for reporting. The results indicated a significant association between the two variables, $G^2(5, N = 83) = 14.69$, $p = .012$. The effect size, as measured by Cramer's *V*, was .39, representing a medium-to-large effect.

Post-hoc analysis using standardized residuals revealed that daughters were significantly more likely to refer to *teaching purposes* as a reason (residual = 2.26) compared to mothers. Conversely, mothers were significantly more likely to report *emotionally charged* reasons (residual = 2.08) than daughters. No other significant differences were found among the remaining categories (all residuals < |1.96|).

### 3.4. Discussion

In Study 2, we investigated the personal and vicarious shame memories of university students and their mothers. After designing and building the hierarchical models, we aimed to assess the unique contribution of predictors on (a) thematic coherence, (b) subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive words), (c) relationships/social interaction, (d) identity connection, and (e) reasons (see Section 3.2.4 for the details of the coding schemes).

Given the exploratory nature of this study, being the first to examine shame memories in this context, we prioritized parsimonious models. Therefore, predictors for each group (university students and their mothers) were selected based on their significant correlations with the outcome variables (see Tables 11 and 12, for university students and mothers, respectively).

For the university student sample, the hierarchical regression analyses proceeded in three steps. Individuation was entered in the first step, followed by the impaired-limits schema domain in the second step. Finally, the shame-related variables (shame-negative self-evaluation and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were included in the third step. We wanted to investigate whether the inclusion of shame-related variables in the final step significantly improved the model's explanatory power after controlling for individuation and impaired limits schema domains.

For the mother sample, on the other hand, the hierarchical regression analyses proceeded in two steps. The schema domains of unrelenting standards, impaired limits, and other-directedness were entered in the first step, and shame-related variables (shame-negative-self-evaluation, shame-withdrawal, and guilt-negative behavior evaluation) were included in the second step. Similarly, we wanted to investigate whether the inclusion of shame-related variables in the final step significantly improved the model's explanatory power after controlling for schema domains.

### 3.4.1. Narrative Construction Across Contexts (Personal vs. Vicarious Shame Memories) and Generations (University Students and Their Mothers)

A converging pattern across the whole sample is worth noting: regardless of the participant type, personal shame memories consistently yielded richer and statistically significant data compared to vicarious memories (Grysman et al., 2013; Steiner, 2024; Thomsen & Pillemer, 2017). In general, the reason why personal shame memories yielded richer data may be likely because personal shame memories hold higher self-relevance and represent direct experiences, whereas vicarious memories are indirect and likely phenomenologically less intense (Pillemer et al., 2015; Pond & Patterson, 2020). This aligns with the *self-reference effect* (SRE), suggesting that experiences directly relevant to the self represent a privileged domain in memory, leading to more robust retrieval than indirect experiences (Rogers et al., 1977; Sweatman et al., 2022). Furthermore, personal memories are a reflection of identity that serve to construct and sustain the individual's sense of self (Conway, 2005). As personal memories are central to the narrative identity shaped through socialization, they may be perceived as more worthwhile to remember (Fivush et al., 2006; Şahin-Acar et al., 2017). This prioritization may led participants to generate richer and more accessible personal memories compared to vicarious memories (Pillemer et al., 2015; Pond & Patterson, 2020). The current study supported the existing literature, demonstrating higher scores in both phenomenological characteristics and coding.

Regarding participant type, university students yielded richer and more robust data compared to their mothers. However, the underlying mechanisms driving these narratives may potentially differ.

#### 3.4.1.1. Narrative Patterns in University Students

Initially, it is important to note that, despite the expectation, no significant correlation had emerged between the thematic coherence of personal and vicarious shame memories among university students ($r$ = .15, $p$ = .294). This lack of correlation may indicate that personal and vicarious shame memory narratives do not necessarily stem from a single and/or unified narrative ability, but they are likely driven by different

emotional and cognitive processes specific to the context of personal versus vicarious shame.

The results revealed a consistent pattern regarding how university students construct their shame narratives. The *individuation* variable emerged as a consistent and key variable especially in personal shame memories along with the negative predictor role of the impaired limits schema domain. Higher levels of individuation showed predictive potential for thematic coherence across both memory types. Additionally, individuation emerged as a robust predictor for the use of subjective perspective terms. Daughters with higher levels of individuation seem to effectively manage the challenging nature of shame and tend to narrate their experiences in a thematically structured manner, following a clear format of beginning, middle, and ending, including a resolution that is rich in especially affective words.

For vicarious shame memories, however, while individuation emerged and remained as a significant predictor of thematic coherence, the impaired limits schema domain lost its predictive power in subsequent models following the inclusion of additional variables. The decrease of impaired limits suggests that the newly introduced factors accounted for the variance initially explained by impaired limits. Indeed, distinct from personal shame memories, although lost its predictive power in the last step, the impaired limits schema domain emerged as a significant *positive* predictor for vicarious shame memories, while shame negative self-evaluation emerged as a significant negative predictor. Specific predictors that worked for thematic coherence of vicarious memories will be discussed in the following sections below (see Section 3.4.2).

To interpret the noteworthy and generally robust predictive capacity of individuation on especially personal shame memories, we must revisit İmamoğlu's (2003) definition of the individuated self. She characterizes this self as being differentiated as a unique person with *intrinsic referents*, such as one's personal inclinations, capabilities, and free will. Relying on these internal referents appears critical, as shame naturally threatens the self's integrity and triggers an overwhelming urge to hide (Gilbert, 1998, 2003; Lewis, 1992; J. P. Tangney, 1995). However, higher individuation seems to

buffer against this threat for personal shame memory. Our findings may suggest that individuation functions as a regulatory resource. It appears to enable participants to control the possible urge to withdraw, allowing them to maintain self-cohesion rather than fragmenting while narrating their shame experiences.

A nuanced pattern emerged regarding the subjective perspective terms (i.e., emotions, evaluations, and cognitions), setting it apart from the findings on thematic coherence. First, it is important to note that the use of affective and cognitive words was correlated between personal and vicarious memories ($r$ = .40, $p$ = .003; $r$ = .38, $p$ = .004, respectively). This suggests that students possess a modestly consistent verbal style across contexts. The prevalence of affective and cognitive words in narratives, indicating the use of internal state language (Fivush & Buckner, 2003), is not reducible to mere linguistic inference; it is an act of meaning-making (McLean et al., 2010). Therefore, we can assume that using more subjective perspective words in a narrative corresponds to an effort of meaning-making.

Crucially, the results indicate that the role of individuation in predicting affective and cognitive words is strictly context-dependent. Individuation drives this process only in personal memories, where it seems to help students articulate their inner thoughts and feelings. In vicarious contexts, conversely, individuation did not reach statistical significance. This limitation extends beyond word choice, illustrating that the regulatory power of individuation appears more constrained within the vicarious context. Lastly, the models for relationship and identity connection yielded no significant results. The absence of these patterns suggests that while individuated students can effectively structure the narrative and process the subjective terms, the isolating nature of shame may prevent them from highlighting the relationship and using these memories to establish shared identity.

Taken together, while identifying specific predictors for each dependent variable provides valuable insights, to understand the overarching pattern of understand why personal memories consistently yielded robust narrative patterns while vicarious memories remained comparatively fragile, we must look beyond single variables to the fundamental contextual shift. Three interrelated mechanisms likely explain this

discrepancy in narratives: the emotional burden of the memories, the transition from *experiencer* to *observer*, and the possibility of maternal mirroring.

Regarding the first mechanism, the reduced narrative complexity in vicarious memories may stem from the fact that the emotional burden was preemptively managed by the mothers. Research on intergenerational narratives indicates that mothers adjust their storytelling style to guide their children's emotional comprehension without overwhelming them (Fivush, 2007; Sales et al., 2003). Even as children reach adulthood, this flexibility likely coexists with a consistent parental reminiscing style that remains stable over time (McCabe & Peterson, 1991; Reese et al., 1993). If the mothers filtered the distress within their shame memories during the original transmission, the daughters would encounter a less threatening version of the memory. Consequently, since the emotional regulation was likely performed by the mother during the original telling, the daughter does not need to deploy her own individuation resources to regulate the affect within the narrative.

The second explanation centers on the fundamental shift from an *experiencer* to an *observer* perspective. In personal narratives, the phenomenology of shame is dominated by an overwhelming urge to disappear or hide the self (Lewis, 1992, Tangney et al., 1996). Consequently, the narrator must prioritize managing this *threat to the self* (De Hooge et al., 2010), to maintain coherence as she narrates a memory that she was the *experiencer*. In contrast, vicarious narratives position the daughter as an observer listening to the mother's experience. Because the threat is directed at the mother rather than the daughter, the paralyzing urge to hide is mostly expected to be diminished. This shift creates psychological distance (Trope & Liberman, 2010), allowing the daughter to redirect resources from self-defense to other cognitive processes. Instead of protecting the self, vicarious shame in this context may function more as an *in-group correction device* (Welten et al., 2012), where the focus is on observing and learning from the social error rather than feeling the direct sting of rejection.

Our empirical findings regarding the reasons for sharing memories may support this *distance* hypothesis. A Chi-square test of independence was performed, and a

likelihood ratio was utilized to examine the relationship between participant groups (daughters vs. mothers) and their perceived reasons for why the original narrator shared the memory. The analysis revealed a statistically significant difference between daughters and mothers regarding their perceived reasons for the sharing of shame memories, $G^2(5, N = 83) = 14.69$, $p = .012$, with a medium effect size (Cramer's $V = .39$). The analysis revealed distinct reason patterns between the groups: daughters were significantly more likely to think that their mothers shared their shame memory to themselves for *teaching or developmental purposes* ($z = 2.26$). This finding suggested that daughters perceived their mother's shame memories primarily as *didactic lessons*. Framing the shame memory as a *lesson* may help daughters maintain their role as emotionally distanced *observers*, preventing them from becoming emotionally overwhelmed and rendering their own individuation capacity less relevant to the narrative construction. Because the memory was received as a *lesson* rather than a shared emotional distress, the daughter adopted a passive recipient role rather than an active agentic role. Thus, her level of individuation became irrelevant to how she narrated this *didactic* story.

The findings of reason coding suggested that daughters perceive their mothers' sharing as an act of *problem-solving* (Bluck et al., 2005). On the other hand, daughters benefit from the sharing process primarily for a *social function*, to understand and integrate their feelings about the event (Alea & Bluck, 2003; Fivush, 2007). This distinction supports the view that the intergenerational transmission of memories is not a uniform exchange but a hierarchical one that persists regardless of the daughter's age. Even though the daughters in our sample can be accepted as young adults (university students), the mothers may remain the emotional historian and emotional scaffolder (Fivush, Bohanek, et al., 2009; Fivush et al., 2006), while the daughter continues to position herself as a recipient of guidance or a seeker of emotional containment (Fivush, 2007; Pasupathi, 2001).

Lastly, the null results in vicarious contexts may be attributed to *maternal mirroring*. In vicarious narratives, word choice might be shaped more by the mother's original narration style than the daughter's individual features. To the extent that the daughters' vicarious narrations echo the mother's *original* narration (Pasupathi, 2001), the

daughter may act as a faithful recorder rather than an active constructor. This interpretation aligns with the predominantly null results of the mothers' personal shame memory data (see section below 3.4.1.2.); if the mothers' original stories were *unstructured*, the daughters' retellings likely mirrored this lack of structure, regardless of the daughters' own individuation levels.

Importantly, the high thematic coherence observed in university students' shame memories may reflect a Western cultural norm of narrative rationalization among younger cohorts, rather than a universal trait, especially given its absence in the mother sample. While literature generally links high thematic coherence with positive psychological outcomes, it remains unclear what highly coherent shame narratives truly signify for an individual. It is yet to be determined whether this coherence represents healthy emotional processing or a form of defensive rumination. Consequently, future studies should replicate these findings across diverse age groups and cultural contexts to better understand the true nature of shame memory coherence.

To sum up, shame seemed not processed uniformly; its impact on narrative structure is found strictly context-dependent. This likely stems from the aversive nature of shame and the accompanying urge to withdraw, which forces the narrator to adopt different regulatory strategies for personal versus vicarious experiences. This context-dependency extends to cognitive structures. Interestingly, certain schema domains showed potential of paradoxical effects, disrupting the personal context while marginally improving the vicarious one (or vice versa), which will be examined in the following section (see Section 3.4.2.2). In stark contrast, however, the mothers' data revealed a fundamentally different statistical pattern.

#### 3.4.1.2. The Absence of Contextual Patterns in Mothers

In sharp contrast to the findings observed in their daughters, the analyses of the mothers' narratives yielded predominantly non-significant results. Across the entire set of models tested for the mothers' group, one achieved full statistical significance, while another approached it. Specifically, the overall model predicting thematic coherence in personal memories was significant ($p$ = .012), with *shame-withdrawal*

emerging as a significant negative predictor (β = -.29, $p$ = .026). For the second model, which predicted subjective perspective cognitive terms in vicarious shame memories, the initial step (Model 1) was significant but yielded no significant individual predictors. In the final step, the overall model reached marginal significance ($p$ = .054), with *shame-withdrawal* acting as a significant positive predictor (β = .36, $p$ = .044). Taken together, these findings suggest that *shame-withdrawal* may have a disruptive effect on thematic coherence in mothers' personal shame memories, which is related to the ability to structure a narrative into a coherent beginning, middle, end with a resolution; however, its potentially enhancing effect on the use of cognitive words in their vicarious shame memories indicates that an entirely different process might be activated when mothers narrate the vicarious shame memories of their daughters.

As mothers had higher scores on the *shame-withdrawal* variable, which captures shame responses characterized by avoidant action tendencies, such as the urge to hide or disappear (Cohen et al., 2011), their narratives become less thematically coherent. Rather than narrating their personal shame memories in a clear beginning, middle, end including resolution which would be thematically coherent way, mothers with higher *shame-withdrawal* tended to construct in a more fragmented way. Ultimately, this lack of structural cohesion appears to mirror the very act of *hiding* within the narrative itself.

The prevalence of cognitive words in narratives often reflects an ongoing process of meaning-making (McLean et al., 2010). By utilizing a richer cognitive vocabulary while narrating, the mother may likely understand the shame experience of her daughter cognitively. This dynamic aligns with the perspective that autobiographical remembering is not merely the cognitive retrieval of past events, but an active, present-moment process of interpersonal emotion regulation and social meaning-making (Nelson & Fivush, 2004; Pasupathi, 2003). While this interpretation remains tentative, is further supported by our *reasons* coding analysis, which revealed how mothers approach the act of listening to their daughter's shame memories and subsequently narrating their own experiences. Our results indicated that mothers were significantly more likely to attribute their daughters' memory sharing to the narratives' *emotionally charged nature* ($z$ = 2.08). This finding is pivotal: it suggests that mothers perceive the

vicarious memory primarily as a *social sharing of emotion* (Rimé, 2009), an immediate call for emotional regulation rather than simply an opportunity for reflective storytelling. Therefore, the tentative finding that maternal *shame-withdrawal* serves as a positive predictor for cognitive term use ($\beta = .36$) likely highlights the mother's active meaning-making process during narrating of her daughter's shame memory. Specifically, higher withdrawal tendencies may prompt a compensatory cognitive effort to process, navigate, and regulate this intensely emotional interpersonal exchange.

Beyond these specific exceptions, the data revealed a systematic absence of patterns across all narrative dimensions. Notably, this lack of predictive power was consistent across diverse coding categories, ranging from structural measures like thematic coherence and subjective perspective to relational measures such as identity connection and social interaction. The fact that variables like identity connection and social interaction were non-significant for both groups suggests that integrating shame into broader relational meanings is inherently challenging for the entire sample; however, the mothers distinguished themselves by failing to show significance even in the personal shame memory where daughters yielded robust models.

Given that only one model across all analyses reached statistical significance in both models, several interacting factors likely account for this scarcity of significant findings in the mothers' group compared to the university students.

First, given that shame is a profoundly difficult and aversive emotion (Gilbert, 1998, 2003; J. P. Tangney, 1995), generational differences in emotional expression and regulation might play a crucial role. Mothers, belonging to an older generation, may hold more conservative attitudes regarding the disclosure of shame, leading to a reluctance to fully engage with the emotional depth required for variables like subjective perspective or identity connection to emerge significantly. It is likely that this generation is less *in touch* with the emotion of shame compared to the younger generation, who appear more open to articulating and processing such emotions. This aligns with the significant findings related to individuation in the daughters group; it

is likely no coincidence that daughters, who are more individuated are better equipped to narrate and handle such complex emotions.

Second, and perhaps more critically, the discrepancy in narrative competence is strongly linked to educational heterogeneity. The mothers in our sample exhibited a wide range of education levels, ranging from primary school graduates to Ph.D. holders, whereas the daughter group was educationally homogenous. University students, by the very nature of their academic training, are frequently exposed to narrative construction tasks and essay-type questions. This *practice effect* provided students with the necessary scaffolding to construct a structurally coherent story and articulate internal states (subjective perspective), even if they could not yet bridge the memory to broader identity meanings. In contrast, the wide variation in mothers' educational backgrounds likely introduced considerable statistical noise, preventing the emergence of a unified narrative pattern and obscuring potential mechanisms that might have been visible in a more homogenous sample.

This impact of individual differences and educational inequality was most pronounced in the mothers' vicarious narratives because narrating another person's (daughter's) experience may require a higher level of cognitive organization and perspective-taking, skills that are often enhanced through formal education. Without consistent educational attainment, the cognitive load of constructing a coherent story about someone else's shame becomes significantly greater. Consequently, the inequality in education levels made the vicarious data particularly vulnerable; mothers' vicarious accounts were often disorganized and scattered, failing to yield significant models due to this fragmentation.

However, the systematic failure of all coding domains extends beyond merely structure; it also encompasses emotional and relational codes. The underlying mechanism driving this broad absence of patterns can be explained by the functional intent of the mothers during original narration. When the maternal goal is emotional scaffolding, containing the daughter's distress in the moment (Fivush et al., 2006), the narrative focus shifts dramatically away from the dimensions measured in this study. Because the mother's focus is on regulating the emotion and helping the daughter

understand the event (Fivush, 2007; Fivush et al., 2009) rather than constructing a permanent or structured narrative, the act of re-telling these events as vicarious shame memory later likely reflects this functional priority. The mother does not prioritize thematic coherence (beginning-middle-end including resolution) or the articulation of specific subjective terms because her role as much pragmatic as it is soothing. Thus, the null results in the mothers' group should not be viewed merely as a failure of data, but as a reflection of a hierarchical intergenerational dynamic: while daughters narrate to explore their experiences, mothers engage in a functional process of emotional containment, a task that prioritizes immediate regulation over narrative structure.

#### 3.4.1.3. The Distinct Phenomenology of Shame

Contrary to our initial expectations and existing literature suggesting that coherence tends to be a stable trait across different contexts (İlgün, 2024; Lind & Thomsen, 2018; Pillemer et al., 2015; Yenen, 2023), we found no significant relationship between thematic coherence of personal and vicarious shame memories among university students ($r$ = .15, $p$ = .294) and mothers ($r$ = .15, $p$ = .384). This null finding is quite revealing; it highlights the notion that the processing of personal shame differs fundamentally from the processing of vicarious shame. A crucial variable here may be the specific nature of the *shame memory* prompted in the instructions; the unique phenomenological structure of shame may elicit distinct narrative patterns that diverge from those of other emotional memories specifically by hindering the global integration required for thematic coherence.

Much of the existing literature on autobiographical memory tends to group sadness, anger, and fear under the umbrella of negatively-induced memories (Berntsen & Rubin, 2002; Çeviker, 2022; Fivush et al., 2003; Porter & Birt, 2001). However, our results may reflect the distinct phenomenological signature of shame that exerts a unique influence on narrative construction, an influence that would be obscured in a generalized negative memory study. Unlike sadness or anger, which often motivate connecting with others or asserting boundaries, shame is fundamentally characterized by the urge to withdraw, hide, and disappear (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992). In personal narratives, the urge to hide presents a threat to the self that requires significant

regulatory effort to prevent narrative fragmentation; this demand on cognitive and emotional resources may impair the narrator's ability to establish the causal links and self-event connections that define thematic coherence. However, in vicarious narratives, where the threat to the self is diminished, the functionality of shame transforms. It shifts from a paralyzing emotion to a social learning tool or an *in-group correction device* (Welten et al., 2012).

To summarize, by isolating shame as a discrete affective category, rather than requesting generic low-point memories, this study brings to light the sophisticated ways in which individuals, and specifically mother-daughter dyads, navigate this complex emotion, toggling between the role of the overwhelmed experiencer and the detached observer.

### 3.4.2. Evaluation of the Models: What Works?

#### 3.4.2.1. Individuation as a Key Facilitator of Narrative Competence

Across the hierarchical regression models, *individuation* emerged as the most robust and consistent positive predictor of narrative characteristics for university students. To understand why this variable serves as such a critical facilitator, one must first consider its definition within this cultural context. İmamoğlu (2003) defines the individuated self as "becoming differentiated as a unique person with intrinsic referents, e.g., one's personal inclinations, capabilities, and free will" (İmamoğlu, 2003, p. 372). Our findings suggested that the thematic coherence, emotional, and cognitive details of personal shame memories were closely related to the extent to which an individual has developed these *internal anchors* defined by İmamoğlu (2003). These anchors seem helping daughters construct a structured account of a challenging emotional experience. According to Kağıtçıbaşı (2007), especially in societies in transition like Türkiye, relatedness is already high *by default* due to strong family bonds. However, the introduction of *autonomy* works miraculously in this context, leading to the emergence of the *autonomous-related self*. When parents adopt a socialization style that supports the child's agency and independent self, the child is expected to gain individual responsibility. This shift has the potential to significantly change how the

child interprets shame: rather than experiencing shame as a purely external and overwhelming source, the autonomous individual internalizes responsibility, viewing mistakes as a personal outcome of their own actions and choices.

The consistent success of *individuation* in our models can be further explained by the developmental significance of this life stage. As Erikson (1968) posits, constructing a personal identity is the central task of adolescence and serves as the foundation for young adulthood. In the course of individuation, the individual undergoes a critical process of achieving autonomy that contributes to developing unique facets of selfhood (Blos, 1967; Mahler et al., 1975). A healthy identity is formed through the simultaneous processes of developing an *individuated* self while sustaining *relatedness* in social contexts (İmamoğlu, 1998, 2003). Since shame is an emotion that carrying the potential of attacking herself (Lewis, 1992), the capacity to narrate it without fragmentation relies heavily on the strength of this identity. Therefore, the capacity to engage with shame, rather than being overwhelmed by it, is a direct reflection of this active identity formation process.

Consequently, our results suggested that *individuation* served as the fundamental structural framework of narratives for university students. The ability to construct a thematically coherent narrative about shame was not merely a linguistic skill, but as a capacity underpinned by the level of individuation. Possessing an individuated self seemed to help daughters counteract the inherent urge of shame to *hide* or *disappear*. Instead of being overwhelmed by the memory, they utilized their intrinsic referents to construct a story that are both characterized by thematical coherence and a rich density of subjective perspective terms. Thus, *individuation* seemed to act as a protective buffer, transforming the possible emotional chaos into a coherent narrative.

It is equally important to note where individuation did not play a significant role. Our models revealed that for university students individuation had no significant effect on coding of relationship or identity connection. This null finding provides a crucial theoretical distinction: the focus of *individuation* was on self-regulation, it did not contribute as an interpersonal bridge. In other words, an individuated daughter possesses the capacity to structurally organize their shame experiences (thematic

coherence) across both memory types, the utilization of meaning-making processes (subjective perspective terms) was significantly predicted by individuation only in their personal shame memories. In vicarious shame memories, individuation remained an insignificant predictor for subjective perspective terms associated with meaning-making, emphasizing social lessons, or identifying with others (relationships and identity connection). This suggested that while individuation empowers the self to withstand the disintegration of shame through structural organization, it does not necessarily dictate the subjective content of the narrative regarding social bonds when narrating vicarious shame memories. Ultimately, this may be because the primary focus of individuation is on self-regulation, not necessarily on social integration, especially in the context of an isolating emotion like shame.

#### 3.4.2.2. Maladaptive Schemas as Disruptors and Potential Facilitators of Narrative Structure

While *individuation* often played a role as a facilitator in narrative characteristics, the role of early maladaptive schemas, specifically the *impaired limits* schema domain, proved to be far more complex and context-dependent in university students. Unlike in the mothers' group, where schema domains did not emerge as significant individual predictors, the results for daughters presented a distinct pattern. Contrary to the expectation that maladaptive schemas solely function as cognitive disruptors, our results revealed a potentially dual nature of the *impaired limits* schema domain: it acted as a disruptor in personal narratives but functioned as a facilitator in vicarious ones.

Although scarce, previous literature reveals some unexpected effects of schemas on narrative characteristics: Çeviker (2022) found that mothers who have higher scores on schema domains, specifically *impaired limits* schema domain, used more positive emotion words during negatively charged memory conversations about COVID-19 with their 48-60 months old children. And the outcomes of children in positively charged memory conversations showed that when their mothers had higher scores in *impaired limits*, daughters used less unique emotion words (Çeviker, 2022).

In the current study, a noteworthy trend toward a crossover effect emerged in daughters' models. In personal shame memory models, as expected, the *impaired limits* schema domain was a negative significant predictor of thematic coherence (β = -.32). The higher *impaired limits* schema domain, which refers to the lack of internal discipline and deficient self-regulation mechanisms (Young et al., 2003), seemed to hinder the thematic coherence of the personal shame memories in university students, indicating that lower internal limits referred to predicting in a relatively fragmented narration. However, although marginal, this pattern had the potential to be reversed in the context of vicarious shame memories in daughters. The impaired limits schema domain was a marginally positive significant predictor of thematic coherence of the vicarious shame memories (β = .25, $p$ = .054), memories where their mother was the protagonist. Furthermore, although the overall model was not significant, statistically significant positive prediction role of *impaired limits* schema domain was observed in relationships/social interaction of shame memories that were vicarious shame memories by nature, where again their mother was the protagonist (see in Table 15).

This potential and unexpected facilitative role of *impaired limits* schema domain in especially vicarious narratives can be interpreted through the lens of relational enmeshment. Young et al. (2003) describe individuals with impaired limits schema domain as those who "have not developed adequate internal limits in regard to reciprocity" (Young et al., 2003, p. 18). In the mother-daughter dyad, high scores on this domain likely signal blurred boundaries. Consequently, the daughter may construct her mother's shame memory with high structural integrity and emphasized social interaction, derived not from healthy perspective-taking, but from an intense emotional intertwining.

Fivush (2007) posits that highly elaborated reminiscing both arises from and plays a role in the development of the attachment relationship between a mother and a child. She explained that highly elaborated reminiscing facilitates an interweaving of self and other through time, which ultimately fosters a sense of security and more intricate connections within the dyad. Paradoxically, in our study, the higher thematic coherence and social interaction was potentially observed in the vicarious shame memory of daughters with high impaired limits scores appears to mimic this

interweaving, yet likely stems from a fundamentally different mechanism: boundary diffusion. Unlike the healthy integration and secure connections described by Fivush (2007), the high coherence observed here may reflect the daughter's inability to emotionally differentiate from the mother's narrative, suggesting an enmeshed state rather than a secure attachment.

Methodologically, although the vicarious one is marginal, the directional shift in impaired limits schema domain may refer that this schema domain disrupts the *self* but supports the *performance* of the other. Individuals with high scores on impaired limits schema domain, often characterized by dramatic expression, might find it easier to deploy a global narration style (beginning-middle-end including resolution) and emphasize connections when the immediate threat to the self is removed (i.e., when narrating the other's memory). Thus, the schema domain that creates chaos in self-regulation paradoxically may facilitate a seemingly structured and connected narrative performance when fueled by enmeshment.

Conversely, for mothers, as noted previously in this section, schema domains were less influential in models. The schema domains (*unrelenting standards, impaired limits schema domain,* and *other-directedness*) accounted for a combined 16% of the variance in predicting thematic coherence in personal shame memory but no schema domain yielded any individual significance. Instead, for mothers, the process was driven by the shame tendency: in the final step, the inclusion of shame-related variables increased the explained variance to 27%, and only *shame-withdrawal* tendencies (e.g., hiding) was statistically significant ($\beta = -.29$, $p = .026$). This result suggested that while daughters' narratives are structurally shaped by the interplay between individuation and schema-driven boundary issues, mothers' narratives appear less influenced by these relational structures. Instead, they tended to be governed by emotional traits, specifically the *shame-withdrawal* tendencies that prioritize hiding over narrative elaboration.

### 3.4.2.3. The Incremental Validity of Shame Variables

A critical objective of this study was to determine whether shame-related variables contributed to narrative variance beyond personality structures. The results revealed a context-dependent pattern regarding the incremental validity of shame.

In personal memories for university students, the addition of shame variables did not explain significant additional variance over and above *individuation* and *impaired limits* schema domain. This suggests that for university students narrating their own memories, the structural capacity provided by individuation and the disruption related to schema domains are the primary architects of the narrative; the specific phenomenology of shame adds little unique explanatory power. However, in the vicarious context, the pattern shifts. The inclusion of shame-related variables, specifically *negative self-evaluations*, significantly improved the model fit when predicting thematic coherence of vicarious shame memories ($p_{\Delta F} = .005$ for Model 3). Specifically, the *negative self-evaluation* variable relates to judging one's entire self as bad (e.g., thinking "I am a terrible person") (Cohen et al., 2011). The higher tendency of *negative self-evaluation* yielded lower thematic coherence while the protagonist of the shame memory was their mother. This finding is particularly important because it reveals a dynamic tension within the narrative process. As discussed in the previous section, the *impaired limits* schema domain acts as a facilitator in vicarious memories. However, the inclusion of *shame-negative self-evaluation* into the model introduces a counterforce. Thus, even when the *impaired limits* schema domain facilitates a structured performance, the raw phenomenology of *shame-negative self-evaluation* creates sufficient *noise* to degrade that structure. This highlights the incremental validity of shame: it captures a specific emotional interference that the *impaired limits* schema domain cannot explain.

On the other hand, for mothers, the overall model for the thematic coherence of personal shame memory reached statistical significance ($p = .012$), and *shame withdrawal* emerged as the only significant independent predictor of the model ($\beta = -.29$, $p = .026$). The shame-withdrawal variable captures shame responses characterized by avoidant action tendencies, such as the urge to hide or disappear (Cohen et al.,

2011). This negative predictor role of shame-withdrawal in thematic coherence suggested that, as mothers had more tendency to hide in narrating their own personal shame memory, they had a tendency to narrate a less organized shame memory. Moreover, although the overall models did not reach significance level, in order to reveal possible tendencies shame-related variables' pattern are noteworthy. *Shame-withdrawal* showed a consistent tendency to negatively predict subjective perspective affective and total terms, while *negative self-evaluation* predicted an increase in subjective perspective cognitive terms, and relationship/social interaction coding schemes, suggesting that these two components of shame may have an impact on narrative processing through distinct pathways.

In line with this, a higher tendency to withdraw might lead to using fewer affective words. This would seem to mirror the act of *hiding* within the narrative itself. Conversely, the negative self-evaluation variable relates to judging one's entire self as bad (e.g., thinking "I am a terrible person") (Cohen et al., 2011). Higher levels of this evaluative tendency might lead to an increased use of cognitive terms, which could be seen as the linguistic manifestation of the self-reflective process itself. Additionally, individuals with a stronger inclination toward negative self-evaluation might tend to narrate shame memories that involve more social interactions or close relationships. Nevertheless, as the overall models did not reach statistical significance, these patterns should be viewed merely as potential emerging tendencies. Such interpretations must be approached with caution and would require further investigation to be fully substantiated.

To summarize, it is likely that the aversive nature of shame leads to disruption in mothers' narration style. While these results primarily indicate a potential tendency, they point toward a subtle relationship between avoidant action tendencies and shame narratives that warrants further research.

#### 3.4.2.4. Divergence in Narrative Levels: The *Zoomed-Out* Effect

Finally, a critical distinction must be made regarding the measurement levels of our outcome variables. Significant findings were predominantly observed in thematic

coherence, a *zoomed-out* coding system, requiring the narrator to step back and organize the experience into a macro-structure characterized by a clear beginning, middle, ending and resolution (Grysman & Mansfield, 2020). *Zoomed-in* approach on the other hand, relies on frequency counts (e.g., subjective perspective and identity connection). While a sharp dichotomy between *zoomed-out* and *zoomed-in* approaches may be oversimplified, thematic coherence emerged as the only measure to show consistency across both personal and vicarious shame memories. This finding invites a meaningful discussion regarding the role of measurement levels in narrative analysis.

Previous literature regarding measurement approach may offer valuable insights into these observations. Grysman and Mansfield (2020) summarized that the most significant advantage of the *zoomed-out* approach is that this approach treats the narrative as a single, coherent unit. Therefore, *zoomed-out* results reflect the human capacity to understand context, which automated in *zoomed-in* methods (like word counts) often miss. Theoretically, this suggests that thematic coherence should capture a stable narrative style. However, the lack of correlation between thematic coherence between personal and vicarious shame memories challenges the idea of a fixed individual style. Instead, it indicates that thematic coherence may be more context-dependent than previously assumed. While it provides a holistic view of the narrative, the way a person structures a story seems to be shaped more by the nature of the shame experience (personal vs. vicarious) than by a universal narrative style. This implies that even a *zoomed-out* measure is not immune to the profound emotional differences between narrating a personal shame memory and vicarious one.

In contrast, coding scheme of subjective perspective terms (measured via affective/cognitive word counts) and identity connections represent a *zoomed-in* approach. These metrics reflect the micro-level linguistic expression of the emotion, which may fluctuate idiosyncratically. The results of the current study offered that *zoomed-in* approaches yielded more losses of catching patterns in shame memory narratives (Grysman & Mansfield, 2020).

While *zoomed-out* approaches override *zoomed-in* ones in some extent, they are not a panacea. A nuanced pattern emerges when we consider the coding of social interaction

which is also a global *zoomed-out* coding system like thematic coherence. Social interaction coding focuses on the overall relational content of the vicarious memory rather than structural form. Generally, this variable was difficult to predict in the current study, because the isolating nature of shame may create possible *noise* that yield suppression in relational themes.

Consequently, thematic coherence, which is a *zoomed-out* approach served as the most robust indicator of how individuals process shame, preserving the structural integrity of the story even if the micro-level emotional content remains chaotic or if relational social interaction is suppressed by the nature of the emotion.

# CHAPTER 4

# STUDY 3: MEMORY CONVERSATION

## 4.1. Introduction

In the first two studies, participants were asked to narrate their shame memories to a researcher. The researcher listened attentively without interrupting, using only non-verbal cues to encourage them to continue. Although this approach serves as a good starting point for studying emotion-induced memories, the participants were somewhat removed from a natural setting, having to narrate their experiences to an unfamiliar researcher. However, given that the specific emotion under investigation was *shame*, a clear need emerged to move beyond this isolated narrative context. This is primarily because shame is a highly interpersonal emotion. Therefore, rather than having participants share their shame memories in isolation, this third and final study was designed to capture the dyadic interactions between mothers and daughters.

Parents play a key role in scaffolding their children's narratives by teaching them what information is important and how to structure their narratives (Fivush & Nelson, 2006; Peterson & Roberts, 2003; Şahin-Acar et al., 2019; Zaman & Fivush, 2013). This process is crucial for a child's developing autobiographical memory, sense of self, and social-emotional skills, as it helps them understand their experiences, and fosters connections between past, present, and future events (Fivush & Nelson, 2006; Paterson & Roberts, 2003). Such scaffolding is especially important in the context of negative events (Salmon & Reese, 2015). Within this dynamic, early mother-child interactions about emotions help adolescents form secure representations of their relationships, particularly with their mothers (Tamari et al., 2024). These findings show that the influence of maternal guidance on a child's autobiographical memory and self-representation appears to have long-lasting effects.

When reminiscing is viewed as a conversational process, it takes on a collaborative quality known as *co-construction* (Nelson, 2003; Wang & Fivush, 2005; Wang & Leichtman, 2000). This type of memory conversation serves both personal and social functions, it helps the younger counterpart to develop their self-identity while enabling mothers and daughters to build a shared history and strengthen their social bond (Nelson, 2003; Reese & Brown, 2000). Furthermore, during these interactions, parents often use their own personal memories to teach and guide their children (McLean, 2015; Pratt et al., 2008).

The profound impact of these conversations is particularly evident in female dyads; literature suggests that the bond between mothers and daughters is often stronger than the bond between fathers and sons, leading to a higher similarity in mother-daughter pairs (Chodorow, 1978).

In the current study, to empirically capture the complex dynamics of this mother-daughter co-construction in a naturalistic setting, we asked the mother-daughter dyads to have a memory conversation with each other in the absence of the researcher. In addition, the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) was used to measure both the actor and partner effects on each participants narrative characteristics.

Building on previous theories and research, it was hypothesized that higher levels of *individuation* would be associated with their own higher autobiographical memory characteristics (specifically, higher total emotion word, unique emotion word, and shame-related word) (actor effects) as well as for their partners (partner effects). Moreover, higher levels of early maladaptive schema domains (*impaired autonomy, disconnection,* and *other-directedness*) and external shame would be associated with their own lower autobiographical memory characteristics (specifically, lower total emotion word, unique emotion word, and shame-related word) (actor effects) as well as for their partners (partner effects). Turn-taking ratio would be exploratorily investigated.

## 4.2. Method

For the Study 3, the researcher conducted online interviews with 188 mother-daughter dyads. To maintain a naturalistic setting, the dyads were physically co-located while the researcher connected to the session virtually. Each interview consisted of two parts: the first part involved the autobiographical memory conversation of the participants, and the second part involved the collection of phenomenological characteristics of narrated memories.

Participants were instructed to select one personal shame memory to discuss with each other. Once they were ready, the researcher left the interview by muting her microphone and turning off her camera. The dyads then engaged in their memory conversations. Upon completing their conversation, they notified the researcher, who then rejoined the interview to continue with the second part.

This study aimed to examine the phenomenological characteristics of memory conversations of the dyads.

### 4.2.1. Participants

A total of 188 mother-daughter dyads participated in Study 3. Female university students (age range 18-26, $M$ = 21.50, $SD$ = 1.52), and their mothers (age range 37-62, $M$ = 49.41, $SD$ = 5.29) were recruited. A convenience sampling method was employed, involving students from Middle East Technical University (METU) Psychology Department enrolled in the "PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology" course in 2023-2024 Spring Semester. A total of 25 students took this course. Each *collaborating student* was required to refer at least four mother–daughter dyads to the researcher for participation in online semi-structured interviews to fulfill the class requirement. The referral procedure was based on the *first contact form*, which included both a demographic information form and the contact details of the university student. Additional referrals were encouraged.

The researcher directly contacted all prospective participants who filled out the first contact form, provided general information about the study, and informed them that

they would participate in an online interview with their mothers together at the same time, which would be audio recorded. Participants were asked to confirm their agreement with these conditions before scheduling the online interviews.

An a priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2009) to determine the minimum sample size required for the primary analyses. To approximate the statistical power for the Actor-Partner Interdependence Models (APIMs), the calculation was based on a multiple regression framework using the dyad as the unit of analysis. The model included 12 predictors to account for the simultaneous estimation of actor and partner effects across the five main independent variables, as well as the actor and partner covariates (total word usage). Assuming a moderate effect size ($f^2$ = .15), an alpha level of .05, and a desired power of .80, the analysis indicated a minimum required sample size of 127 dyads. Although available case analysis reduced the available data to approximately 130 complete dyads, the study remained adequately powered to detect the hypothesized dyadic effects and meet the requirements of the APIM framework.

The data collection process started in April 2024 and was completed in September 2024.

### 4.2.2. Measures

All measures and their sub-scales the reliability scores are summarized in Table 16.

**Table 16.** Reliability Scores for all the Measures in Study 3

| | University Students | Mothers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Balanced-Integration Differentiation Scale | | | |
| Interpersonal orientation | .73 | .74 | .75 |
| Intrapersonal orientation | .90 | .89 | .90 |
| Young Schema Domains | | | |
| D1: Impaired autonomy | .94 | .93 | .94 |
| D2: Disconnection | .93 | .90 | .92 |
| D3: Unrelenting standards | .77 | .67 | .76 |
| D4: Impaired limits | .73 | .68 | .71 |
| D5: Other directedness | .82 | .76 | .79 |

**Table 16** (continued)

| | University Students | Mothers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| OAS – External Shame | .91 | .91 | .91 |
| Guilt and Shame Scale - Total | .83 | .88 | .86 |
| Guilt sub-scale | .83 | .81 | .82 |
| Shame sub-scale | .76 | .85 | .80 |
| Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale | | | |
| Guilt–Negative Behavior Evaluations [NBE] | .66 | .65 | .65 |
| Guilt-Repair | .69 | .55 | .63 |
| Shame–Negative Self Evaluations [NSE] | .43 | .47 | .43 |
| Shame–Withdraw | .39 | .28 | .36 |

#### 4.2.2.1. Demographic Information Form

The researcher created a link on Qualtrics called *first contact form*. This form included the contact information of female university students who could be prospective participants in the study, and her demographic information form. Collaborating students distributed this link to the prospective participants, assigning a unique participant code to each of them. The contact information of the female university students included their telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses.

For the mothers, their demographic information form was included in the questionnaire package provided after the interviews. No contact information for the mothers was collected.

The demographic forms included the questions regarding participants' age, education level, occupation, city(ies) where they have spent most of their lives, romantic status, whom they live with, the number of siblings and birth order, who raised them during the first five years of their lives, their income, and their parents' education level.

#### 4.2.2.2. Balanced-Integration Differentiation Scale

The Balance Scale was developed by İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) to measure self-construals addressed in the Balance Integration-Differentiation (BID) Model.

The items in the scale are scored from 1 to 5 (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). The scale consists of two subscales: interpersonal orientation, which is measured with 16 items (high scores indicate high relatedness), and intrapersonal orientation, which is measured with 13 items (high scores indicate high individuation). There are two poles of each orientation valued as high or low. The high end of interpersonal orientation is called *related*, whereas the low end of this orientation is called *separated*. The high end of intrapersonal orientation is called *individuated*, whereas the low end is called *normative patterning*. By crossing these two poles of each orientation, four self-construals can be formed: related-individuated (balanced), related-normative patterning, separated-individuated, and separated-normative patterning (unbalanced). The current study used total scores separately for interpersonal (*relatedness*) and intrapersonal (*individuation*) orientation subscales. İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) reported the Cronbach's alpha coefficients between $\alpha = .80$ and .91 for the interpersonal orientation, and between $\alpha = .71$ and .82 for the intrapersonal orientation. In Study 3, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the interpersonal orientation subscale was found to be $\alpha = .75$; and $\alpha = .90$ for the intrapersonal orientation subscale.

See Table 16 for separate coefficient scores of daughters and mothers for all measures.

#### 4.2.2.3. Young Schema Questionnaire

Jeffrey Young developed the Young Schema Questionnaire – Short Form, Version 3 (YSQ-S3; Young & Brown, 2005) based on schema therapy (Young, 1990, 2003), which is an adaptation of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy with insights from Attachment Theory, experiential approaches, and concepts of emotional core needs. These 90 items in the questionnaire are clustered into 5 different schema domains, including 18 separate early maladaptive schemas (EMS). The items in the scale are scored from 1 to 6 (*1 = completely untrue of me, 6 = describes me perfectly*). Higher values indicate a stronger presence of the respective schema. These 18 EMS are grouped into five schema domains: (1) Disconnection and Rejection Schema Domain, (2) Impaired Autonomy and Performance Schema Domain, (3) Impaired Limits Schema Domain, (4) Other-Directedness Schema Domain, and (5) Over vigilance and

Inhibition Schema Domain. The Turkish adaptation of the form was conducted by Soygüt et al. (2009). Five schema domains, as in the original questionnaire, and 14 of the originally proposed 18 factors were determined in the Turkish adaptation (Soygüt et al., 2009). The schemes are namely as: (1) Emotional Deprivation, (2) Failure to Achieve, (3) Pessimism, (4) Social Isolation/Mistrust, (5) Emotional Inhibition, (6) Approval-Seeking, (7) Enmeshment/Dependence, (8) Entitlement/Insufficient Self-Control, (9) Self-Sacrifice, (10) Abandonment, (11) Punitiveness, (12) Defectiveness, (13) Vulnerability to Harm, (14) Unrelenting Standard. These 14 interpretable factors and 5 schema domains in the Turkish adaptation were in tune with the original version of the questionnaire (Soygüt et al., 2009). In the Turkish adaptation, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the factors were found between .53 - .81. The psychometric properties are reported as appropriate (Soygüt et al., 2009). In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the schema domains were found to be α = .71 -.94.

#### 4.2.2.4. The Other As Shamer-2 Questionnaire

The Other As Shamer-2 (OAS-2) is a self-report scale that focuses on beliefs about how other people evaluate oneself and measures trait shame (Matos et al., 2015). It was adapted into Turkish by Yıldırım et al. (2021) and is scored on a 5-point Likert scale (*0 = never, 4 = almost always*), with higher scores indicating higher levels of external shame. The seven items with a single-factor form of the original instrument were retained, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient α = .85 was found for the Turkish adaptation (Yıldırım et al., 2021). In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the OAS-2 was found to be α = .91.

#### 4.2.2.5. The Guilt and Shame Scale

The Guilt and Shame Scale (GSS) was developed by Şahin and Şahin (1992) to measure guilt and shame under various conditions. GSS includes a total of 24 items that are 12 shame-related and 12 guilt-related items with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *not at all* to *extremely*. Higher scores indicate higher levels of guilt and shame. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was α = .89 for the total scale, α = .81 for the guilt subscale, and α = .80 for the shame subscale. The current study used total scores

separately for guilt and shame subscales. In Study 3, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of guilt subscale was found to be α = .82, and it was found to be α = .80 for the shame subscale.

#### 4.2.2.6. Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale

Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale is a 16-item scale developed by Cohen et al. (2011) to measure the tendency to experience shame and guilt. The Turkish adaptation of the scale was conducted by Topçu (2019), and its psychometric properties were reported as appropriate. Consisting of four subscales (Guilt-Negative Behavior Evaluations [NBE], Guilt-Repair, Shame-Negative Self Evaluations [NSE], Shame–Withdraw), the measurement tool is 7-point Likert type (*1 = very unlikely, 7 = very likely*). Guilt-NBE items describe feelings of shame about one's actions (e.g., "you would feel that your actions were pathetic."). Guilt-repair items describe tendencies to correct or compensate for the transgression (e.g., "you would try to be more considerate towards your friends."). Shame-NSE items describe feelings of shame about oneself (e.g., "you would feel like a bad person"). Shame-withdraw items describe tendencies to hide or withdraw from public (e.g., "you would isolate yourself from guests until they have left"). High scores on the subscales indicate a high tendency. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the subscales were found to be inadequate, ranging from .36 to .65, and were therefore excluded from the present study.

#### 4.2.2.7. Interview

Online interviews with the dyads were conducted together in Study 3. All interviews consisted of two main parts: The first part involved autobiographical memory conversations of the participants, and the second part involved the collection of the characteristics of narrated memories.

All the online interviews were audio-recorded, and Microsoft Teams automatically generated a transcript for each interview. All students who were enrolled in the class and participated in the internship program were responsible for editing the transcripts of their assigned partners. For each participant whose transcript was edited by the

students, it was confirmed that the student did not know the participant personally. The instruction for memory conversation was as follows:

> Now, I would like each of you to think of a shame memory, a memory when you felt shame. It could have occurred at any time, in the presence of others, in a social setting, or perhaps when you were alone.
>
> Now, I would like each of you to think of one memory within this context where you felt shame and choose one. The memory could involve both of you together (as a mother and daughter), or it could be a moment you experienced when your mother/daughter was not present, it's up to you.
>
> Now, I would like each of you to take a moment to think and decide on one memory before you begin your narration. Once each of you has chosen your memory, I will leave you alone and kindly ask that you converse these memories with each other as naturally as possible.
>
> (The researcher waited until they indicated they were ready.)
>
> Please call me back when your conversation is complete.

After each dyad had selected their personal shame memories, the researcher left the interview by muting herself and turning off her camera to provide the dyad with space while they engaged in conversation. The researcher remained muted and with her camera off until the dyad notified her that they were done with their conversation. Once they announced they were finished their conversation, the researcher rejoined and thanked the dyad. She then informed them that they would proceed to second part for post-narrative questions.

#### 4.2.2.8. Post-Narrative Questions

After participants declared their conversation was over, post-narrative questions were asked to collect AM characteristics of memory conversations. The researcher shared the links with participants via the Microsoft Office chat box to collect their narrated memory characteristics. Participants were required to use two different devices to answer the questions through their respective links if they wished to respond simultaneously (one link was for the university student, and the other was for the mother). The researcher reminded the participants of their participant codes and asked each participant to enter their participant code at the beginning of the questionnaires.

Some mother participants required assistance in answering the questions via shared link. At that point, the researcher suggested that university students could read the questions aloud and record their mother's answers, either before or after completing their own responses. While participants answered questions via Qualtrics, the researcher remained available for any questions.

As in the Study 2, the following data were collected online from participants for their personal memory that they narrated in the conversation: the time of the event, the intensity of emotions experienced at the time of the event (shame, anxiety, anger, humiliation, disgrace, sadness, and guilt) and in the present (same emotions), the perceived percentage of responsibility for the incident, and the perceived percentage of intentionality in the incident. Additionally, participants reported how they coped with the incident and whether any witnesses noticed their feelings of shame. If so, they were asked to speculate on what the witnesses might have felt.

Participants also rated how frequently they thought about the incident in the following four weeks, whether they experienced flashbacks, and whether they shared the incident with anyone. If they did, they specified with whom, when, and how frequently they recounted the event. Furthermore, they rated how frequently they thought about the incident, as well as its importance, valence, accessibility, clarity, temporal distance, emotional intensity, and vividness.

For the memory chosen by their mother/daughter, participants were asked whether they had ever discussed the specific incident before with their mother/daughter. If so, they were also asked how many times they had talked about that specific incident of their mother/daughter.

Finally, participants rated how frequently they shared their shame memories with their mother/daughter and the perceived closeness of their relationship with their mother/daughter.

The questions can be found in Appendix C.

### 4.2.3. Codings

Memory conversations of mother-daughter dyads about their shame memories were coded for total words, total emotion words, unique emotion words, shame-related words, and turn-taking.

To assess inter-rater reliability, intraclass correlation (ICC) were employed. The summary of interrater reliability values between the main coder and the second coder can be seen in Table 17. The master coder's scores were used for all analyses.

**Table 17.** Interrater Reliability Scores for Coding Schemes of Study 3

| Coding Schemes | Interrater Reliability Type | Interrater Reliability Scores |
|---|---|---|
| Total words – University students | Intraclass Correlation | 1.00 |
| Total emotion words– University students | Intraclass Correlation | .95 |
| Unique emotion words– University students | Intraclass Correlation | .80 |
| Shame-related words– University students | Intraclass Correlation | .98 |
| Turn-taking– University students | Intraclass Correlation | 1.00 |
| Total words – Mothers | Intraclass Correlation | 1.00 |
| Total emotion words– Mothers | Intraclass Correlation | .96 |
| Unique emotion words– Mothers | Intraclass Correlation | .85 |
| Shame-related words– Mothers | Intraclass Correlation | .97 |
| Turn-taking– Mothers | Intraclass Correlation | .99 |

#### 4.2.3.1. Total words

In order to obtain the total word count, the memory conversation was divided into two parts: the daughter's contribution and the mother' contribution. All words used by each participant in their respective sections during the conversation were summed up. This calculation was performed using the Microsoft Word program.

#### 4.2.3.2. Total emotion words

In order to obtain the total number of emotion words, the previously separated conversation parts assigned to each participant were scanned for emotion words. All emotion words (e.g. shame, laugh, bad etc.) used by each participant during the conversation were totaled. This score included repetitions. For subsequent analyses, the main coder later categorized these emotion words into positive (e.g. laugh, good, beautiful) and negative (e.g. cry, bad, fear).

#### 4.2.3.3. Unique emotion words

In order to obtain the number of unique emotion words, the previously separated conversation parts assigned to each participant were scanned for the variety of emotion words used. Repetitions were not counted, only unique emotion words used by each participant were totaled.

#### 4.2.3.4. Shame-related words

In order to obtain shame-related words, the previously separated conversation parts assigned to each participant were specifically scanned for shame-related words. The shame-related word count comprised the total frequency of verbs, adjectives, or adverbs utilized to specifically name the emotion of *shame* including the repetitions. This score included repetitions.

#### 4.2.3.5. Turn-taking

The turn-taking score for each participant was determined by totaling their contributions during the memory conversation, capturing that natural phenomenon where one person stops talking and the partner begins.

### 4.2.4. Procedure

The current research received ethical approval from Middle East Technical University's Human Subjects Ethics Committee with the protocol numbers 0448 and 0474-ODTUİAEK-2023 (See Appendix A).

Female university students with their mothers were invited to an autobiographical memory study through collaborating students enrolled in the "PSY 3396 Workshop in Developmental Psychology" class and interns from the summer internship program referred female university students and their mothers to the study through an invitation to participate.

Female university students were provided with an application form including their demographic information and their contact information (first contact form). The researcher contacted the university student who filled out the first contact form and provided brief information about how the interview would be conducted. The researcher sent a Doodle form to schedule the interview. For this study, the researcher ensured that each mother-daughter dyad was co-located and would participate the online interview together; therefore, they were required to select a time when they would be available together to participate. The female university students were instructed to choose a suitable time for their availability. Once the university student completed the scheduling form, the interview link was automatically sent to both the university student participant (via the e-mail they provided in the scheduling system) and the researcher. The interview with female university students and their mothers were conducted together for this study. At the beginning of the interview session, prior to the main study procedure, informed consent was obtained from the mother.

Microsoft Teams was used for online interviews. All interviews consisted of two main parts: The first part involved autobiographical memory conversations of the participants, and the second part involved the collection of the characteristics of narrated memories. Post narrative questions were directed to the participant online via Qualtrics forms, which were prepared separately for mothers and daughters. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes to complete both parts.

All the memory conversation meetings were audio recorded, and Microsoft Teams generated a transcript for each meeting. All collaborating students who took the class and participated the summer internship program edited the transcripts of their partners. For each participant whose transcript was edited by the students, it was confirmed that the student did not know the participant personally. Subsequently, a final review of all

the transcripts was conducted by a team of three undergraduate scholarship holders, specifically appointed as part of a project funded for this thesis.

### 4.2.5. Analytic Strategy

SPSS version 31.0.0 was used for descriptive analyses, intercorrelations among the study variables, and regression analyses. For the main dyadic analyses, the *lavaan* package (Rosseel, 2012) in R software (R Core Team, 2016) was used test actor and partner effects within the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) framework.

The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) serves as a framework in dyadic research, allowing to analyze the reciprocal influences on one another in a relationship. Rather than treating partners as isolated units, APIM distinguishes between actor effects, which focus on how an individual's own attributes affect their own experience, and partner effects, which measure the impact a person has on their partner's outcomes (Kenny et al., 2006). By untangling these intertwined influences, the model offers a more sophisticated look at relational dynamics.

To test the dyadic associations in memory conversation between university students and their mothers in Study 3, path analyses were conducted within the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) framework using the *lavaan* package (Rosseel, 2012) in R software (R Core Team, 2016). The models in this study included both actor effects, which investigated the predictor role of participants' own levels of *individuation*, early maladaptive schema domains (*impaired autonomy*, *disconnection*, and *other-directedness*) and *external shame* on their own autobiographical memory characteristics (specifically, total emotion words, unique emotion words, and shame-related words), as well as partner effects, which explored the predictor role of each participant's *individuation*, early maladaptive schema domains (*impaired autonomy, disconnection,* and *other-directedness*), and *external shame* on their partner's autobiographical memory characteristics during their memory conversation.

To test the dyadic hypotheses, the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) was estimated using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Prior to the main analyses, preliminary data screening was planned to evaluate both APIM-specific and general

SEM assumptions. For the APIM framework, dyadic non-independence was evaluated to justify the dyadic approach, and partner distinguishability was established. Furthermore, the data were screened for standard SEM assumptions, including linearity, multivariate normality, and the presence of outliers. Notably, in this line of research, since the frequency of certain words or phrases is included in the calculation of dependent variables, extreme values represent natural variations in personal narratives rather than measurement errors. Consequently, these extreme values were retained in the dataset. To account for the retention of these natural variations and the inherent non-normality of narrative data, Robust Maximum Likelihood (MLR) estimation was employed for all path analyses to obtain robust standard errors. Missing data were handled by excluding cases on an analysis-by-analysis basis (available case analysis). Rather than removing dyads from the entire study, each model was estimated using the maximum available data for the variables included in that specific analysis. Finally, to control for the influence of narrative length, the total word count (volume) for each narration was included as a covariate in all models. Although the total word count exhibited substantially larger variance relative to other predictor variables, the MLR estimator is robust to such scaling discrepancies. To verify this, the models were re-estimated with standardized total word count, and results confirmed that no parameter estimates, significance levels, or model fit indices were altered; therefore, the raw total word count was retained as a covariate in all models.

### 4.3. Results

#### 4.3.1. Data screening

Of the initial sample of 188 mother-daughter dyads, four were exluded. Two recordings were unusable due to technical issues with the participants' internet connection, one dyad was excluded because a participant could not narrate any shame memory, and another dyad had a third party who intervened in the conversation. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 184 dyads.

Univariate normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis values, which fell well within the acceptable limits of ± 3 and ± 10, respectively (Kline, 2016). Initial screening identified a few potential univariate and multivariate outliers; however, as

also applied in Study 2, these extreme values were retained to preserve natural variations in the narrative data. Additionally, visual inspection of bivariate scatterplots confirmed that the relationships between continuous predictor and outcome variables were adequately linear, satisfying the SEM assumptions.

Specifically, Actor-Partner Interdependence Models (APIMs) were estimated for total emotion words, unique emotion words, and shame-related words, while separate multiple linear regression analyses were conducted for daughters and mothers for turn-taking frequency.

### 4.3.2. Preliminarily Findings

Before testing the main hypotheses, descriptive statistics and bivariate Pearson correlations were analyzed to evaluate assumptions. The fundamental assumption for analyzing data from dyads is non-independence. Bivariate correlations revealed significant non-independence between mothers and daughters for total emotion words ($r = .56$, $p < .001$), shame-related words ($r = .67$, $p < .001$), and unique emotion words ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), justifying the use of the APIM framework for these outcomes. Furthermore, as expected from the reciprocal nature of conversational dynamics, dyadic turn-taking exhibited an exceptionally high correlation ($r = .97$, $p < .001$). Because this reflects a structural interdependence where one member's turns mathematically constrain the other's, turn-taking frequency was analyzed using separate regression analyses rather than the APIM framework.

To ensure the statistical stability of the models, the risk of multicollinearity among the predictor variables (individuation, schema domains and external shame) was assessed. Pearson correlation coefficients revealed that while most relationships were weak to moderate, strong correlations were observed between certain schema domains. Specifically, for daughters, the highest correlation was found between disconnection and impaired autonomy schema domains ($r = .72$, $p < .001$). For mothers, the relationship between these same domains was even more pronounced ($r = .81$, $p < .001$). Despite these high intercorrelations, multicollinearity was not deemed a threat to the validity of the models. The Variance Inflation Factors were strictly examined, and all values were found to be below 3.0, which is well within the conservative

threshold of 5.0. These results confirm that each predictor contributes unique information to the model without problematic redundancy, justifying the inclusion of all variables in the primary dyadic analyses. Furthermore, visual inspections of the residual scatterplots and Normal P-P plots for the turn-taking regression models indicated that the assumptions of homoscedasticity and normality of residuals were met for both mothers and daughters.

Finally, within-person correlations among the outcome variables were examined to inform the analytical approach for each outcome variable. Strong intercorrelations were found among the narrative outcomes; for instance, daughters' total emotion words were highly correlated with their shame-related words ($r = .86$, $p < .001$), and mothers' total emotion words were highly correlated with their unique emotion words ($r = .87$, $p < .001$). These strong associations supported the planned approach of estimating separate APIMs for each narrative dimension to prevent model instability and convergence issues. Additionally, the total word count of the narratives was highly correlated with the primary narrative outcomes (e.g., $r = .85$, $p < .001$ for daughters', and $r = .82$, $p < .001$ for mothers' total word count and total emotion words). This confirmed the necessity of including total word count as a covariate in the models.

#### 4.3.2.1. Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Characteristics

As part of the preliminary analysis, descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations were examined. Descriptive statistics for the study variables were summarized in Table 18 and bivariate correlations for university students and mothers can be found in Table 19 and 20.

**Table18.** Descriptive Statistics for Post-Narrative Questions of Participants in Study 3

| University Students | | | | Mothers | | | | Comparison by Participant Type | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | *t* | *p* |
| Age | 21.50 | 1.52 | 18 - 26 | Age | 49.41 | 5.29 | 37 - 62 | -68.29*** | <.001 |
| | *f* | *%* | | | *f* | *%* | | | |
| Time since occurrence | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than a month | 9 | 4.8 | | | 3 | 1.6 | | | |
| About 1-11 months | 16 | 8.5 | | | 6 | 3.2 | | | |
| 1 to 5 years | 32 | 17.0 | | | 18 | 9.6 | | | |
| More than 5 years | 53 | 28.2 | | | 21 | 11.2 | | | |
| Missing | 78 | 41.5 | | | 140 | 74.5 | | | |
| Personal Shame Memories | | | | | | | | | |
| Past Shame | 4.26 | 0.84 | 1-5 | Past Shame | 4.33 | 0.93 | 1-5 | -0.71 | .479 |
| Past Anxiety | 3.54 | 1.27 | 1-5 | Past Anxiety | 3.61 | 1.31 | 1-5 | -0.49 | .627 |
| Past Anger | 2.89 | 1.48 | 1-5 | Past Anger | 3.38 | 1.53 | 1-5 | -2.78** | .006 |
| Past Humiliation | 3.08 | 1.48 | 1-5 | Past Humiliation | 2.99 | 1.58 | 1-5 | 0.55 | .584 |
| Felt disgraced | 4.07 | 1.21 | 1-5 | Felt disgraced | 3.73 | 1.37 | 1-5 | 2.39 | .018* |
| Past Sad | 3.40 | 1.36 | 1-5 | Past Sad | 4.03 | 1.35 | 1-5 | -4.28*** | <.001 |
| Past Guilt | 3.31 | 1.46 | 1-5 | Past Guilt | 3.36 | 1.56 | 1-5 | -0.33 | .741 |
| Responsibility % | 63.59 | 33.93 | 0-100 | Responsibility % | 59.02 | 33.87 | 0-100 | 1.28 | .200 |
| Purpose % | 24.90 | 32.44 | 0-100 | Purpose % | 20.88 | 31.77 | 0-100 | 1.05 | .293 |
| Current Shame | 2.64 | 1.23 | 1-5 | Current Shame | 2.78 | 1.38 | 1-5 | -0.99 | .326 |
| Current Anxiety | 1.94 | 1.17 | 1-5 | Current Anxiety | 2.23 | 1.36 | 1-5 | -1.82 | .070 |
| Current Anger | 2.35 | 1.45 | 1-5 | Current Anger | 2.48 | 1.53 | 1-5 | -0.67 | .505 |
| Current Humiliation | 1.97 | 1.22 | 1-5 | Current Humiliation | 1.87 | 1.27 | 1-5 | .574 | .567 |
| Current felt disgraced | 2.56 | 1.30 | 1-5 | Current felt disgraced | 2.36 | 1.53 | 1-5 | 1.13 | .261 |
| Current Sad | 2.36 | 1.41 | 1-5 | Current Sad | 2.90 | 1.63 | 1-5 | -2.95** | .004 |

**Table 18** (continued)

| | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | | *M* | *SD* | Min-Max | *t* | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current Guilt | 1.88 | 1.18 | 1-5 | Current Guilt | 2.54 | 1.61 | 1-5 | -3.61*** | <.001 |
| Importance | 3.35 | 1.59 | 1-7 | Importance | 3.98 | 2.03 | 1-7 | -3.33*** | <.001 |
| Valence | 3.10 | 1.40 | 1-7 | Valence | 3.51 | 1.93 | 1-7 | -2.31* | .022 |
| Ease | 6.03 | 1.54 | 1-7 | Ease | 5.76 | 1.99 | 1-7 | 1.45 | .149 |
| Clear | 5.67 | 1.37 | 2-7 | Clear | 6.35 | 1.24 | 3-7 | -5.03*** | <.001 |
| Temporal Closeness | 3.49 | 1.99 | 1-7 | Temporal Closeness | 2.23 | 1.95 | 1-7 | 6.13*** | <.001 |
| Intensity | 3.84 | 1.58 | 1-7 | Intensity | 4.10 | 2.01 | 1-7 | -1.40 | .162 |
| Vividness | 4.80 | 1.61 | 1-7 | Vividness | 5.29 | 1.80 | 1-7 | -2.75** | .006 |
| Remember frequency of the personal memory | 3.58 | 1.47 | 1-6 | Remember frequency of the personal memory | 3.40 | 1.50 | 1-7 | 1.05 | .295 |
| Recount frequency of the personal memory | 2.90 | 1.31 | 1-6 | Recount frequency of the personal memory | 3.07 | 1.48 | 1-7 | -0.94 | .351 |
| How frequently telling shame memories to mothers | 4.46 | 1.87 | 1-7 | How frequently telling shame memories to daughters | 4.25 | 1.80 | 1-7 | 1.10 | .273 |
| Closeness with mother | 5.93 | 1.25 | 1-7 | Closeness with the daughter | 6.43 | 1.05 | 1-7 | -4.14*** | <.001 |

*Note.* For variables violating the homogeneity of variance assumption, results for *Equal variances not assumed* are reported.*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .00$

**Table 19.** Bivariate Correlations for University Students

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Age | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Relatedness | -.002 (.977) | — | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Individuation | .091 (.246) | .019 (.807) | — | | | | | | | |
| 4.External shame | -.103 (.188) | -.561*** (<.001) | -.099 (.207) | — | | | | | | |
| 5.Guilt | -.007 (.930) | .263*** (<.001) | .129 (.104) | -.089 (.261) | — | | | | | |
| 6. Shame | -.147 (.062) | -.047 (.554) | -.151 (.056) | .178* (.023) | .343*** (<.001) | — | | | | |
| 7.Impaired Autonomy D1 | -.082 (.296) | -.594*** (<.001) | -.245** (.002) | .660*** (<.001) | -.124 (.116) | .202* .010 | — | | | |
| 8.Disconnection D2 | -.064 (.414) | -.792*** (<.001) | -.150 (.057) | .675*** (<.001) | -.179* (.023) | .107 (.176) | .716*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 9.Unrelenting St. D3 | -.188* (.016) | -.208** (.008) | -.107 (.173) | .211** (.007) | -.035 (.660) | .131 (.097) | .467*** (<.001) | .270*** (<.001) | — | |
| 10.Impaired Limits D4 | -.092 (.244) | -.168* (.032) | .248*** (<.001) | .081 (.306) | -.125 (.113) | -.028 (.724) | .270*** (<.001) | .205 (.009) | .301*** (<.001) | — |
| 11.Other Dir. D5 | -.023 (.767) | -.305*** (<.001) | -.061 (.443) | .280*** (<.001) | .247*** (<.001) | .135 (.086) | .545*** (<.001) | .438*** (<.001) | .386*** (<.001) | .142 (.071) |
| 12.Total words | .150* (.043) | -.153 (.053) | .055 (.491) | .071 (.370) | -.115 (.151) | -.133 (.096) | .107 (.181) | .040 (.615) | -.101 (.206) | -.014 .861 |
| 13.Total emotion words | .080 (.280) | -.119 (.133) | .089 (.262) | .069 (.386) | -.073 (.364) | -.054 (.498) | .091 (.256) | .024 (.768) | -.137 (.085) | .047 (.556) |
| 14.Unique emotion words | .090 (.226) | -.129 (.104) | .028 (.723) | .139 (.080) | -.116 (.148) | .028 (.730) | .177* (.025) | .092 (.249) | .121 (.328) | -.026 (.741) |

**Table 19** (continued)

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15.Shame-related words | .061 (.415) | -.085 (.283) | .112 (.159) | .027 (.737) | .011 (.887) | -.109 (.172) | .035 (.660) | -.004 (.962) | .121 (.328) | .119 (.136) |
| 16.Turn-taking | .019 (.803) | -.194* (.014) | .038 (.633) | .089 (.263) | -.103 (.200) | -.179* (.024) | .101 (.207) | .106 (.184) | -.087 (.273) | .054 (.496) |

| Variable Names | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.Other Dir. D5 | — | | | | | |
| 12.Total words | -.035 (.663) | — | | | | |
| 13.Total emotion words | -.038 (.632) | .849*** (<.001) | — | | | |
| 14.Unique emotion words | .034 (.673) | .745*** (<.001) | .846*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 15.Shame-related words | -.031 (.700) | .680*** (<.001) | .856*** (<.001) | .552*** (<.001) | — | |
| 16.Turn-taking | -.052 (.513) | .780*** (<.001) | .681*** (<.001) | .513*** (<.001) | .660*** (<.001) | — |

*Note. N* ranges from 162 to 184. Values in parentheses are *p*-values. Variables are 1.Age = Current age of the participant, 2.Relatedness = Interpersonal orientation, 3.Individuation = Interpersonal orientation, 4.External shame, 5.Guilt, 6.Shame, 7.Impaired Autonomy D1 = Impaired Autonomy Domain 1, 8.Disconnection D2 = Disconnection Domain 2, 9.Unrelenting St. D3 = Unrelenting Standarts Domain 3, 10.Impaired Limits D4 = Impaired Limits Domain 4, 11.Other Dir. D5 = Other Directedness Domain 5, 12.Total words, 13. Total emotion words, 14.Unique emotion words, 15.Shame-related words, 16.Turn-taking. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

**Table 20.** Bivariate Correlations for Mothers

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Age | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Relatedness | .008 (.926) | — | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Individuation | .111 (.188) | .199 (.018) | — | | | | | | | |
| 4.External shame | .061 (.472) | -.617*** (<.001) | -.237** (.005) | — | | | | | | |
| 5.Guilt | .167* (.046) | .152 (.072) | .329 (<.001) | -.047 (.583) | — | | | | | |
| 6. Shame | -.008 (.926) | -.097 (.251) | -.080 (.344) | .198* (.019) | .527*** (<.001) | — | | | | |
| 7.Impaired Autonomy D1 | .111 (.187) | -.506*** (<.001) | -.275** (.001) | .596*** (<.001) | -.013 (.878) | .232** .006 | — | | | |
| 8.Disconnection D2 | .158 (.060) | -.600*** (<.001) | -.185* (.029) | .622*** (<.001) | -.043* (.614) | .158 (.061) | .795*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 9.Unrelenting St. D3 | .094 (.266) | -.107 (.209) | -.040 (.636) | .186* (.028) | .115 (.173) | .325*** (<.001) | .420*** (<.001) | .328*** (<.001) | — | |
| 10.Impaired Limits D4 | -.033 (.698) | .140 (.638) | .280*** (<.001) | -.119 (.160) | .164 (.053) | -.027 (.746) | .095 (.263) | .115 (.172) | .312*** (<.001) | — |
| 11.Other Dir. D5 | .196* (.019) | -.052 (.544) | .005 (.952) | .282*** (<.001) | .284*** (<.001) | .278*** (<.001) | .502*** (<.001) | .388*** (<.001) | .560*** (<.001) | .279*** (<.001) |
| 12.Total words | -.008 (.916) | -.060 (.484) | .128 (.133) | .001 (.988) | .084 (.328) | .088 (.304) | -.077 (.369) | .036 (.674) | -.065 (.446) | .013 .877 |
| 13.Total emotion words | -.057 (.448) | -.006 (.943) | .076 (.372) | -.035 (.679) | .046 (.590) | .079 (.358) | -.130 (.128) | -.041 (.635) | -.008 (.923) | .025 (.773) |
| 14.Unique emotion words | -.040 (.595) | .039 (.650) | .049 (.569) | -.050 (.557) | .117 (.169) | .116 (.173) | -.136 (.112) | -.066 (.437) | .018 (.833) | -.026 (.741) |

**Table 20** (continued)

| Variable Names | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15.Shame-related words | -.078 (.303) | -.017 (.845) | .099 (.247) | -.021 (.803) | -.030 (.725) | -.022 (.802) | -.093 (.274) | .059 (.492) | .025 (.775) | .094 (.271) |
| 16.Turn-taking | .039 (.604) | -.057 (.506) | .055 (.521) | -.042 (.619) | .080 (.352) | .018 (.835) | -.067 (.434) | .042 (.624) | -.065 (.448) | .126 (.141) |

| Variable Names | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.Other Dir. D5 | — | | | | | |
| 12.Total words | -.079 (.355) | — | | | | |
| 13.Total emotion words | -.072 (.403) | .820*** (<.001) | — | | | |
| 14.Unique emotion words | -.010 (.906) | .739*** (<.001) | .871*** (<.001) | — | | |
| 15.Shame-related words | -.101 (.235) | .598*** (<.001) | .755*** (<.001) | .454*** (<.001) | — | |
| 16.Turn-taking | .002 (.982) | .675*** (<.001) | .728*** (<.001) | .552*** (<.001) | .638*** (<.001) | — |

*Note. N* ranges from 142 to 184. Values in parentheses are *p*-values. Variables are 1.Age = Current age of the participant, 2.Relatedness = Interpersonal orientation, 3.Individuation = Interpersonal orientation, 4.External shame, 5.Guilt, 6.Shame, 7.Impaired Autonomy D1 = Impaired Autonomy Domain 1, 8.Disconnection D2 = Disconnection Domain 2, 9.Unrelenting St. D3 = Unrelenting Standarts Domain 3, 10.Impaired Limits D4 = Impaired Limits Domain 4, 11.Other Dir. D5 = Other Directedness Domain 5, 12.Total words, 13. Total emotion words, 14.Unique emotion words, 15.Shame-related words, 16.Turn-taking. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

### 4.3.3. Main Findings: Actor-Partner Interdependence Models and Regression Analyses Predicting Narrative Outcomes

To investigate the actor and/or partner effects on narrative characteristics, a series of analyses were conducted for each of the outcome variables. Actor-Partner Interdependence Models (APIMs) were estimated for total emotion words (positive and negative emotion words), unique emotion words, and shame-related words, as these outcomes are conceptually independent within dyads and amenable to examine within the APIM framework. Turn-taking variable, however, is structurally interdependent within dyads, as the number of turns taken by one member mathematically constrains the other, rendering the APIM framework inappropriate for this outcome. Therefore, multiple regression analyses were conducted for daughters and their mothers to examine actor effects on turn-taking frequency.

As hypothesized, daughters' and their mothers' individuation level, early maladaptive schema domains (specifically *impaired autonomy, disconnection* and *other-directedness* schema domains), and external shame were entered to the models. In APIMs, both the actor effects (i.e., the influence of an individual's own psychological characteristics on their narrative outcome) and the partner effects (i.e., the influence of the dyad member's characteristics on that individual's outcome) were systematically evaluated. Dyads were treated as distinguishable based on the inherently asymmetric roles of mothers and daughters. All APIMs were estimated using Maximum Likelihood Robust (MLR) estimation to account for non-normality. Finally, to control for individual differences in overall narrative length, the total word count of each participant's narrative was included as a covariate in all APIMs.

To empirically verify whether mothers and daughters should be treated as interchangeable or distinct members, an Omnibus Test of Distinguishability was conducted. We compared a saturated model (with all parameters freely estimated) with a constrained model (I-SAT) where means, variances, and covariances were forced to be equal across dyad members. The results showed that the constrained model significantly worsened the model fit, $\chi^2$ *(6)* = 37.87, $p < .001$, Robust CFI = .262, confirming that mothers and daughters cannot be treated as interchangeable dyad

members. Consequently, mothers and daughters were treated as *distinguishable members* in all subsequent analyses.

The specific dyadic findings for each of the narrative characteristics are detailed in the subsequent sections, beginning with the models predicting total emotion words.

#### 4.3.3.1. Model 1: Dyadic Predictors of Total Emotion Words

The residuals of daughters' and mothers' emotion words were significantly correlated ($r$ = .294, $p$ = .001), confirming the non-independence of the dyadic data and supporting the necessity of a dyadic analytic approach. Furthermore, a strong and significant correlation was observed between daughters' and mothers' total word counts ($r$ = .572, $p$ = .001), justifying the inclusion of this covariance to account for shared conversational volume.

The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) examining total emotion words yielded a significant scaled Chi-square, $\chi^2(22) = 43.597$, $p$ = .004. Although the Chi-square test was significant, the alternative fit indices indicated a strong overall fit (Robust CFI = .959, Robust TLI = .913, RMSEA = .072, and SRMR = .058), suggesting that the model effectively captured the primary dyadic dynamics. Overall, the model explained a substantial proportion of the variance in emotion word usage for both daughters ($R^2$ = .70) and their mothers ($R^2$ = .70).

A closer look at the results revealed no statistically significant predictors for total emotion word usage. Comprehensive results are presented in Table 21.

Given the absence of statistically significant predictors for the total emotion words, exploratory supplemental analyses were conducted for positive and negative emotion words to examine potential valence-specific effects. This approach aimed to tentatively explore whether the model's dynamics differed across distinct emotional valences.

**Table 21.** Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Total Emotion

| Total Emotion Words | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI *LL, UL* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daughter Outcome | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 1.67 | .094 | [-0.02, 0.29] |
| Impaired Autonomy | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 1.06 | .289 | [-0.02, 0.06] |
| Disconnection | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.02 | -0.26 | .793 | [-0.06, 0.04] |
| Other-Directedness | -0.02 | 0.04 | -0.03 | -0.58 | .561 | [-0.10, 0.06] |
| External Shame | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.33 | .740 | [-0.11, 0.16] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (M) | -0.04 | 0.06 | -0.04 | -0.78 | .435 | [-0.15, 0.07] |
| Impaired Autonomy (M) | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.81 | .416 | [-0.04, 0.09] |
| Disconnection (M) | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.02 | -0.27 | .787 | [-0.08, 0.06] |
| Other-Directedness (M) | -0.03 | 0.05 | -0.04 | -0.65 | .514 | [-0.12, 0.06] |
| External Shame (M) | -0.13 | 0.08 | -0.1 | -1.62 | .106 | [-0.29, 0.03] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 10.36 | < .001*** | [0.03, 0.04] |
| Mother's Model | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | -0.07 | 0.06 | -0.05 | -1.19 | .236 | [-0.19, 0.05] |
| Impaired Autonomy | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.05 | -0.57 | .570 | [-0.08, 0.05] |
| Disconnection | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.06 | -0.80 | .425 | [-0.12, 0.05] |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Other-Directedness | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.81 | .416 | [-0.06, 0.16] |
| External Shame | -0.01 | 0.09 | -0.01 | -0.15 | .879 | [-0.18, 0.16] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (D) | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.86 | .391 | [-0.08, 0.21] |
| Impaired Autonomy (D) | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.49 | .625 | [-0.03, 0.05] |
| Disconnection (D) | -0.03 | 0.03 | -0.07 | -0.92 | .358 | [-0.08, 0.03] |
| Other-Directedness (D) | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.83 | .409 | [-0.06, 0.15] |
| External Shame (D) | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.61 | .540 | [-0.12, 0.24] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.83 | 7.06 | < .001*** | [0.02, 0.04] |

*Note.* $N$ = 139 dyads. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. (M) = Mother as partner; (D) = Daughter as partner. Standardized coefficients (β) are reported from the std.all column. $R^2$ = .69 (Daughter), .70 (Mother). Model fit indices: $\chi^2(22) = 43.60$, p = .004; Robust CFI = .959; Robust TLI = .913; Robust RMSEA = .072; and SRMR = .058. ∗∗∗$p < .001$.

#### 4.3.3.1.1. Supplemental Analysis (Model 1.1): Positive and Negative Emotion

To exploratorily evaluate whether the observed dyadic effects were specific to emotional valence, a robustness check was conducted by estimating a separate APIM for positive and negative emotion words. The model for positive emotion word exhibited a marginal but acceptable fit: $\chi^2(22) = 46.893$, $p = .002$, Robust CFI = .905, Robust TLI = .800, Robust RMSEA = .081, and SRMR = .054. The model for negative emotion word exhibited a good overall fit: $\chi^2(22) = 38.314$, $p = .017$, Robust CFI = .962, Robust TLI = .920, Robust RMSEA = .064, and SRMR = .057.

Results for the positive emotion word usage showed that regarding actor effects, neither daughters' nor mothers' individual variables (*individuation, schema domains,* or *external shame*) significantly predicted their own usage of positive emotion words (all *p*s > .05). However, the same model revealed a significant negative partner effect of mothers' individuation level on daughters' positive emotion word usage ($\beta = -.14$, $p = .028$). This indicated that as mothers' levels of individuation increased, their daughters' frequency of expressing positive emotions during the memory conversation decreased. For mothers, however, no actor effect was observed predicting their positive emotional expression (all *p*s > .05). Lastly, as expected, total word count served as a significant covariate for both daughters ($\beta = .73$, $p < .001$) and mothers ($\beta = .53$, $p < .001$), accounting for conversational volume in positive word model.

The results of the negative emotion word usage, on the other hand, revealed a significant positive actor effect for daughters: daughters' higher levels of individuation significantly predicted their own increased usage of negative emotion words during the conversation ($\beta = .14$, $p = .045$). For mothers, however, neither individuation nor any schema domains significantly predicted negative emotional expression (all *p*s > .05). Regarding partner effects, no significant cross-dyadic relationships were observed; mothers' variables did not predict daughters' negative emotion words, and vice versa (all *p*s > .05). As expected, total word count remained a significant covariate for both daughters ($\beta = .77$, $p < .001$) and mothers ($\beta = .80$, $p < .001$).

Full parameters for this supplemental model are provided in Table 22.

**Table 22.** Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Positive and Negative Emotion Words

| Positive Emotion Words | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daughter Outcomes | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.00 | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.11 | .911 | [-0.06, 0.05] |
| Impaired Autonomy | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.88 | .377 | [-0.01, 0.02] |
| Disconnection | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.03 | -0.35 | .729 | [-0.02, 0.01] |
| Other-Directedness | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.02 | -0.32 | .750 | [-0.03, 0.02] |
| External Shame | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.93 | .351 | [-0.02, 0.07] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (M) | -0.04 | 0.02 | -0.14 | -2.19 | .028* | [-0.08, 0.00] |
| Impaired Autonomy (M) | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.93 | .355 | [-0.01, 0.03] |
| Disconnection (M) | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.03 | -0.31 | .757 | [-0.03, 0.02] |
| Other-Directedness (M) | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.09 | .931 | [-0.02, 0.03] |
| External Shame (M) | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.12 | -1.68 | .093 | [-0.09, 0.01] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.173 | 7.69 | < .001*** | [0.01, 0.01] |
| Mother Outcomes | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | -0.03 | 0.03 | -0.08 | -1.16 | .245 | [-0.08, 0.02] |
| Impaired Autonomy | -0.02 | 0.01 | -0.15 | -1.52 | .129 | [-0.03, 0.00] |
| Disconnection | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.79 | .428 | [-0.01, 0.03] |
| Other-Directedness | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.23 | .821 | [-0.04, 0.05] |
| External Shame | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.07 | -0.71 | .480 | [-0.11, 0.05] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (D) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.73 | .467 | [-0.04, 0.08] |
| Impaired Autonomy (D) | -0.01 | 0.01 | -0.07 | -0.88 | .382 | [-0.02, 0.01] |
| Disconnection (D) | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.46 | .645 | [-0.02, 0.02] |
| Other-Directedness (D) | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.16 | .870 | [-0.05, 0.05] |
| External Shame (D) | -0.01 | 0.05 | -0.04 | -0.29 | .775 | [-0.10, 0.08] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 5.10 | < .001*** | [.00, .01] |

**Table 22** (continued)

| Negative Emotion Words | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daughter Outcomes | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 2.00 | .045* | [0.00, 0.28] |
| Impaired Autonomy | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.91 | .364 | [-0.02, 0.05] |
| Disconnection | -0.00 | 0.02 | -0.00 | -0.03 | .975 | [-0.04, 0.04] |
| Other-Directedness | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.05 | -0.61 | .539 | [-0.11, 0.06] |
| External Shame | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | .999 | [-0.12, 0.12] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (M) | -0.01 | 0.05 | -0.01 | -0.21 | .835 | [-0.10, 0.08] |
| Impaired Autonomy (M) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.58 | .565 | [-0.04, 0.08] |
| Disconnection (M) | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.14 | .892 | [-0.07, 0.06] |
| Other-Directedness (M) | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.05 | -0.76 | .447 | [-0.11, 0.05] |
| External Shame (M) | -0.09 | 0.08 | -0.09 | -1.26 | .207 | [-0.24, 0.05] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 9.16 | < .001*** | [0.02, 0.03] |
| Mother Outcomes | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | -0.03 | 0.06 | -0.03 | -0.49 | .625 | [-0.14, 0.08] |
| Impaired Autonomy | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.06 | -0.65 | .514 | [-0.07, 0.04] |
| Disconnection | -0.04 | 0.04 | -0.09 | -1.10 | .271 | [-0.11, 0.03] |
| Other-Directedness | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 1.80 | .072 | [-0.01, 0.15] |
| External Shame | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.42 | .676 | [-0.11, 0.17] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (D) | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.68 | .500 | [-0.09, 0.19] |
| Impaired Autonomy (D) | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.84 | .400 | [-0.02, 0.06] |
| Disconnection (D) | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.08 | -1.15 | .248 | [-0.07, 0.02] |
| Other-Directedness (D) | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 1.22 | .223 | [-0.03, 0.14] |
| External Shame (D) | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.91 | .365 | [-0.08, 0.22] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 6.39 | < .001*** | [0.02, 0.03] |

*Note.* $N$ = 139 dyads. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. (M) = Mother as partner; (D) = Daughter as partner. Standardized coefficients (β) are reported from the std.all column.

$R^2$ = .69 (Daughter), .70 (Mother). Model fit indices for positive emotion word: $\chi^2(22) = 43.60$, $p$ = .004; Robust CFI = .959; Robust TLI = .913; Robust RMSEA = .072; and SRMR = .058. Model fit indices for negative emotion word: $\chi^2(22) = 38.31$, p = .017; Robust CFI = .962; Robust TLI = .920; Robust RMSEA = .073; and SRMR = .057. $*p < .05$, $***p < .001$.

#### 4.3.3.2. Model 2: Dyadic Predictors of Unique Emotion Words

The second APIM focused on the unique emotion word usage as the dependent variable. The model demonstrated an adequate and reliable fit to the data: $\chi^2(22)$ = 44.98, $p$ = .003, Robust CFI = 941, Robust TLI = .878, Robust RMSEA = .075, and SRMR = 0.058. Although the TLI value fell slightly below traditional threshold of .90, the remaning fit indices suggest a reliable representation of the dyadic dynamics in unique emotion word usage between mothers and daughters.

A closer look at the results revealed no statistically significant predictors for unique emotion word usage.

Full parameter estimates are detailed in Table 23.

**Table 23.** Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Unique Emotion Words

| Unique Emotion Words | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daughter Outcome | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.87 | .383 | [-0.04, 0.09] |
| Impaired Autonomy | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 1.89 | .058 | [-0.00, 0.04] |
| Disconnection | -0.00 | 0.02 | -0.03 | -0.28 | .778 | [-0.03, 0.03] |
| Other-Directedness | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.08 | -1.29 | .196 | [-0.07, 0.01] |
| External Shame | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.12 | .908 | [-0.07, 0.08] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (M) | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.08 | -1.41 | .158 | [-0.09, 0.02] |
| Impaired Autonomy (M) | -0.01 | 0.02 | -0.09 | -0.76 | .445 | [-0.05, 0.02] |
| Disconnection (M) | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.82 | .411 | [-0.02, 0.05] |
| Other-Directedness (M) | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 1.74 | .082 | [-0.01, 0.09] |
| External Shame (M) | -0.06 | 0.05 | -0.1 | -1.35 | .178 | [-0.16, 0.03] |

**Table 23** (continued)

| Control Variable | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total word count | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 6.24 | < .001*** | [0.01, 0.02] |
| Mother Outcome | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | -0.06 | 0.03 | -0.10 | -1.82 | .069 | [-0.12, 0.00] |
| Impaired Autonomy | -0.01 | 0.02 | -0.06 | -0.63 | .527 | [-0.04, 0.02] |
| Disconnection | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.08 | -0.92 | .358 | [-0.06, 0.02] |
| Other-Directedness | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 1.93 | .054 | [-0.00, 0.10] |
| External Shame | -0.00 | 0.05 | -0.00 | -0.01 | .990 | [-0.11, 0.10] |
| Partner Effects | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Individuation (D) | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.74 | .457 | [-0.05, 0.10] |
| Impaired Autonomy (D) | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.00 | -0.04 | .967 | [-0.03, 0.03] |
| Disconnection (D) | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.16 | -1.88 | .060 | [-0.06, 0.00] |
| Other-Directedness (D) | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.39 | .699 | [-0.05, 0.07] |
| External Shame (D) | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 1.06 | .288 | [-0.05, 0.15] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 12.16 | < .001*** | [0.01, 0.01] |

*Note.* $N$ = 139 dyads. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. (M) = Mother as partner; (D) = Daughter as partner. Standardized coefficients (β) are reported from the std.all column. $R^2$ = .58 (Daughter), .61 (Mother). Model fit indices: $\chi^2(22) = 44.98$, $p = .003$; Robust CFI = .941; Robust TLI = .878; Robust RMSEA = .087; and SRMR = .058. ∗∗∗$p < .001$.

#### 4.3.3.3. Model 3: Dyadic Predictors of Shame-Related Words

The third APIM examined the dyadic predictors of shame-related words within the memory conversations. The model demonstrated a robust and good fit to the data: $\chi^2(22) = 36.48$, $p = .027$, Robust CFI = .951, Robust TLI = .897, Robust RMSEA = .063, and SRMR = .053. Although the TLI value sat just a fraction below the conventional .90 threshold, the overall constellation of indices confirms that the model provides a highly reliable and nuanced framework for capturing how shame-related expressions are used between mothers and daughters.

The final APIM analysis, centered on the explicit naming of shame, revealed that daughters' linguistic choices were potentially shaped by their mothers' relational

styles. Results for the shame-related word usage showed that regarding actor effects, neither daughters' nor mothers' individual variables (*individuation, schema domains,* or *external shame*) significantly predicted their own usage of shame-related word (all *p*s > .05). However, the same model revealed two significant negative partner effects on daughters results: Specifically, mothers' other-relatedness schema domain significantly predicted a decrease in daughters' usage of shame-related words (β = −.17, *p* = .015). Parallel to this, mothers' external shame levels also exerted a significant negative influence on daughters' explicit labeling of shame (β = −.16, *p* = .046). Lastly, mothers' own shame-related expressions did not differ depending on their daughters' characteristics (all *p*s > .05), suggesting a more stable or perhaps more guarded linguistic pattern on the maternal side.

Complete estimates are presented in Table 24.

**Table 24.** Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) Results for Shame-Related Words

| Shame-related Words | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daughter Outcome | | | | | | |
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 1.54 | .123 | [-0.02, 0.19] |
| Impaired Autonomy | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.19 | .846 | [-0.02, 0.03] |
| Disconnection | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.14 | .887 | [-0.03, 0.03] |
| Other-Directedness | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.48 | .633 | [-0.05, 0.08] |
| External Shame | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.49 | .621 | [-0.08, 0.13] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (M) | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.12 | .907 | [-0.08, 0.09] |
| Impaired Autonomy (M) | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 1.41 | .160 | [-0.01, 0.06] |
| Disconnection (M) | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.06 | -0.49 | .624 | [-0.07, 0.04] |
| Other-Directedness (M) | -0.06 | 0.03 | -0.17 | -2.42 | .015* | [-0.11, -0.01] |
| External Shame (M) | -0.10 | 0.05 | -0.16 | -1.99 | .046* | [-0.20, -0.00] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 6.97 | < .001*** | [0.01, 0.02] |

**Table 24** (continued)

| Mother Outcome | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Actor Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.47 | .641 | [-0.07, 0.11] |
| Impaired Autonomy | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.19 | -1.54 | .125 | [-0.07, 0.01] |
| Disconnection | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 1.30 | .195 | [-0.02, 0.10] |
| | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
| Other-Directedness | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.02 | -0.21 | .838 | [-0.07, 0.05] |
| External Shame | -0.01 | 0.06 | -0.01 | -0.09 | .930 | [-0.11, 0.10] |
| Partner Effects | | | | | | |
| Individuation (D) | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.01 | .996 | [-0.11, 0.11] |
| Impaired Autonomy (D) | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.33 | .745 | [-0.02, 0.03] |
| Disconnection (D) | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.55 | .582 | [-0.03, 0.05] |
| Other-Directedness (D) | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 1.54 | .124 | [-0.01, 0.12] |
| External Shame (D) | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | .997 | [-0.11, 0.11] |
| Control Variable | | | | | | |
| Total word count | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 4.89 | < .001*** | [0.01, 0.01] |

*Note.* $N$ = 139 dyads. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit. (M) = Mother as partner; (D) = Daughter as partner. Standardized coefficients (β) are reported from the std.all column. $R^2$ = .383 (Daughter), .445 (Mother). Model fit indices: $\chi^2(22) = 36.48$, $p = .027$; Robust CFI = .951; Robust TLI = .897; Robust RMSEA = .069; and SRMR = .053. $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$.

#### 4.3.3.4. Predictors of Turn-Taking

Rather than an APIM, multiple regression analyses were conducted for daughters and mothers to examine whether individuation, schema-domains and external shame predicted turn-taking frequency. This decision was informed by the structural interdependence of turn-taking within dyads ($r = .966$, $p < .001$), which renders the APIM framework inappropriate for this outcome variable, as the number of turns taken by one member mathematically constrains the other.

The regression analysis revealed that individual variables did not function as robust predictors for turn-taking frequency in this specific context. For daughters, the overall model was not statistically significant, $F(5, 154) = 1.213$, $p = .305$, $R^2 = .038$. Similarly, for mothers, the model did not reach statistical significance, $F(5, 136) =$

0.85, $p = .517$, $R^2 = .030$. The variables in the models did not significantly predict turn-taking frequency for neither daughters nor mothers. Detailed estimates are provided in Table 25.

**Table 25.** Regression Analyses Predicting Turn-Taking Frequency for Daughters and Mothers

| Turn-taking Variable | B | *SE* | β | *z* | *p* | 95% CI [LL, UL] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daughter Outcome | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.24 | 0.22 | 0.09 | 1.10 | .273 | [-0.19, 0.68] |
| Impaired Autonomy | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.18 | 1.28 | .203 | [-0.05, 0.25] |
| Disconnection | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.74 | .463 | [-0.12, 0.26] |
| Other-Directedness | -0.27 | 0.15 | -0.17 | -1.75 | .083 | [-0.57, 0.04] |
| External Shame | -0.06 | 0.27 | -0.03 | -0.22 | .830 | [-0.60, 0.48] |
| Mother Outcome | | | | | | |
| Individuation | 0.04 | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0.20 | .841 | [-0.32, 0.40] |
| Impaired Autonomy | -0.15 | 0.09 | -0.27 | -1.77 | .080 | [-0.33, 0.02] |
| Disconnection | 0.20 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 1.78 | .078 | [-0.02, 0.43] |
| Other-Directedness | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.35 | .725 | [-0.23, 0.33] |
| External Shame | -0.05 | 0.27 | -0.02 | -0.20 | .843 | [-0.59, 0.48] |

*Note.* B = unstandardized coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardized coefficient; CI = confidence interval. Model fit for daughters: $R^2 = .038$, $F(5, 154) = 1.213$, $p = .305$. Model fit for mothers: $R^2 = .030$, $F(5, 136) = 0.849$, $p = .517$.

### 4.4. Discussion

In Study 3, we investigated shame memory conversations of university students and their mothers that each dyad member shared their personal shame memory. To capture the interpersonal nature of these conversations, dyads were narrating their memories together with each other in the absence of the researcher. Based on the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) framework and regression analyses, the findings revealed notable actor and partner dynamics. To contextualize the patterns emerging across models, it is essential to first consider the inherent nature of the emotion at hand. As a self-conscious emotion, shame is mostly negatively charged (Gilbert, 2003; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Nathanson, 1996). In line with the literature, memory valence evaluated by the participants in the current study was also rated as *negative*

which was congruent with the nature of the conversations ($M$ = 3.30, $SD$ = 1.69; where *1* represented *extremely negative* and *7 extremely positive*). Moreover, shame inherently carries significant survival value within social contexts (Gilbert, 2003; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Nathanson, 1996). The emotion of shame has been linked to the social withdrawal (Brewin et al., 1989) and might pose a risk to threaten the individual's social standing (Gilbert, 1998; Nathanson, 1996), demanding psychological resources for regulation. Therefore, asking a mother-daughter dyad to converse about their personal shame memories may naturally mobilize specific relational dynamics. The conversations observed in this study appeared to extend beyond mere casual exchanges, likely involving underlying regulatory processes. This dynamic is seemingly reflected in how individuation, other-directedness schema domain and external shame predicted the emotion words and shame-related words used.

Building on previous theories and research, it was hypothesized that higher levels of *individuation* would be associated with their own higher autobiographical memory characteristics (specifically, total emotion word, unique emotion word, and shame-related word) (actor effects) as well as for their partners (partner effects); higher levels of early maladaptive schema domains (*impaired autonomy, disconnection,* and *other-directedness*) and *external shame* would predict lower autobiographical memory characteristics (specifically, total emotion word, unique emotion word, and shame-related word) would be associated with their own lower autobiographical memory characteristics (actor effects) as well as for their partners (partner effects). Turn-taking of the participants would be examined exploratorily.

These hypotheses were partially supported by indicating certain actor and partner effects on the daughter's narrative characteristics. Consistent with the Study 2, the models in Study 3 lacked predictive power regarding the mother's narrative characteristics.

Although the model was not statistically significant in predicting the daughters' total emotion word usage, noteworthy patterns emerged when the emotion words were categorized into *positive* and *negative emotion words*. Results revealed that mothers'

*individuation* level negatively predicted their daughter's use of *positive emotion words* during the shame memory conversation ($\beta = -.14$, $p = .028$). Complementing this, a daughter's use of *negative emotion words* in the same conversation was positively predicted by her own *individuation* level ($\beta = .14$, $p = .045$).

A closer examination of these findings within the context of high *individuation* reveals several key points that warrant discussion. İmamoğlu (2003) defines the individuated self as "becoming differentiated as a unique person with intrinsic referents, e.g., one's personal inclinations, capabilities, and free will" (İmamoğlu, 2003, p. 372). Mothers exhibiting these traits seemed to encourage their daughters to explore the intrinsic aspects of their shame experiences, embracing these feelings without holding back, while also mirroring this openness as active listeners. Complementing this result, the daughter's own higher individuation levels predicted an elevated use of negative words. These two results reinforce the idea that higher individuation in both parties fosters the courage to explore both personal and maternal shame experiences more directly as they are, which statistically reflected as lower positive and higher negative emotion words. In their conversation, daughters seemed like feeling no need to sugarcoat their experiences, opting instead to thoroughly process their unique subjective realities, which may uncover some vulnerabilities that their highly individuated mothers facilitate. Because negatively charged memory conversations primarily serve functions such as emotion regulation, lesson learning/lesson taking, these conversations (Fivush, 2007; Houle & Philippe, 2020), at least for daughters, seemed to fulfill their intended purpose.

Building upon this initial finding, the data further revealed that elevated levels of maternal *other-directedness* schema domain and *external shame* predicted a decrease in their daughter's use of shame-related words during the conversation. The shame-related word count comprised the total frequency of verbs, adjectives, or adverbs utilized to specifically name the emotion of shame. This metric inherently captures the act of labeling the experience, particularly given that the participants were requested to narrate on memories that they felt shame. Lewis (1971) argued that individuals are often ashamed of their shame, which can be stated as *shame of shame* (Macdonald,

1998). Labeling the experience directly as *shame* often brings this difficulty to the surface, creating a double layer of discomfort. Research by Terwijn (1993) echoes this, noting that individuals tended to avoid using the word of *shame*, choosing words such as awkwardness or hurt, to describe their internal experiences, but not the word *shame* itself (Retzinger, 1991).

When interacting with mothers who exhibit high scores on *other-directedness* schema domain, which is associated with deficits in the fulfillment of the basic universal need for self-directedness and excessive focus on the desires, feelings, and responses of others (Rafaeli et al., 2011), and high in external shame, which stems from the perception of being negatively judged by others (Matos et al., 2015), daughters' tendencies to avoid labeling memories as *shame* seemed to be significantly exacerbated. The mothers' preoccupation with how others see them may make it for daughters even harder to openly label the specific emotion of memories. Daughters likely recognize their mothers' propensity to prioritize the needs and thought of others. The *other-directedness* schema domain has been closely associated with a deficit in self-directedness that can foster an excessive focus on the desires, feelings, and responses of others (Rafaeli et al., 2011). When mothers exhibit these features in order to gain love and approval, maintain a sense of connection or belonging, or avoid retaliation, their children might learn to suppress important aspects of their self in order to gain love, attention, or approval. Children may learn within this context that others' needs and desires (and/or social acceptance and status) are valued more than their own unique needs and feelings. This environment is highly conducive to developing hyper-attunement to the needs and feelings of others, prompting individuals to navigate their own needs and feelings in accordance with the web of relationships. Similarly, high *external shame* levels of the mothers, which characterized by the attentional focus to the judging eyes of others (Matos et al., 2015), would direct the same direction to the daughters. The daughter's effort to avoid using less *shame-like* words might reflect Goffman's (1959) view that we are all naturally attuned to our audiences. Much like the performances Goffman describes, daughters manage their self-presentations to gain approval and protect themselves from disapproval of their mothers. Labeling their memories as *shame* may disturb the mother because it can underline the oppressive

nature of the emotion of shame. Consequently, within the context of these memory conversations, daughters presumably learn to navigate their word choices with heightened caution, a vigilance that is statistically mirrored in their reduced usage of shame-related words.

# CHAPTER 5

# GENERAL DISCUSSION

## 5.1. Recap of the Current Studies

The primary goal of the current studies is to explore the characteristics of shame memories in mother-daughter dyads. To achieve this, three subsequent studies were designed, each building upon the previous one to investigate shame memories across different research designs. In the first study, after ensuring that the participants were able to narrate their personal shame memories, the themes of *relational context* and *content* were examined across participant type (university students and mothers) and socioeconomic status (low and. middle-to-high). With the aim of extending the findings of the first study, the second study was designed to examine both personal shame memories and *vicarious shame memories*. All narrated memories were explored in terms of thematic coherence, subjective perspective terms (affective and cognitive words), identity connection, relationships/social interaction, and reasons. Building upon the findings of the two studies, the third and last study investigate the *memory conversations* of mother-daughter dyads about their personal shame memories together. Memory conversations that the dyad constructed were coded according to their autobiographical memory characteristics, such as volume, total emotion words, unique emotion words, shame-related words, and conversational turn-taking. In addition, self-construals, early maladaptive schemas, and shame-related variables (including external shame, internal shame, and guilt shame tendency) were gathered from the participants in Studies 2 and 3 to create predictive models.

### 5.2. Relational Contexts of Personal Shame Memories

To begin with, analyzing the relational themes of personal shame memories in Study 1 based on participant type revealed that students' themes centered around their *education environment* and *peer context*, comprising up to 60% of the total personal shame memories they shared. The predominant themes observed among mothers, on the other hand, were the *family environment* and the *professional setting*, accounted for close to 80% of the relational themes in mothers. These findings can be better interpreted in light of previous research. McLean (2008) reported that younger adults' life stories were still in the process of constructing and their more recent life events were still in flux and older adults has more stability. Our results align with what McLean (2008) underlines that mothers' shame memories center on consistent figures (e.g., family members) due to their relative life stability, while, students' memories include more transient figures, reflecting the social shifts associated with ongoing educational transitions.

Another key point on relational context themes of shame memories is that the *intrapersonal context* was the least frequent, yet conceptually significant theme among students' shame memories, whereas it was entirely absent from the mothers' narrations. This relational theme was characterized not by a particular setting or interaction with others, but by the development of internal constructs within the mind, even when the individual was alone. The reason such memories were encountered only once out of the 40 narratives may be due to either a hesitation or reluctance to share such private experiences with a researcher during recording, or the fact that these memories were less accessible during narration. Since narrating such aversive shame memories is inherently difficult, and shame often leads individuals to perceive themselves as unattractive, unpleasant, inadequate, and flawed (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996), the act of sharing such profoundly introspective and intimate material might have been driven by a different motivation: the participant may have utilized the interview setting as a form of exposure and/or self-disclosure, viewing it as an opportunity to confront and overcome the distressing content she narrated.

Another grouping variable of the Study1, a socioeconomic status-based analyses, revealed that the most frequent theme was *family context* for both low SES and middle-to-high SES participants, but the frequency of the remaining themes varies accordingly. For participants with higher SES, the *education environment* and *peer context* were the predominant themes together, appearing approximately half the time, while, for the low SES participants, these two themes occupied nearly 20%. Despite their similar educational backgrounds, the thematic divergence in their personal shame memories appears to indicate that their *working selves* could prioritize distinct goals (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000), perhaps reflecting their social realities. From a broader perspective on SES-based analyses, a subtle pattern appears to emerge regarding how hierarchy is integrated into the relational context. It is possible that the prevalence of frequencies may reflect the extent to which a thematic hierarchy is rooted in social reality, particularly in domains where formal structures are more prevalent. Family, education, and professional settings typically involve a degree of hierarchy where in their personal shame memories participants represent the subordinate party, such as a child, student, or employee, relative to a more powerful figure, such as a parent, teacher, or employer. These themes occurred close to 90% in total among low-SES participants' personal shame memories, whereas this was approximately 60% in their middle-to-high SES counterparts. The cross-tabulation results based on the interaction of participant type and SES analyses also supports these results: While for low SES students 80% of the themes includes some level of hierarchy (the sum of *family*, *education* and *professional setting*), this percentage is roughly 55% for their higher SES counterparts. For mothers on the other hand, all shame memories were under the *family* and *professional setting* in low-SES mothers, while it was around 70% for higher SES mothers. Ultimately, these patterns may suggest that socioeconomic disadvantage may be linked to how frequently shame is narrated within hierarchical relationships. For lower-SES individuals, hierarchical contexts appear to dominate their shame narratives. While this may suggest a higher frequency of such experiences in daily life, it primarily reflects what participants choose to remember and share. In contrast, higher-SES participants may be more likely to recall shame within egalitarian environments, such as peer-based or public settings. Similarly, in terms of *educational environment* and *peer context* themes, the cross-

tabulation results revealed that lower SES students demonstrated a greater tendency to carry their family context into their personal shame memories compared to their higher SES counterparts (40% for low SES vs. 9.1% for higher SES). The tendency of higher SES students to prioritize the education-related goals, while their lower SES counterparts contend with different realities, may reflect the broader impact of economic disadvantage; specifically, that financial stress on parents often reshapes the family environment (Oftedal et al., 2025; Osher et al., 2020), which in turn may keep the family dynamic more at the forefront for the low SES student's lived experience. Mothers, on the other hand, had similar theme frequencies regardless of low or higher SES backgrounds.

While the limited number of participants of Study 1 precludes broad generalizations, low SES mothers' concentrated pattern may still be interpreted as a reflection of their lived reality. Since the literature suggests that parents from low-income families face a wide range of difficulties (Ho et al., 2022), these two domains, family and work, likely represent the most salient sources of distress that dominate their narratives.

To sum up, results based on participant type on relational context of personal shame memories mostly revealed that themes reflecting the realities of the participants, and occasionally the goals and expectations from the interview, that are shaped by their working selves. Individuals tended to narrate personal shame memories most proximal to their current developmental and environmental stage, a finding consistent with the Self-Memory System (SMS) model (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). When results were based on the SES of participants, while the *education environment* and *peer context* were the predominant themes together for participants with higher SES, these two themes occupied nearly 20% for participants with low SES participants. Moreover, the cross-tabulation results revealed that lower SES students demonstrated a greater tendency to carry their family context into their personal shame memories compared to their higher SES counterparts (40% for low SES vs. 9.1% for higher SES). Therefore, we can conclude that participant type, interacting with their SES, may differentiate participants lived experiences and routines more nuanced, with differing

frequency of the relational context of shame memories, reflecting the narrative environment, although with the caution of the small sample size of this pilot study.

### 5.3. Content of Personal Shame Memories

In the Study 1, personal shame memories that participants narrated were analyzed for exploring the content of memories. Regardless of their participant type and socioeconomic status, participants most frequently narrated memories of *mishaps and missteps*. This suggests participants remembered and/or chose to narrate memories of shame arising from being observed by others in unforeseen circumstances. Shame often leads individuals to perceive themselves as unattractive, inadequate, and flawed (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996). In the Study 1, participants were asked to narrate memories in which they experienced such self-perceptions. Choosing memories within the *mishaps and missteps* theme may represent a safer way to manage the stress of self-disclosing these vulnerable aspects of the self.

The second most frequent memory content for mothers was *aggression*, while it is the third most frequent for students. Notably, in all personal shame memories of mothers, they were the *recipients* of some form of aggression. In contrast, half of the verbal aggression memories of students involved the participant as the *initiator*, while the other half involved the participant as the *recipient*. It is worth noting that when the cross-tabulation results based on the interaction of participant type and SES were investigated, *aggression* theme (45.5%), especially with the verbal (27.3%) and indirect aggression (18.2%) sub-themes, emerged as a competing one for middle-high SES mothers, appearing with the same frequency as *mishaps and missteps*. For low-SES groups, 12.5% of mothers shared personal shame memories of *physical aggression* sub-theme, while none of their higher-SES counterparts did. Those numbers aren't necessarily high because of the small sample size, but the frequencies might actually reflect the participants' lived reality. Until the early 2000s, physical punishment of children was widely accepted as a legitimate way to ensure compliance, distinct from abuse. Some sources suggest that when corporal punishment is considered normal within a culture, children might interpret it as a deliberate strategy in their best interests, which could potentially buffer its negative effects (Avezum et

al., 2023; Durrant & Ensom, 2012). Conversely, if it is non-normative, children might perceive it as a sign of parental rejection, exacerbating maladjustment (Lansford, 2010). In the case of mothers who are now parents themselves, even if they initially exposed to corporal punishment as normative, their retrospective evaluation may have shifted, as physical punishment is no longer widely accepted and is now considered inappropriate. Therefore, mothers might have more frequently narrated memories involving *aggression* content as shame memories, while the lower frequency of this theme among university students could be attributed to their less frequent experiences of aggression.

*Performance-related* was the second most frequent memory content among students, while it is the third most frequent theme in mothers. The cross-tabulation results based on the interaction between participant type and SES, yielding relatively homogenous distribution for university students regardless of SES; while showing that all the mothers who narrated this theme as their personal shame memories belong to low SES. Literature shows that young people tend to set high standards for themselves and feel responsible for their own successes and failures, experiencing constant pressure to perform at a high level across multiple arenas of their everyday lives (Petersen, 2019). This persistent striving for excellence often leads to feelings of stress and inadequacy in young adults (Petersen, 2019), and, when these self-imposed standards are not met, may contribute to the formation of shame memories. Consequently, it is plausible that this dynamic partially accounts for the high prevalence of *performance-related* shame memories among university students. Research indicates that older adults tend to report and express greater empathy when observing the performances of individuals (Richter & Kunzmann, 2011). Therefore, it is plausible that mothers may exhibit a higher degree of self-compassion or empathy toward their own perceived performance failures compared to their daughters. The prevalence of *performance-related* themes in low-SES mothers' but not in their higher SES counterparts suggests that socioeconomic fact may influence the subjective evaluation of performance. Supporting the literature that suggests socioeconomic constraints can intensify self-evaluative tendencies (Kopala-Sibley et al., 2013; Wendel et al., 2021).

*Sexuality* and *body-image related* themes were the least frequent themes, regardless of participant type and SES status. Cross-tabulation results based on the interaction between participant type and SES showed that while rare, some low-SES students shared shame memories related to sexuality and body image. However, these memories were absent in their higher SES counterparts. Interestingly, the pattern observed in the students was reversed among the mothers. While higher SES mothers shared a limited number of shame memories related to *body image*, lower SES mothers reported no such memories concerning either *sexuality* or *body image*.

These two themes of *sexuality* and *body-image related* may represent the most sensitive dimensions of memory content (as in the interpersonal relational context, which requires a deeper level of insight and maybe courage). Therefore, it's understandable, and may even be considered as a functional boundary, to not share the most intimate shame memories with an unfamiliar researcher within a brief ten-minute interview. The low frequency rates of those themes do not necessarily imply that such incidents are equally rare. Especially distressing sexual memories are often challenging to recall; this difficulty can create psychological pathways that keep such memories inaccessible for extended durations (Joslyn et al., 1997), or intentionally withheld due to participant reluctance, or perhaps both.

To sum up, participant type and SES yielded similar frequency distributions. Irrespective of their participant type or SES, participants predominantly narrated shame memories of *mishaps and missteps*, while tended to avoid more sensitive topics such as *sexuality*. Furthermore, although analyses of the interaction between participant type and SES revealed clearer patterns, these findings should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size of this pilot study.

### 5.4. Personal and Vicarious Shame Memories in University Students and their Mothers

Building on preliminary correlational analyses, Study 2 developed distinct predictive models of both students and their mothers for their personal and vicarious shame memories. In general, two primary findings emerged from the results of Study 2: first,

personal shame memories produced consistently more robust findings than vicarious ones; second, predictive models produced more significant results for university students than their mothers.

Aligning with existing literature, the primary finding revealed that personal shame memories yielded significantly richer data compared to vicarious memories (Grysman et al., 2013; Steiner, 2024; Thomsen & Pillemer, 2017). Three main factors likely explain why personal shame memories might have yielded richer data. First, personal shame memories hold higher self-relevance and represent direct experiences, whereas vicarious memories are indirect and likely phenomenologically less intense (Pillemer et al., 2015; Pond & Patterson, 2020). This aligns with the *self-reference effect* (SRE), suggesting that experiences directly relevant to the self represent a privileged domain in memory, leading to more robust retrieval than indirect experiences (Rogers et al., 1977; Sweatman et al., 2022). Furthermore, personal memories are a reflection of identity that serves to construct and sustain the individual's sense of self (Conway, 2005). As personal memories are central to the narrative identity shaped through socialization, they may be perceived as more worthwhile to remember (Fivush et al., 2006; Şahin-Acar et al., 2017). This prioritization may led participants to generate richer and more accessible personal memories compared to vicarious memories (Pillemer et al., 2015; Pond & Patterson, 2020). Second, a fundamental shift from an *experiencer* to an *observer* perspective may play an important role. In personal narratives, the phenomenology of shame is dominated by an overwhelming urge to disappear or hide the self (Lewis, 1992, Tangney et al., 1996). This urge might lead the narrator to prioritize managing the *threat to the self* (De Hooge et al., 2010) to maintain coherence when narrating a personal memory where she is the *experiencer*. In contrast, vicarious narratives position the narrator as an *observer* listening to the protagonist's experience. Because the threat is directed at the other rather than the self, the paralyzing urge to hide is mostly expected to be diminished, allowing the narrator to redirect resources from self-defense to other cognitive processes. Instead of protecting the self, vicarious shame in this context may function more as an *in-group correction device* (Welten et al., 2012), where the focus is on observing and learning from the social error rather than feeling the direct sting of rejection. Third, the reduced

narrative characteristics in vicarious memories relative to personal ones may be attributed to the protagonists' preemptively managing the associated emotional burden. This was particularly evident in students' vicarious memories. Research on intergenerational narratives indicates that mothers adjust their storytelling style to guide their children's emotional comprehension without overwhelming them (Fivush, 2007; Sales et al., 2003). Even as children reach adulthood, this flexibility likely coexists with a consistent parental reminiscing style that remains stable over time (McCabe & Peterson, 1991; Reese et al., 1993). If the mothers filtered the distress within their original shame memories during their previous narration, the daughters would encounter a less threatening version of the original memory. Therefore, as the emotional regulation was likely performed by the mother during the original narration, the daughter does not need to deploy her own individuation resources to regulate the affect, which likely explains the non-significant results yielded by the narratives of vicarious memory.

Another converging finding that Study 2 showed was students' models effectively predicted their outcomes, while the models for mothers yielded predominantly non-significant results: only one of the maternal models achieved statistical significance. This discrepancy can likely be attributed to several interacting factors. Given that shame is a profoundly difficult and aversive emotion (Gilbert, 1998, 2003; Tangney, 1995), generational differences in emotional expression and regulation might play a crucial role. Mothers, belonging to an older generation, may hold more conservative attitudes regarding the disclosure of shame, leading to a reluctance to fully engage with the emotional depth required for variables like subjective perspective or identity connection to emerge significantly. It is likely that the generation of mothers is less *in touch* with the emotion of shame compared to the younger generation, who appear more open to narrating and processing such emotions. Second, and perhaps more critically, the lack of discernible patterns in the mothers' narratives may stem from disparities in their educational levels. Our sample mothers had a wide range of education levels, from primary school graduates to PhD holders, while the daughter group was educationally homogenous by nature. All the daughters were university students, and due to their academic training, they are most probably familiar with tasks

of constructing narratives and writing essays. This familiarity would yield a *practice effect* which provides them with the necessary skills of constructing a structurally and personally coherent story. In contrast, the wide variation in mothers' educational backgrounds likely introduced considerable statistical noise, preventing the emergence of a unified narrative pattern and obscuring potential mechanisms that might have been visible in a more homogenous sample. This impact of individual differences and educational inequality was most pronounced in the mothers' vicarious narratives because narrating their partner's memories may require a higher level of cognitive organization and perspective-taking, skills that are often enhanced through formal education. Without consistent educational attainment, the cognitive load of constructing a coherent story about someone else's shame becomes significantly greater. Consequently, the inequality in education levels made the vicarious data particularly vulnerable; mothers' vicarious accounts were often disorganized and scattered, failing to yield significant models due to this fragmentation.

However, the systematic failure of all coding domains in mothers' narratives extends beyond merely structure; it also encompasses emotional and relational codes. Our results indicated that mothers were significantly more likely to perceive that their daughters shared their shame memories with them because those narratives have an emotionally charged nature. This finding suggests that mothers perceive the vicarious shame memory primarily as a *social sharing of emotion* (Rimé, 2009), an immediate call for emotional regulation rather than an opportunity for reflective storytelling. When the maternal goal is emotional scaffolding, containing the daughter's distress at the sharing moment (Fivush et al., 2006), the narrative focus shifts dramatically away from the dimensions measured in this study. Because the mother's focus is on regulating the emotion and helping the daughter understand the event (Fivush, 2007; Fivush et al., 2009), the act of re-telling these events as vicarious shame memory likely reflects this functional priority. The lack of significant findings for thematic coherence (beginning-middle-end including resolution) and subjective terms (affective and cognitive terms) can be attributed to the mother's role: at that moment, the immediate need to soothe the daughter naturally overshadows the structural elements of the narrative.

Moving beyond these converging trends, it is important to take a closer look at each individual variable in the models for daughters and their mothers. Starting with *individuation*, this variable emerged as the most robust and consistent positive predictor of narrative competence for university students. As a university student differentiated as a unique person with intrinsic referents, she seems to utilize their intrinsic referents to construct a story that is both structured (thematic coherent) and emotionally detailed (rich in affective terms). The ability to construct a coherent narrative about shame is not merely a linguistic skill, but a manifestation of an individuated self. Possessing an individuated self seems to help daughters counteract the inherent urge of shame to *hide* or *disappear* instead of being overwhelmed by memory. Thus, *individuation* acts as a protective buffer, transforming potential emotional chaos into a coherent narrative. To unpack this mechanism further, we can draw upon the developmental premise that constructing a personal identity is the central task of adolescence (Erikson, 1968) and serves as the foundation for young adulthood. In the course of individuation, the individual undergoes a critical process of achieving autonomy that contributes to developing unique facets of selfhood (Blos, 1967; Mahler et al., 1975). A healthy identity is formed through the simultaneous processes of developing an individuated self while sustaining relatedness in social contexts (İmamoğlu, 1998, 2003). Since shame is an emotion that carrying the potential of attacking herself (Lewis, 1992), the capacity to narrate it without fragmentation relies heavily on the strength of this identity. Therefore, the capacity to engage with shame, rather than being overwhelmed by it, can be interpreted as a reflection of this active identity formation process. However, the predictive power of *individuation* appears to be mostly limited to personal shame memories (except for the thematic coherence). This is likely because vicarious shame memories involve the emotional experience of a close other, such as a daughter narrating her mother's experience (and vice versa), allowing individuated individuals to maintain clear psychological boundaries. Since the memory originally belongs to someone else, they do not feel compelled to engage in meaning-making, extract social lessons, or build identity connections (captured in our models as *subjective perspective terms*, *social interaction* and *identity connection*). Ultimately, this is because the primary focus of

*individuation* is on self-regulation, not necessarily on social integration, especially in the context of an isolating emotion like shame.

While individuation provides clear psychological boundaries, the *impaired limits* schema domain presented a potential divergence in the daughters' models depending on the memory type. Higher *impaired limits*, indicating deficient self-regulation (Young et al., 2003), negatively predicted thematic coherence in personal shame memories, corresponding to more fragmented narratives. In contrast, although the finding for thematic coherence in vicarious memories merely approached statistical significance ($\beta = .25$, $p = .054$), this pattern points to a potential reversal when the mother was the protagonist. In these narratives, the impaired limits domain showed a comparable marginal positive association with both thematic coherence of personal and vicarious shame memories. This observation might be explained by relational enmeshment rather than healthy perspective-taking. The observed thematic coherence could potentially reflect emotional intertwining. It is possible that, due to highly permeable psychological boundaries, daughters with higher impaired limits scores might struggle to view their mothers as entirely separate entities. Taken together, these exploratory findings point to a potential trend whereby daughters' narratives might be structurally shaped by the interplay between individuation and schema-driven boundary issues.

In contrast, the models for mothers revealed a different pattern. Their narratives appear less influenced by these relational structures, neither *individuation* nor the *impaired limits* schema domain emerged as significant predictors in their models. Instead, mothers' memory construction shows a tendency to be governed by emotional traits. Specifically, *shame-withdrawal* showed a consistent tendency to negatively predict subjective perspective affective and total terms, while *negative self-evaluation* uniquely predicted an increase in subjective perspective cognitive terms, and relationship/social interaction coding schemes, suggesting that these two components of shame influence narrative processing through distinct pathways. The *shame-withdrawal* variable captures shame responses characterized by avoidant action tendencies, such as the urge to hide or disappear (Cohen et al., 2011). In line with this

impulse, a higher tendency to withdraw might lead to using fewer affective words. This would seem to mirror the act of *hiding* within the narrative itself. Conversely, the *negative self-evaluation* variable relates to judging one's entire self as bad (e.g., thinking "I am a terrible person") (Cohen et al., 2011). Higher levels of this evaluative tendency might lead to an increased use of cognitive terms, which could be seen as a direct linguistic manifestation of the self-reflective process itself. Additionally, individuals with a stronger inclination toward *negative self-evaluation* might tend to narrate shame memories that involve more social interactions or close relationships. Nevertheless, as the overall models did not reach statistical significance, these patterns should be viewed merely as emerging tendencies. Such interpretations must be approached with caution and would require further investigation to be fully substantiated. Overall, it is likely that the aversive nature of shame leads to disruption in mothers' narration style. While these results primarily indicate a potential tendency, they point toward a subtle relationship between avoidant action tendencies and shame narratives that warrants further research.

Before concluding this section, one final point regarding the measurement levels of the outcome variables warrants discussion. Significant findings for both daughters and their mothers were predominantly observed in thematic coherence, a *zoomed-out* coding system, requiring the narrator to step back and organize the experience into a macro-structure characterized by a clear beginning, middle, ending with a resolution (Grysman & Mansfield, 2020). *Zoomed-in* approach on the other hand, relies on frequency counts (e.g., subjective perspective and identity connection). Grysman and Mansfield (2020) contend that the primary advantage of the *zoomed-out* approach is that this approach treats the narrative as a single, coherent unit. From a theoretical perspective, thematic coherence appears to capture an enduring narrative style, which may explain the overall robustness of the predictive models employed in this study. Consequently, thematic coherence emerged as the most robust indicator of how individuals process shame, preserving the structural integrity of the narration even when the micro-level emotional content remains chaotic or if relational social interaction is suppressed by the nature of the emotion. Therefore, *zoomed-out* results

capture the human capacity to understand context, which automated in *zoomed-in* methods (like word counts) often miss.

### 5.5. Memory Conversations about Personal Shame Memories in University Students and their Mothers

Shame memory conversations between university students and their mothers, in which individual shared a personal shame memory, were investigated in Study 3. As a self-conscious emotion, shame is mostly negatively charged and inherently carries significant survival value within social contexts (Gilbert, 2003; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Nathanson, 1996). The emotion of shame has been linked to the social withdrawal (Brewin et al., 1989) and might pose a risk to threaten the individual's social standing (Gilbert, 1998; Nathanson, 1996), demanding psychological resources for regulation. Therefore, asking a mother-daughter dyad to converse about their personal shame memories may naturally mobilize specific relational dynamics.

Building on previous theories and research, it was hypothesized that higher levels of *individuation*; lower levels of early maladaptive schema domains (*impaired autonomy, disconnection,* and *other-directedness*) and *external shame* would be associated with the participants' own higher autobiographical memory characteristics (specifically, total emotion word, unique emotion word, and shame-related word) (actor effects) as well as for their partners (partner effects). These hypotheses were partially supported by indicating certain actor and partner effects on the daughter's narrative characteristics. A closer examination of these findings within the context of high *individuation* reveals several key points that warrant discussion.

Results revealed that mothers' *individuation* level negatively predicted their daughter's use of *positive emotion words* during the shame memory conversation ($\beta = -.14$, $p = .028$). Conversely, a daughter's use of *negative emotion words* in the same conversation was positively predicted by her own *individuation* level ($\beta = .14$, $p = .045$). Mothers exhibiting high *individuation* seemed to encourage their daughters to explore the intrinsic aspects of their shame experiences during their conversation, embracing these feelings without holding back, while also mirroring this openness as

active listeners. Complementing this result, the daughter's own higher *individuation* levels predicted an elevated use of negative words. These two results reinforce the idea that higher *individuation* in both parties fosters the courage in daughters to explore both personal and maternal shame experiences more directly as they are, which statistically reflected as lower positive and higher negative emotion words. In Study 2, *individuation* acted as a buffer for in daughters' personal shame memories, leading to greater thematic coherence and the use of more affective words. Study 3 highlighted a dyadic effect: higher mother individuation led daughters to use more negative words, which likely reflects a freer exploration of their experiences.

Building upon this initial finding, the data of memory conversations further revealed that elevated levels of maternal *other-directedness* schema domain and *external shame* predicted a decrease in their daughter's use of shame-related words during the conversation. Lewis (1971) argued that individuals are often ashamed of their shame, which can be stated as *shame of shame* (Macdonald, 1998). Terwijn (1993) noted that individuals tended to avoid using the word of *shame*, choosing words such as awkwardness or hurt, to describe their internal experiences, but not the word *shame* itself (Retzinger, 1991). When interacting with mothers who exhibit high scores on *other-directedness* schema domain, and high in *external shame*, daughters' tendencies to avoid labeling memories as *shame* seemed to be significantly exacerbated. The mothers' preoccupation with how others see them may make it for daughters even harder to openly label the specific emotion of memories. The daughter's effort to avoid using less *shame-like* words might reflect Goffman's (1959) view that we are all naturally attuned to our audiences. Much like the performances Goffman describes, daughters manage their self-presentations to gain approval and protect themselves from disapproval of their mothers. Existing literature supported these explanations, noting that the assocaition between variaous types of shame (e.g. overt, unidentified shame vs. bypassed shame) could lead to increased concealment (Macdonald, 1998). From this perspective, avoiding the *shame* label may serve as a kind of denial (Lewis, 1971; Macdonald, 1998). Although analyzing various types of shame extends beyond the scope of this research, it is crucial to highlight how shame can be experienced differently across individuals. These variations might be shaped not only by the nature

of the specific emotion type of shame but also by personal characteristics, including maladaptive schema domains and external shame levels.

Because emotions have evolved as adaptive with intrapsychic and interpersonal functions (Bowlby, 1977; Bretherton et al., 1986; Lorenz, 1965), one might ask why we talk about our memories that we feel shame? Although the scope of these studies lay beyond answering this quesiton, the reason coding give hints about it. The overall answer to this question is to heal. Majority of the conversaitons contained the compassion dyadically.

### 5.6. Contributions and Strengths

By exploring the narratives of shame, the present studies make several key contributions to the autobiographical memory literature. Together, these three studies provide a comprehensive understanding of the nature of shame memories in: the relational context and the memory content of personal shame memories based on participant type (mothers and their adult daughters) and socioeconomic status (lower vs. higher SES); narrative features of personal and vicarious shame memories; and characteristics of mother-daughter conversations about their shame memories were identified for the first time, to the best of our knowledge.

Literature suggested that, in general, participants in studies of shame have been willing to share their experiences of shame in a research setting (Andrews, 1995; Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Macdonald, 1998; Macdonald & Tantam, 1994). However, it was initially uncertain whether *mother-daughter dyads* would be equally willing to do so. After the first study provided the necessary confidence to proceed, the scope of subsequent studies was expanded to include vicarious memories and memory conversations. As discussed in detail above, variables including *individuation*, *the impaired limits* and *other-directedness* schema domain, and *external shame* were found to have predictive effects on multiple narrative features in distinct ways. Moreover, differing reasons of university students and their mothers' narrating their personal shame memories to each other was also another contribution to the literature: While daughters were significantly more likely to refer to *teaching purposes* as a reason their mothers shared

personal shame memories with them, mothers were significantly more likely to report *emotionally charged* reasons. Not only the effects of the individual's own traits, such as individuation and impaired limits schema domains, but also the effects of their partner's traits on their narrative characteristics were assessed through dyadic analyses. Embracing the interdependent nature of the conversations and reflecting it within the statistical analyses represents a key methodological strength.

Unpacking shame memories through such diverse designs constitutes the primary strength of these studies. Furthermore, collecting all shame memories verbally through online semi-structured interviews conducted by a single researcher serves another notable strength, minimizing potential confounding variables that might have emerged if more that one researcher conducted interviews.

Finally, a notable strength of this dissertation is its positioning at the intersection of developmental and clinical psychology. As scholars have increasingly recognized, the boundaries between these sub-disciplines are far more permeable than traditionally assumed (Cicchetti, 2006; Sroufe & Rutter, 1984), opening space for richer and more integrative research questions. Across all three studies, this work aims to be a modest contribution to that ongoing conversation.

### 5.7. Limitations and Future Directions

While the present research offers valuable insights, several limitations should be noted. First, in Study 1, socioeconomic status (SES) was based on the daughter's self-report. If a daughter rated her past or current SES as *very low* or *low*, we classified that dyad as low SES. SES is always a complex variable to measure. However, Türkiye has faced severe economic instability in recent years. According to Uluğ et al. (2023), significant shifts in the relationship between interest rates, inflation, and exchange rates began between 2018 and 2021. This prolonged period of financial turbulence was further exacerbated by supply disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, leading to a severe and continuous decline in people's purchasing power, especially since 2022. Because of this ongoing crisis, measuring perceived SES has become even more complicated. For example, when looking at the data, one

participant who identified as *low SES* had an income *six times higher* than the minimum wage. This likely happens because people naturally compare their current financial situation with their past. Since they experience continuous economic difficulties today, they perceive themselves as having a *lower* status. While this reflects their psychological reality, it creates noise in the SES variable. Therefore, the results related to SES should be interpreted with caution.

Second, a specific limitation of Study 2 concerns the small number of dyads. Ideally, analyzing both personal and vicarious memories requires a large sample size tested within a single, comprehensive statistical model. However, many participants found it difficult to narrate vicarious memories. This challenge significantly reduced our final sample size. As a result, we had to run the statistical models separately rather than testing everything at once. Therefore, the findings from Study 2 should be considered preliminary. Future research should aim to replicate these findings with a larger sample size, which would allow for testing fewer, but more statistically powered, unified models.

Third, a key limitation of Study 3 concerns the memory type selected by participants. Although the literature on mother-child conversations makes a distinction between *reminiscing* and *recounting* (Şahin-Acar et al., 2019), this study did not impose any restriction on the instructions given. Whereas *reminiscing* involves the discussion of experiences that took place in the presence of both parties, *recounting* refers to memory conversations regarding experiences that occurred in the absence of the other party. This distinction matters because the primary focuses of the talks can be varied: *reminiscing* primarily serves the function of bonding, while the primary goal of *recounting* would be information elicitation rather than bonding (Reese & Brown, 2000; Wang, 2013). Not differentiating between these two types of personal shame memories is a noteworthy limitation of the current study. Further studies should address this gap by explicitly instructing participants to narrate either a *reminisced* or *recounted* shame memory, allowing for a more systematic examination.

Beyond these study-specific constraints, there are general limitations that apply across all three studies. The most notable one is the difference in educational backgrounds

between the two generations. Because the daughters were university students, they formed a highly homogeneous group in terms of education. Mothers, however, had very diverse educational backgrounds. This difference likely explains why the statistical models for the daughters were robust, while the mothers' results were less consistent. This educational gap also may affect how participants shared their memories. The familiarity with standard narrative structure (i.e., organizing a clear beginning, middle, ending with a resolution essential for *thematic coherence*) likely gave daughters a performance advantage, whereas variations in mothers' educational backgrounds might have introduced noise into their structural accounts. Therefore, future research should aim to replicate these findings with more homogenous samples of mothers or by statistically controlling for sociodemographic factors.

Another important limitation concerns the voluntary nature of the study. Because all participants chose to participate the research with their mother or daughter, there is likely a *self-selection bias*. Naturally, dyads who are comfortable sharing personal memories in a study together might already have a closer or more open relationship than those who chose not to participate. This shared characteristic means our sample might not represent all types of mother-daughter dynamics. Furthermore, while women from the same family were interviewed for these studies, future research should explore different constellations. The results of the studies clearly reflect the distinct female dialectic at play, specifically, the unique ways these women influence, conflict with, and support one another across generations. Selecting women from the same family was a deliberate choice, as we viewed it as a strong starting point, given that women are the *emotional historians* of families (Fivush, Marin, et al., 2009).

Another methodological constraint was the specific emotions chosen by the participants, as we did not exclude any type of memory. For example, although the nature, functions, and sources of shame and guilt are inherently different, individuals can easily confuse the emotions of guilt and shame. These possible overlaps in all the current studies may have introduced a confounding variable that further studies need to consider.

Last but not least, previous research suggests that gender and educational level can influence the extent of cooperation between interviewers and respondents (Catania et al., 1996; Durrant et al., 2010). This is particularly relevant since semi-structured interviews conducted by the researcher served as the primary data collection method for these studies. Although Macdonald (1998) noted that participants are willing to share their shame experiences in research interviews, Catania et al. (1996) and Durrant et al. (2010) stated that respondents are generally more cooperative when they share similar characteristics with interviewers, which may be advantageous for university student participants in this study. Therefore, university students may perceive the interviewer as similar to themselves (e.g. female and student), leading to increased cooperation during sensitive self-disclosure in sexuality and body-image related themes. Conversely, the situation for mothers may not be the same as for university students. Bittmann (2020) found that the data quality in interviews is lowest when female participants are interviewed by a younger female, potentially creating a disadvantage for the mother participants. Consequently, while having all interviews being conducted by the same researcher ensured procedural consistency, it is essential to consider the potential for differential impact on the mother and daughter participants due to these interviewer-respondent dynamics.

Drawing upon the functional perspective of Nelson and Fivush (2004), which posits that autobiographical narratives serve crucial social and emotional functions, one might question why mother-daughter dyads choose to converse about their shame memories. Since emotions have evolved as adaptive mechanisms with both intrapsychic and interpersonal functions (Bowlby, 1977; Bretherton et al., 1986; Lorenz, 1965), talking about shame with a close other fundamentally seems to be an attempt to heal. Rather than remaining a source of isolation characterized by *being silenced* (Fivush, 2010), sharing these narratives serves either as an emotional opening to process the event or as a closure to integrate it. Therefore, future research should investigate how these specific conversations evoke a dyadic compassion that facilitates interpersonal healing and emotional regulation, thereby transforming a shared vulnerability into a relational strength.

Nevertheless, as the first study to explore shame memories within this specific intergenerational context, the current work serves as a pioneering step, highlighting the complexity of studying such sensitive emotions across different developmental and educational backgrounds.

### 5.8. Conclusion

The autobiographical memories we narrate, and the way we narrate them, reveal a great deal about who we are. The studies in this dissertation sought to shed light on how university students and their mothers give voice to *shame memories*, those experiences in which the protagonist wished to *hide* and *disappear*.

The findings of the Study 1 revealed that the ways in which daughters and their mothers narrate personal shame memories differ from each other. Two distinct thematic analyses, focusing on relational and content of the shame memories, produced findings that themes were reflecting the participants' realities, and, at times their goals and expectations regarding the interview, which were shaped by their working selves. Individuals tended to narrate personal shame memories that were most proximal to their current developmental and environmental stage, a finding consistent with the Self-Memory System (SMS) model (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). In addition, further analysis of the interaction between participant type and SES yielded clearer patterns, although one should approach them with the caution due to the small sample size of the pilot study.

Findings of the Study 2 demonstrated that regardless of the participant type, personal shame memories consistently produced richer and statistically more significant data compared to vicarious memories (Grysman et al., 2013; Steiner, 2024; Thomsen & Pillemer, 2017). Furthermore, university students exhibited more robust narrative data compared to their mothers. The first finding of personal memories' robust findings compared to the vicarious ones aligns with the *self-reference effect* (SRE), suggesting that experiences directly relevant to the self constitute a privileged domain in memory, leading to more robust data than indirect experiences (Rogers et al., 1977; Sweatman et al., 2022). Regarding the university students group, *individuation* emerged as a

robust predictor of thematic coherence for both personal and vicarious shame memories; specifically, higher levels of individuation were associated with increased thematic coherence, characterized by a structured beginning, middle, end with a resolution. Notably, the *impaired limits* schema domain exerted a divergent impact: higher scores in impaired limits schema domain impaired the thematic coherence of personal shame memories while facilitating the coherence of vicarious shame memories among university students. For mothers, the only significant predictor to emerge was *shame-withdrawal* in their personal shame memories, which had negative impact on their thematic coherence. Ultimately, this lack of structural cohesion appears to mirror the very act of *hiding* within the narrative itself.

Regarding the Study 3, again, university students' revealed some statistically significant results of mothers' *individuation* level negatively predicted their daughter's use of *positive emotion words*, while a daughter's use of *negative emotion words* in the same conversation was positively predicted by her own *individuation* level. Mothers exhibiting these traits seemed to encourage their daughters to explore the intrinsic aspects of their shame experiences, embracing these feelings without holding back, while also mirroring this openness as active listeners. Complementing this result, the daughter's own higher individuation levels predicted an elevated use of negative words. These two results reinforce the idea that higher individuation in both parties fosters the courage to explore both personal and maternal shame experiences more directly as they are, which statistically reflected as lower positive and higher negative emotion words. Moreover, the data further revealed that elevated levels of maternal *other-directedness* schema domain and *external shame* predicted a decrease in their daughter's use of shame-related words during the conversation. Through the Study 3, not only the effects of the one's own traits, but also the effects of their partner's traits on their narrative characteristics were revealed to have meaningful impacts. For the daughters during their conversation labeling their memories as *shame* may disturb their mother because it may mean to underline the oppressive nature of the emotion of shame. Consequently, within the context of these memory conversations, daughters presumably learn to navigate their word choices with heightened caution, a vigilance that is statistically mirrored in their reduced usage of shame-related words.

Taken together, the three studies presented in this dissertation offer a comprehensive and multi-layered examination of shame memories within mother-daughter relationships, a domain that remains remarkably underexplored in the autobiographical memory literature. To the best of our knowledge, this is among the first attempts to investigate *shame memories* not only as individual psychological phenomena, but as relational experiences embedded within the co-construction of memory in a mother-daughter dyadic context. Across the studies, shame memories were examined through their thematic and relational content, through the individual psychological factors that predicts how personal and vicarious shame memories are narrated, and through the actor and partner dynamics that emerge during mother-daughter memory conversations. This work build on the recognition that primary caregivers occupy a pivotal role in (early) memory socialization, shaping not only what children encode and retrieve, but also how emotionally significant experiences such as shame are framed, conceptualized, narrated and co-constructed. Although the present studies did not directly assess early socialization practices, the findings collectively illuminate the mechanisms through which shame memories are recognized, shared, or silenced within the family system, and how maternal psychological characteristics may shape what daughters feel permitted to remember and to narrate during memory conversations. In this sense, the current dissertation contributes to a growing understanding of how shame, as a self-conscious and a profoundly social emotion, is not merely remembered in isolation, but is actively co-constructed within the relational fabric of mother-daughter interactions, with implications for how co-construction practices may be transmitted across generations.

## REFERENCES


Abell, E., & Gecas, V. (1997). Guilt, shame, and family socialization: A retrospective study. *Journal of Family Issues*, *18*(2), 99–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/019251397018002001

Adler, J. M. (2012). Living into the story: Agency and coherence in a longitudinal study of narrative identity development and mental health over the course of psychotherapy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(2), 367–389. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025289

Alea, N., & Bluck, S. (2003). Why are you telling me that? A conceptual model of the social function of autobiographical memory. *Memory*, *11*(2), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/741938207

Alessandri, S. M., & Lewis, M. (1996). Differences in pride and shame in maltreated and nonmaltreated preschoolers. *Child Development*, *67*(4), 1857. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131736

American Psychological Association. (2002). *Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists*. https://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines-archived.pdf

Andrews, J., Zaman, W., Merrill, N., Duke, M., & Fivush, R. (2015). Gender differences in adolescent birth narratives. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *4*(4), 356–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2015.10.002

Arnett, J. J. (2024). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (Third Edition). Oxford University Press.

Arriaga, R. I., Fenson, L., Cronan, T., & Pethick, S. J. (1998). Scores on the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory of children from low and middle-income families. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *19*(2), 209–223. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400010043

Avezum, M. D. M. de M., Altafim, E. R. P., & Linhares, M. B. M. (2023). Spanking and corporal punishment parenting practices and child development: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *24*(5), 3094–3111. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221124243

Aznar, A., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2013). Spanish parents' emotion talk and their children's understanding of emotion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00670

Aznar, A., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2015). Gender and age differences in parent–child emotion talk. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *33*(1), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12069

Baerger, D. R., & McAdams, D. P. (1999). Life story coherence and its relation to psychological well-being. *Narrative Inquiry*, *9*(1), 69–96. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.9.1.05bae

Bakır-Demir, T. (2021). *When My Parents Tell Their Stories: The Investigation of Vicarious Memories in the Family Context* [Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis]. University of Otago.

Bakır-Demir, T., Reese, E., & Şahin-Acar, B. (2020). How three generations narrate their vicarious family stories: Intrafamilial similarities, gender and cross-generational differences. *Memory*, *28*(4), 553–566. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2020.1749282

Bakır-Demir, T., Reese, E., Şahin-Acar, B., & Taumoepeau, M. (2023). How I remember my mother's story: A cross-national investigation of vicarious family stories in Turkey and New Zealand. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *54*(3), 340–364. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221132833

Bakır-Demir, T., Reese, E., Şahin-Acar, B., & Türsel, E. G. (2021). Vicarious family stories of Turkish young, middle-aged, and older adults: Are family stories related to well-being? *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *10*(3), 412–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2020.12.003

Banks, M. V., & Salmon, K. (2013). Reasoning about the self in positive and negative ways: Relationship to psychological functioning in young adulthood. *Memory*, *21*(1), 10–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2012.707213

Bauer, P. (2007). *Remembering the Times of Our Lives*. Psychology Press.

Bauer, P., Stennes, L., & Haight, J. (2003). Representation of the inner self in autobiography: Women's and men's use of internal states language in personal narratives. *Memory*, *11*(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/741938176

Baumeister, R. F., & Newman, L. S. (1994). How stories make sense of personal experiences: Motives that shape autobiographical narratives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*(6), 676–690. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294206006

Beck, A. T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Beck, A. T., Freeman, A., & Davis, D. D. (2004). *Cognitive therapy of personality disorders*. The Guilford Press.

Berntsen, D., Hoyle, R. H., & Rubin, D. C. (2019). The Autobiographical Recollection Test (ART): A measure of individual differences in autobiographical memory. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *8*(3), 305–318. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0101839

Berntsen, D., & Rubin, D. C. (2002). Emotionally charged autobiographical memories across the life span: The recall of happy, sad, traumatic and involuntary memories. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*(4), 636–652. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.17.4.636

Berntsen, D., & Rubin, D. C. (2006). The Centrality of Event Scale: A measure of integrating a trauma into one's identity and its relation to post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *44*(2), 219–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.01.009

Bishop, A., Younan, R., Low, J., & Pilkington, P. D. (2022). Early maladaptive schemas and depression in adulthood: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *29*(1), 111–130. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2630

Bittmann, F. (2020). The more similar, the better? How (mis)match between interviewers and respondents in survey situations affects item nonresponse and

data quality. *Survey Research Methods*, *14*(3), 301–323. https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2020.v14i3.7621

Blos, P. (1967). The Second Individuation Process of Adolescence. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, *22*(1), 162–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/00797308.1967.11822595

Bluck, S., Alea, N., Habermas, T., & Rubin, D. C. (2005). A TALE of three functions: The self–reported uses of autobiographical memory. *Social Cognition*, *23*(1), 91–117. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.23.1.91.59198

Bohanek, J. G., & Fivush, R. (2010). Personal narratives, well-being, and gender in adolescence. *Cognitive Development, Autobiographical Memory: Context and Consequences*, *25*(4), 368–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2010.08.003

Bohanek, J. G., Fivush, R., & Walker, E. (2005). Memories of positive and negative emotional events. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *19*(1), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1064

Bohanek, J. G., Fivush, R., Zaman, W., Lepore, C. E., Merchant, S., & Duke, M. P. (2009). Narrative interaction in family dinnertime conversations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *55*(4), 488–515. https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.0.0031

Borrelli, G., Lamberti Zanardi, A., Scognamiglio, C., Cinquegrana, V., & Perrella, R. (2024). The relationship between childhood interpersonal and non-interpersonal trauma and autobiographical memory: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1328835

Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds: I. Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *130*, 201–210. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.130.3.201

Boyacıoğlu, I., & Akfirat, S. (2015). Development and psychometric properties of a new measure for memory phenomenology: The Autobiographical Memory Characteristics Questionnaire. *Memory*, *23*(7), 1070–1092. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2014.953960

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bretherton, I., Fritz, J., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Ridgeway, D. (1986). Learning to Talk about Emotions: A Functionalist Perspective. *Child Development*, *57*(3), 529. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130334

Brewin, C. R., MacCarthy, B., & Furnham, A. (1989). Social support in the face of adversity: The role of cognitive appraisal. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *23*(3), 354–372. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(89)90007-X

Bruner, J. (1990). Culture and human development: A new look. *Human Development*, *33*(6), 344–355. https://doi.org/10.1159/000276535

Calvete, E. (2014). Emotional abuse as a predictor of early maladaptive schemas in adolescents: Contributions to the development of depressive and social anxiety symptoms. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(4), 735–746. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.10.014

Calvete, E., Orue, I., & Hankin, B. L. (2013). Transactional relationships among cognitive vulnerabilities, stressors, and depressive symptoms in adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *41*(3), 399–410. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-012-9691-y

Catania, J. A., Binson, D., Canchola, J., Pollack, L. M., Hauck, W., & Coates, T. J. (1996). Effects of interviewer gender, interviewer choice, and item wording on responses to questions concerning sexual behavior. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *60*(3), 345–375. https://doi.org/10.1086/297758

Chen, Y., Cullen, E., Fivush, R., Wang, Q., & Reese, E. (2021). Mother, father, and I: A cross-cultural investigation of adolescents' intergenerational narratives and well-being. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *10*(1), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2020.08.011

Chodorow, N. (1978a). Mothering, Object-Relations, and the Female Oedipal Configuration. *Feminist Studies*, *4*(1), 137. https://doi.org/10.2307/3177630

Chodorow, N. (1978b). *The reproduction of mothering*. University of California Press.

Cicchetti, D. V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, *6*(4), 284–290. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.284

Claesson, K., & Sohlberg, S. (2002). Internalized shame and early interactions characterized by indifference, abandonment and rejection: Replicated findings. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *9*(4), 277–284. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.331

Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2011). Introducing the GASP scale: A new measure of guilt and shame proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(5), 947–966. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022641

Contractor, A. A., Greene, T., Dolan, M., Weiss, N. H., & Armour, C. (2020). Relation between PTSD symptom clusters and positive memory characteristics: A network perspective. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *69*, 102157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2019.102157

Conway, M. A. (2005). Memory and the self. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *53*(4), 594–628. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.08.005

Conway, M. A., & Pleydell-Pearce, C. W. (2000). The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review*, *107*(2), 261–288. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.107.2.261

Conway, M. A., Singer, J. A., & Tagini, A. (2004). The self and autobiographical memory: Correspondence and coherence. *Social Cognition*, *22*(5), 491–529. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.22.5.491.50768

Çeviker, G. (2022). *Emotionally Charged And Shared Memory Conversations of Mother-Child Dyads: The Role of Mothers' Early Maladaptive Schemas* [Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Middle East Technical University].

Darwin, C. (1965). *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. University of Chicago Press.

De Hooge, I. E., Zeelenberg, M., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2010). Restore and protect motivations following shame. *Cognition & Emotion*, *24*(1), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930802584466

Delton, A. W., & Robertson, T. E. (2016). How the mind makes welfare tradeoffs: Evolution, computation, and emotion. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *7*, 12–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.06.006

Dollaghan, C. A., Campbell, T. F., Paradise, J. L., Feldman, H. M., Janosky, J. E., Pitcairn, D. N., & Kurs-Lasky, M. (1999). Maternal education and measures of early speech and language. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research: JSLHR*, *42*(6), 1432–1443. https://doi.org/10.1044/jslhr.4206.1432

Dostal, A. L., & Pilkington, P. D. (2023). Early maladaptive schemas and obsessive-compulsive disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *336*, 42–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.05.053

Duke, M. P., Lazarus, A., & Fivush, R. (2008). Knowledge of family history as a clinically useful index of psychological well-being and prognosis: A brief report. *Psychotherapy*, *45*(2), 268–272. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-3204.45.2.268

Dunn, J., Brown, J., Slomkowski, C., Tesla, C., & Youngblade, L. (1991). Young children's understanding of other people's feelings and beliefs: Individual differences and their antecedents. *Child Development*, *62*(6), 1352–1366. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01610.x

Durrant, G. B., Groves, R. M., Staetsky, L., & Steele, F. (2010). Effects of interviewer attitudes and behaviors on refusal in household surveys. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *74*(1), 1–36.

Durrant, J., & Ensom, R. (2012). Physical punishment of children: Lessons from 20 years of research. *CMAJ*, *184*(12), 1373–1377. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.101314

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry*, *9*(4), 241–273. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0904_1

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Ellsworth, P. (1972). *Emotion in the human face: Guidelines for research and an integration of findings* (pp. xii, 191). Pergamon Press.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. Norton.

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). Guilford Press.

Fernald, A., Marchman, V. A., & Weisleder, A. (2013). SES differences in language processing skill and vocabulary are evident at 18 months. *Developmental Science, 16*(2), 234–248. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12019

Ferreira, C., Matos, M., Duarte, C., & Pinto-Gouveia, J. (2014). Shame memories and eating psychopathology: The buffering effect of self-compassion. *European Eating Disorders Review, 22*(6), 487–494. https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2322

Fischer, K. W., & Tangney, J. P. (1995). Self-conscious emotions and the affect system: Dynamics of self-evaluation and social interaction. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 3–22). The Guilford Press.

Fivush, R. (2004). The silenced self: Constructing self from memories spoken and unspoken. In D. R. Beike, J. M. Lampinen, & D. A. Behrend (Eds.), *The Self and Memory* (pp. 75–93). Psychology Press.

Fivush, R. (2007). Maternal reminiscing style and children's developing understanding of self and emotion. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 35*, 37–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-006-0065-1

Fivush, R. (2008). Remembering and reminiscing: How individual lives are constructed in family narratives. *Memory Studies, 1*(1), 49–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698007083888

Fivush, R. (2010). Speaking silence: The social construction of silence in autobiographical and cultural narratives. *Memory, 18*(2), 88–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210903029404

Fivush, R. (2011). The development of autobiographical memory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 559–582. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131702

Fivush, R. (2013). Gender and Voice in Emotional Reminiscing. In K. Lagattuta (Ed.), *Children and Emotion* (pp. 81–94). Karger. https://karger.com/books/book/295/chapter/5492830/Gender-and-Voice-in-Emotional-Reminiscing

Fivush, R. (2019). *Family Narratives and the Development of an Autobiographical Self: Social and Cultural Perspectives on Autobiographical Memory*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429029158

Fivush, R., Berlin, L. J., Sales, J. M., Mennuti-Washburn, J., & Cassidy, J. (2003). Functions of parent-child reminiscing about emotionally negative events. *Memory (Hove, England)*, *11*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/741938209

Fivush, R., Bohanek, J. G., Marin, K., & Sales, J. M. (2009). Emotional memory and memory for emotions. In *Flashbulb memories: New issues and new perspectives* (pp. 163–184). Psychology Press.

Fivush, R., Brotman, M. A., Buckner, J. P., & Goodman, S. H. (2000). Gender differences in parent–child emotion narratives. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, *42*(3–4), 233–253. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007091207068

Fivush, R., & Buckner, J. P. (2003). Creating gender and identity through autobiographical narratives. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 149–167). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Fivush, R., Habermas, T., Waters, T. E. A., & Zaman, W. (2011). The making of autobiographical memory: Intersections of culture, narratives and identity. *International Journal of Psychology: Journal International De Psychologie*, *46*(5), 321–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2011.596541

Fivush, R., Haden, C. A., & Reese, E. (2006). Elaborating on elaborations: Role of maternal reminiscing style in cognitive and socioemotional development. *Child Development*, *77*(6), 1568–1588. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00960.x

Fivush, R., Marin, K., McWilliams, K., & Bohanek, J. G. (2009). Family Reminiscing Style: Parent Gender and Emotional Focus in Relation to Child Well-Being. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *10*(3), 210–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248370903155866

Fivush, R., McAnally, H., & Reese, E. (2019). Family stories and family secrets. *The Journal of New Zealand Studies*, (NS29). https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.v0iNS29.6259

Fivush, R., & Nelson, K. (2006). Parent-child reminiscing locates the self in the past. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *24*(1), 235–251. https://doi.org/10.1348/026151005X57747

Fivush, R., & Wang, Q. (2005). *Emotion Talk in Mother-Child Conversations of the Shared Past: The Effects of Culture, Gender, and Event Valence*. *6*(4), 489–506. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327647jcd0604_3

Gallo, L. C., Bogart, L. M., Vranceanu, A.-M., & Matthews, K. A. (2005). Socioeconomic status, resources, psychological experiences, and emotional responses: A test of the reserve capacity model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(2), 386–399. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.386

Gibson, M., & Francis, A. J. P. (2019). Intergenerational Transfer of Early Maladaptive Schemas in Mother–Daughter Dyads, and the Role of Parenting. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *43*, 737–747. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-018-09994-3

Gilbert, P. (1998). What is shame? Some core issues and controversies. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 3–38). Oxford University Press.

Gilbert, P. (2003). *Evolution, social roles, and the differences in shame and guilt*. *70*(4), 1205–1230.

Gilbert, P., & McGuire, M. (1998). Shame, social roles and status: The psychobiological continuum from monkey to human. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 99–125). Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Penguin.

Graneist, A., & Habermas, T. (2020). Exploring gender differences in the use of internal state language in mother-adolescent reminiscing. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, *82*(5–6), 321–335. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-01053-9

Grysman, A., & Hudson, J. A. (2010). Abstracting and extracting: Causal coherence and the development of the life story. *Memory*, *18*(6), 565–580. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2010.493890

Grysman, A., & Hudson, J. A. (2013). Gender differences in autobiographical memory: Developmental and methodological considerations. *Developmental Review*, *33*(3), 239–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2013.07.004

Grysman, A., & Mansfield, C. D. (2020). Narrative methods in autobiographical memory. In S. Gülgöz & B. Şahin-Acar (Eds.), *Autobiographical Memory Development* (pp. 67–82). Routledge.

Grysman, A., Prabhakar, J., Anglin, S. M., & Hudson, J. A. (2013). The time travelling self: Comparing self and other in narratives of past and future events. *Consciousness and Cognition: An International Journal*, *22*(3), 742–755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2013.04.010

Habermas, T., & Bluck, S. (2000). Getting a life: The emergence of the life story in adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(5), 748–769. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.748

Habermas, T., & de Silveira, C. (2008). The development of global coherence in life narratives across adolescence: Temporal, causal, and thematic aspects. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*(3), 707–721. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.707

Habermas, T., & Diel, V. (2013). The episodicity of verbal reports of personally significant autobiographical memories: Vividness correlates with narrative text quality more than with detailedness or memory specificity. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2013.00110

Hermans, H. J. M. (2006). The self as a theater of voices: Disorganization and reorganization of a position repertoire. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, *19*(2), 147–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720530500508779

Hirst, W., & Manier, D. (2008). Towards a psychology of collective memory. *Memory*, *16*(3), 183–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701811912

Ho, L. L. K., Li, W. H. C., Cheung, A. T., Luo, Y., Xia, W., & Chung, J. O. K. (2022). Impact of Poverty on Parent–Child Relationships, Parental Stress, and Parenting Practices. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.849408

Hoff, E. (2013). Interpreting the early language trajectories of children from low-SES and language minority homes: Implications for closing achievement gaps. *Developmental Psychology, 49*(1), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027238

Hoglund, C. L., & Nicholas, K. B. (1995). Shame, guilt, and anger in college students exposed to abusive family environments. *Journal of Family Violence, 10*(2), 141–157. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02110597

Houle, I., & Philippe, F. L. (2020). Is the negative always that bad? Or how emotion regulation and integration of negative memories can positively affect well-being. *Journal of Personality*, *88*(5), 965–977. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12544

İlgün, Y. (2024). *Something good, something bad, something drastic: Personal and vicarious high point, low point and turning point memories of young couples* [Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Middle East Technical University].

İmamoğlu, E. O. (1998). Individualism and collectivism in a model and scale of Balanced Differentiation and Integration. *The Journal of Psychology, 132*(1), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989809599268

İmamoğlu, E. O. (2003). Individuation and relatedness: Not opposing but distinct and complementary. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 129*(4), 367–402.

Johnson, W., & Krueger, R. F. (2006). How money buys happiness: Genetic and environmental processes linking finances and life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(4), 680–691. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.680

Joslyn, S., Carlin, L., & Loftus, E. F. (1997). Remembering and forgetting childhood sexual abuse. *Memory*, *5*(6), 703–724. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/741941550

Jovev, M., & Jackson, H. J. (2004). Early maladaptive schemas in personality disordered individuals. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *18*(5), 467–478. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.18.5.467.51325

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Keltner, D., & Harker, L. (1998). The forms and functions of the nonverbal signal of shame. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 78–98). Oxford University Press.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic Data Analysis*. The Guilford Press.

Kim, S., Thibodeau, R., & Jorgensen, R. S. (2011). Shame, guilt, and depressive symptoms: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(1), 68–96. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021466

Klein, S. B., & Loftus, J. (1988). The nature of self-referent encoding: The contributions of elaborative and organizational processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*(1), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.1.5

Köber, C., Schmiedek, F., & Habermas, T. (2015). Characterizing lifespan development of three aspects of coherence in life narratives: A cohort-sequential study. *Developmental Psychology*, *51*(2), 260–275. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038668

Kopala-Sibley, D. C., Mongrain, M., & Zuroff, D. C. (2013). A lifespan perspective on dependency and self-criticism: Age-related differences from 18 to 59. *Journal of Adult Development*, *20*(3), 126–141. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-013-9163-9

Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., & Keltner, D. (2009). Social class, sense of control, and social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(6), 992–1004. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016357

Kuebli, J., & Fivush, R. (1992). Gender differences in parent-child conversations about past emotions. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, *27*(11–12), 683–698. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02651097

Kulkofsky, S., Wang, Q., & Koh, J. B. K. (2009). Functionss of memory sharing and mother-child reminiscing behaviors: Individual and cultural variations. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *10*(1–2), 92–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248370903041231

Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1998). The sense of control as a moderator of social class differences in health and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 763–773. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.74.3.763

Laible, D. (2011). Does it matter if preschool children and mothers discuss positive vs. negative events during reminiscing? Links with mother-reported attachment, family emotional climate, and socioemotional development. *Social Development, 20*(2), 394–411. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2010.00584.x

Lansford, J. E. (2010). The special problem of cultural differences in effects of corporal punishment. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 73*(2), 89–106.

Leaper, C., Anderson, K. J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34*(1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.1.3

Lewis, M. (1992). *Shame: The exposed self*. The Free Press.

Lewis, M. (2016). The emergence of human emotions. In L. F. Barrett, M. Lewis, & J. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *The handbook of emotions* (pp. 272–292). The Guilford Press.

Li, K., Waters, T. E. A., & Bosmans, G. (2025). Late adolescents' early maladaptive schemas: Are they longitudinally linked with middle childhood temperament over and above attachment? *Research on Child and Adolescent Psychopathology, 53*(1), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-024-01256-z

Liang, R., & Van Leeuwen, K. (2024). Pre-separation mother–child relationship and adjustment behaviors of young children left behind in rural China: Pathways through distant mothering and current mother–child relationship quality. *Behavioral Sciences, 14*(12), 1193. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14121193

Lind, M., & Thomsen, D. K. (2018). Functions of personal and vicarious life stories: Identity and empathy. *Memory, 26*(5), 672–682. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2017.1395054

Loader, P. (1998). Such a shame—A consideration of shame and shaming mechanisms in families. *Child Abuse Review, 7*(1), 44–57.

https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0852(199801/02)7:1%3C44::AID-CAR334%3E3.0.CO;2-7

Lorenz, K. (1965). *Evolution and the modification of behavior*. University of Chicago Press.

Luchetti, M., & Sutin, A. R. (2018). Age differences in autobiographical memory across the adult lifespan: Older adults report stronger phenomenology. *Memory*, *26*(1), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2017.1335326

Lysaker, P. H., & Lysaker, J. T. (2006). A typology of narrative impoverishment in schizophrenia: Implications for understanding the processes of establishing and sustaining dialogue in individual psychotherapy. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *19*(1), 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070600673703

Lyubomirsky, S., Sousa, L., & Dickerhoof, R. (2006). The costs and benefits of writing, talking, and thinking about life's triumphs and defeats. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(4), 692–708. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.692

Macdonald, J. (1998). Disclosing Shame. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 141–160). Oxford University Press.

Mącik, D., Chodkiewicz, J., & Bielicka, D. (2016). Trans-generational transfer of early maladaptive schemas—A preliminary study performed on a nonclinical group. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, *4*(3), 132–145. https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2016.60411

Maggi, S., Zaccaria, V., Breda, M., Romani, M., Aceti, F., Giacchetti, N., Ardizzone, I., & Sogos, C. (2022). A narrative review about prosocial and antisocial behavior in childhood: The relationship with shame and moral development. *Children*, *9*(10), 1556. https://doi.org/10.3390/children9101556

Mahler, F., Ross, J., O'Rourke, R. A., & Covell, J. W. (1975). Effects of changes in preload, afterload and inotropic state on ejection and isovolumic phase measures of contractility in the conscious dog. *The American Journal of Cardiology*, *35*(5), 626–634. https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9149(75)90048-X

Main, M. (2000). The organized categories of infant, child, and adult attachment: Flexible vs. inflexible attention under attachment-related stress. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *48*(4), 1055–1096; discussion 1175-1187. https://doi.org/10.1177/00030651000480041801

Mariani, R., Di Trani, M., Negri, A., & Tambelli, R. (2020). Linguistic analysis of autobiographical narratives in unipolar and bipolar mood disorders in light of multiple code theory. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *273*, 24–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.03.170

Mariani, R., Giovanna, M. M., Alessia, R., Isabella, M., Michela, D. T., & Massimo, P. (2025). The weight of words: An analysis of autobiographical narratives and psychopathological measures in anorexia nervosa. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *54*(3), 32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-025-10150-8

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*(2), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.35.2.63

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*(4), 420–430. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610375557

Marshall, S., & Reese, E. (2022). Growing memories: Benefits of an early childhood maternal reminiscing intervention for emerging adults' turning point narratives and well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *99*, 104262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2022.104262

Matos, M., Duarte, J., & Pinto-Gouveia, J. (2017). The origins of fears of compassion: Shame and lack of safeness memories, fears of compassion and psychopathology. *The Journal of Psychology*, *151*(8), 804–819. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2017.1393380

Matos, M., & Pinto-Gouveia, J. (2006). *Shame Experience Interview (SEI)* [Unpublished Manuscript].

Matos, M., & Pinto-Gouveia, J. (2010). Shame as a traumatic memory. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *17*(4), 299–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.659

Matos, M., & Pinto-Gouveia, J. (2014). Shamed by a parent or by others: The role of attachment in shame memories relation to depression. *International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy*, *14*(2), 217–244.

Matos, M., Pinto-Gouveia, J., & Costa, V. (2013). Understanding the importance of attachment in shame traumatic memory relation to depression: The impact of emotion regulation processes. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *20*(2), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.786

Matos, M., Pinto-Gouveia, J., & Duarte, C. (2012). Above and beyond emotional valence: The unique contribution of central and traumatic shame memories to psychopathology vulnerability. *Memory (Hove, England)*, *20*(5), 461–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2012.680962

Matos, M., Pinto-Gouveia, J., & Duarte, C. (2013). Internalizing early memories of shame and lack of safeness and warmth: The mediating role of shame on depression. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *41*(4), 479–493. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465812001099

Matos, M., Pinto-Gouveia, J., Gilbert, P., Duarte, C., & Figueiredo, C. (2015). The Other As Shamer Scale – 2: Development and validation of a short version of a measure of external shame. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *74*, 6–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.037

McAdams, D. P. (2001). The psychology of life stories. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*(2), 100–122. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.2.100

McAdams, D. P. (2003). Identity and the life story. In R. Fivush & C. A. Haden (Eds.), *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 187–207). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

McAdams, D. P., Hoffman, B. J., Day, R., & Mansfield, E. D. (1996). Themes of agency and communion in significant autobiographical scenes. *Journal of Personality*, *64*(2), 339–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1996.tb00514.x

McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*(3), 233–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413475622

McCabe, A., & Peterson, C. (1991). Getting the story parental styles of narrative elicitation and developing narrative skills. In A. McCabe & C. Peterson (Eds.), *Developing Narrative Structure* (pp. 217–253). Lawrence Erlbaum. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1728606

McLean, K. C. (2008). Stories of the young and the old: Personal continuity and narrative identity. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*(1), 254–264. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.254

McLean, K. C. (2015). *The co-authored self: Family stories and the construction of personal identity*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199995745.001.0001

McLean, K. C. (2016). *The Co-authored Self: Family Stories and the Construction of Personal Identity*. Oxford University Press.

McLean, K. C., Breen, A. V., & Fournier, M. A. (2010). Constructing the self in early, middle, and late adolescent boys: Narrative identity, individuation, and well-being. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *20*(1), 166–187. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2009.00633.x

McLean, K. C., & Lilgendahl, J. P. (2008). Why recall our highs and lows: Relations between memory functions, age, and well-being. *Memory*, *16*(7), 751–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210802215385

McLean, K. C., Lilgendahl, J. P., Fordham, C., Alpert, E., Marsden, E., Szymanowski, K., & McAdams, D. P. (2018). Identity development in cultural context: The role of deviating from master narratives. *Journal of Personality*, *86*(4), 631–651. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12341

McLean, K. C., Pasupathi, M., & Pals, J. L. (2007). Selves creating stories creating selves: A process model of self-development. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc*, *11*(3), 262–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307301034

McLean, K. C., & Syed, M. (2016). Personal, master, and alternative narratives: An integrative framework for understanding identity development in context. *Human Development*, *58*(6), 318–349. https://doi.org/10.1159/000445817

Merrill, N., & Fivush, R. (2016). Intergenerational narratives and identity across development. *Developmental Review*, *40*, 72–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.03.001

Merrill, N., Waters, T. E. A., & Fivush, R. (2016). Connecting the self to traumatic and positive events: Links to identity and well-being. *Memory*, *24*(10), 1321–1328. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2015.1104358

Mills, R. S. L. (2003a). Possible antecedents and developmental implications of shame in young girls. *Infant and Child Development*, *12*(4), 329–349. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.308

Mills, R. S. L. (2003b). Possible antecedents and developmental implications of shame in young girls. *Infant and Child Development*, *12*(4), 329–349. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.308

Mukherjee, J., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2023). Dynamics of gender identity and gender difference: Influence of child-rearing practices. In Chakraborty, N. Mishra, A. Natarajan, & B. Chatterjee (Eds.), *Gender Equality from a Modern Perspective*. Apple Academic Press.

Muris, P. (2006). Maladaptive schemas in non-clinical adolescents: Relations to perceived parental rearing behaviours, Big Five personality factors and psychopathological symptoms. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *13*(6), 405–413. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.506

Nathanson, D. L. (1994). *Shame and pride: Affect, sex, and the birth of the self* (44583rd edition). W. W. Norton & Company.

Nathanson, D. L. (1996). *Knowing feeling: Affect, script, and psychotherapy*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Nelson, K. (2003). Self and social functions: Individual autobiographical memory and collective narrative. *Memory*, *11*(2), 125–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/741938203

Nelson, K., & Fivush, R. (2004). The emergence of autobiographical memory: A social cultural developmental theory. *ResearchGate*, *111*(2), 486–511. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.111.2.486

Nicol, A., Mak, A. S., Murray, K., Walker, I., & Buckmaster, D. (2020). The relationships between early maladaptive schemas and youth mental health: A systematic review. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *44*(4), 715–751. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-020-10092-6

Oftedal, A., Larsen, L., & Helland, M. S. (2025). Economic hardship during the COVID-19 pandemic and trajectories of parent–child relationships: A prospective longitudinal study among Norwegian families. *Family Process*, *64*(2), e70031. https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.70031

Osher, D., Cantor, P., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, T. (2020). Drivers of human development: How relationships and context shape learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(1), 6–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1398650

Pascual-Leone, A., & Greenberg, L. S. (2007). Emotional processing in experiential therapy: Why "the only way out is through." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *75*(6), 875–887. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.75.6.875

Pasupathi, M. (2001). The social construction of the personal past and its implications for adult development. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(5), 651–672. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.5.651

Pasupathi, M. (2003). Emotion regulation during social remembering: Differences between emotions elicited during an event and emotions elicited when talking about it. *Memory*, *11*(2), 151–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/741938212

Pasupathi, M. (2007). Telling and the remembered self: Linguistic differences in memories for previously disclosed and previously undisclosed events. *Memory*, *15*(3), 258–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701256456

Pasupathi, M., Lucas, S., & Coombs, A. (2002). Conversational functions of autobiographical remembering: Long-married couples talk about conflicts and pleasant topics. *Discourse Processes*, *34*(2), 163–192. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326950DP3402_3

Petersen, A. (2019). Alle er potentielt udsatte [Everyone is potentially marginalized]. In A. Görlich, M. Pless, N. Katznelson, & L. Graversen (Eds.), *Ny udsathed i ungdomslivet—11 forskere om den stigende mistrivsel blandt unge [New form of marginalization among youth – 11 researchers on the rise in mental health issues among youth]* (pp. 79–94). Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Peterson, C., & Roberts, C. (2003). Like mother, like daughter: Similarities in narrative style. *Developmental Psychology*, *39*(3), 551–562. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.3.551

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.

Pillemer, D. B., Steiner, K. L., Kuwabara, K. J., Thomsen, D. K., & Svob, C. (2015). Vicarious memories. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *36*, 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2015.06.010

Pillemer, D. B., Thomsen, D. K., & Fivush, R. (2024). Vicarious memory promotes successful adaptation and enriches the self. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *13*(2), 159–171. https://doi.org/10.1037/mac0000167

Pinto-Gouveia, J., & Matos, M. (2011). Can shame memories become a key to identity? The centrality of shame memories predicts psychopathology. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *25*(2), 281–290. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1689

Pond, E., & Peterson, C. (2020). Highly emotional vicarious memories. *Memory*, *28*(8), 1051–1066. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2020.1812663

Porter, S., & Birt, A. R. (2001). Is traumatic memory special ? A comparison of traumatic memory characteristics with memory for other emotional life experiences. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *15*(7), S101–S117. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.766

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2020). Shaming interrogatives: Admonishments, the social psychology of emotion, and discursive practices of behaviour modification in family mealtimes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *59*(2), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12346

Pratt, M. W., Norris, J. E., Hebblethwaite, S., & Arnold, M. L. (2008). Intergenerational transmission of values: Family generativity and adolescents'

narratives of parent and grandparent value teaching. *Journal of Personality*, *76*(2), 171–198. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00483.x

Qiang, R., Li, X., & Han, Q. (2021). The relationship between social class and generalized trust: The mediating role of sense of control. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.729083

R Core Team. (2016). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* [Computer software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.r-project.org/

Rafaeli, E., Bernstein, D. P., & Young, J. (2011). *Schema Therapy*. Routledge. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2005798

Rasmussen, A. S., & Berntsen, D. (2009). Emotional valence and the functions of autobiographical memories: Positive and negative memories serve different functions. *Memory & Cognition*, *37*(4), 477–492. https://doi.org/10.3758/mc.37.4.477

Reese, E. (2002). Social factors in the development of autobiographical memory: The state of the art. *Social Development*, *11*(1), 124–142. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00190

Reese, E., & Brown, N. (2000). Reminiscing and recounting in the preschool years. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *14*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0720(200001)14:1%3C1::AID-ACP625%3E3.0.CO;2-G

Reese, E., Fivush, R., Merrill, N., Wang, Q., & McAnally, H. (2017). Adolescents' intergenerational narratives across cultures. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(6), 1142–1153. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000309

Reese, E., Haden, C. A., Baker-Ward, L., Bauer, P., Fivush, R., & Ornstein, P. A. (2011). Coherence of personal narratives across the lifespan: A multidimensional model and coding method. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *12*(4), 424–462. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2011.587854

Reese, E., Haden, C. A., & Fivush, R. (1993). Mother-child conversations about the past: Relationships of style and memory over time. *Cognitive Development*, *8*(4), 403–430. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2014(05)80002-4

Reese, E., Jack, F., & White, N. (2010). Origins of adolescents' autobiographical memories. *Cognitive Development*, *25*, 352–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2010.08.006

Reese, E., Meins, E., Fernyhough, C., & Centifanti, L. (2019). Origins of mother–child reminiscing style. *Development and Psychopathology*, *31*(2), 631–642. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579418000172

Reese, E., Myftari, E., McAnally, H. M., Chen, Y., Neha, T., Wang, Q., Jack, F., & Robertson, S. J. (2017). Telling the tale and living well: Adolescent narrative identity, personality traits, and well-being across cultures. *Child Development*, *88*(2), 612–628. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12618

Reese, E., & Neha, T. (2015). Let's korero (talk): The practice and functions of reminiscing among mothers and children in Maori families. *Memory*, *23*(1), 99–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2014.929705

Retzinger, S. (1991). *Violent emotions: Shame and rage in marrital quarrels*. Sage.

Richter, D., & Kunzmann, U. (2011). Age differences in three facets of empathy: Performance-based evidence. *Psychology and Aging*, *26*(1), 60–70. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021138

Rimé, B. (2007). The social sharing of emotion as an interface between individual and collective processes in the construction of emotional climates. *Journal of Social Issues*, *63*(2), 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00510.x

Rimé, B. (2009). Emotion elicits the social sharing of emotion: Theory and empirical review. *Emotion Review*, *1*(1), 60–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073908097189

Rimé, B., Mesquita, B., Boca, S., & Philippot, P. (1991). Beyond the emotional event: Six studies on the social sharing of emotion. *Cognition & Emotion*, *5*(5–6), 435–465. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939108411052

Rogers, T. B., Kuiper, N. A., & Kirker, W. S. (1977). Self-reference and the encoding of personal information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*(9), 677–688. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.35.9.677

Ross, M., & Wang, Q. (2010). Why we remember and what we remember: Culture and autobiographical memory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*(4), 401–409. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610375555

Rosseel, Y. (2012). **lavaan**: An *R* Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(2). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02

Rubin, D. C. (2005). A basic-systems approach to autobiographical memory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *14*(2), 79–83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00339.x

Rubin, D. C. (2006). The basic-systems model of episodic memory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, *1*(4), 277–311. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00017.x

Rubin, D. C., Schrauf, R. W., & Greenberg, D. L. (2003). Belief and recollection of autobiographical memories. *Memory & Cognition*, *31*(6), 887–901. https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03196443

Şahin, B., & Mebert, C. J. (2013). The role of culture and self-construal in autobiographical memories of US and Turkish college students. *Memory*, *21*(8), 1004–1017. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2013.774418

Şahin, N. H., & Şahin, N. (1992). *Guilt, shame and depression in adolescence*. World Congress of Cognitive Therapy, Toronto, Canada.

Şahin-Acar, B., Bahtiyar-Saygan, B., Alsancak-Akbulut, C., & Sagel-Cetiner, E. (2019). Reunion after a long day: Mother-child dyads' unshared memory conversations. *Cognitive Development*, *52*, 100822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2019.100822

Şahin-Acar, B., Bakır, T., & Kuş, E. G. (2017). Intrafamilial similarities and cross-generational differences in the earliest childhood memories of daughters, mothers, and grandmothers. *Memory*, *25*(8), 978–985. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2016.1239741

Şahin-Acar, B., & Leichtman, M. D. (2015a). Mother–child memory conversations and self-construal in Eastern Turkey, Western Turkey and the USA. *Memory*, *23*(1), 69–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2014.935437

Şahin-Acar, B., & Leichtman, M. D. (2015b). Mother–child memory conversations and self-construal in Eastern Turkey, Western Turkey and the USA. *Memory*, *23*(1), 69–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2014.935437

Sales, J. M., Fivush, R., & Peterson, C. (2003). Parental reminiscing about positive and negative events. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *4*(2), 185–209. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327647JCD0402_03

Salmon, K., & Reese, E. (2015). Talking (or Not talking) about the past: The influence of parent–child conversation about negative experiences on children's memories. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *29*(6), 791–801. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3186

Santrock, J. W. (2023). *Life-Span Development*. McGraw Hill. https://www.mheducation.com/highered/product/life-span-development-santrock.html

Schank, R. C. (1995). *Tell me a story: Narrative and intelligence*. Northwestern University Press.

Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1995). Knowledge and memory: The real story. In R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Ed.), *Knowledge and memory: The real story* (pp. 1–85). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Schröder, L., Keller, H., & Kleis, A. (2013). Parent-child conversations in three urban middle-class contexts: Mothers and fathers reminisce with their daughters and sons in Costa Rica, Mexico, and Germany. *Actualidades En Psicología*, *27*(115), 49–73. https://doi.org/10.15517/ap.v27i115.9885

Schug, J., Yuki, M., & Maddux, W. (2010). Relational mobility explains between- and within-culture differences in self-disclosure to close friends. *Psychological Science, 21*(10), 1471–1478. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610382786

Shimanoff, S. B. (1984). Commonly named emotions in everyday conversations. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *58*(2), 514–514. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1984.58.2.514

Soygüt, G., Karaosmanoğlu, A., & Çakır, Z. (2009). Erken dönem uyumsuz şemaların değerlendirilmesi: Young Şema Ölçeği Kısa Form-3'ün psikometrik özelliklerine ilişkin bir inceleme. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, *20*(1), 75.

Sparrowe, R. T. (2020). LMX and welfare trade-off ratios: An evolutionary perspective on leader-member relations. *The Leadership Quarterly, Special Issue on Evolution and Biology of Leadership*, *31*(2), 101271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.11.001

Steiner, K. L. (2024). Positive and negative vicarious memories in college students and adults. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *13*(3), 438–449. https://doi.org/10.1037/mac0000135

Stuewig, J., & McCloskey, L. A. (2005). The relation of child maltreatment to shame and guilt among adolescents: Psychological routes to depression and delinquency. *Child Maltreatment*, *10*(4), 324–336. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559505279308

Sutin, A. R., Luchetti, M., Aschwanden, D., Stephan, Y., & Terracciano, A. (2021). Sense of purpose in life, cognitive function, and the phenomenology of autobiographical memory. *Memory*, *29*(9), 1126–1135. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2021.1966472

Sutin, A. R., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Phenomenology of autobiographical memories: The Memory Experiences Questionnaire. *Memory*, *15*(4), 390–411. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701256654

Svane, R. P., Olesen, M. J. R., Kingo, O. S., & Krøjgaard, P. (2021). Gender and parental involvement in parent-child reminiscing in a Scandinavian sample. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *62*(2), 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12695

Sweatman, H., Lawrence, R., & Chai, X. J. (2022). Development of self-referential effect on memory recollection. *Child Development*, *93*(6), 1848–1859. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13826

Tamari, R., Aviezer, O., & Oppenheim, D. (2024). Early maternal guidance of mother-child emotion dialogues predicts adolescents' attachment representations: A longitudinal study. *Attachment & Human Development*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2024.2391310

Tangney, J., & Dearing, R. (2002). *Shame and Guilt*. Guilford Press.

Tangney, J. P. (1995). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-Conscious Emotions* (pp. 114–139). The Guilford Press.

Taylor, S. E. (1991). Asymmetrical effects of positive and negative events: The mobilization-minimization hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*(1), 67–85. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.67

Terwijn, H. (1993). *An emotion theoretical approach to shame: A study of shame experiences* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. University of Amsterdam.

Thomsen, D. K., Cowan, H. R., & McAdams, D. P. (2025). Mental illness and personal recovery: A narrative identity framework. *Clinical Psychology Review, 116*, 102546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2025.102546

Thomsen, D. K., & Pillemer, D. B. (2017). I know my story and i know your story: Developing a conceptual framework for vicarious life stories. *Journal of Personality*, *85*(4), 464–480. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12253

Topçu, D. (2019). *An Investigation of Reliability and Validity of The Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale with a Turkish Sample* [Unpublished Master's Thesis, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi].

Tõugu, P., Tulviste, T., Schröder, L., Keller, H., & De Geer, B. (2011). Socialization of past event talk: Cultural differences in maternal elaborative reminiscing. *Cognitive Development*, *26*(2), 142–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2010.12.004

Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review, 117*(2), 440–463. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018963

Tulving, E. (2002). Episodic memory: From mind to brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135114

Vanden Poel, L., & Hermans, D. (2019). Narrative coherence and identity: Associations with psychological well-being and internalizing symptoms. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 1171. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01171

Vernon-Feagans, L., Hammer, C., Miccio, A., & Manlove, E. (2001). Early language and literacy skills in low-income African American and Hispanic children. In S. B. Newman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 192–210). Guilford Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Wang, Q. (2001). Culture effects on adults' earliest childhood recollection and self-description: Implications for the relation between memory and the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(2), 220–233. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.220

Wang, Q. (2013). The cultured self and remembering. In P. J. Bauer & R. Fivush (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook on the development of children's memory* (pp. 605–625). Wiley-Blackwell.

Wang, Q. (2021). Cultural pathways and outcomes of autobiographical memory development. *Child Development Perspectives*, *15*(3), 196–202. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12423

Wang, Q., Doan, S. N., & Song, Q. (2010). Talking about internal states in mother–child reminiscing influences children's self-representations: A cross-cultural study. *Cognitive Development, Autobiographical Memory: Context and Consequences*, *25*(4), 380–393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2010.08.007

Wang, Q., & Fivush, R. (2005). Mother–child conversations of emotionally salient events: Exploring the functions of emotional reminiscing in European-American and Chinese families. *Social Development*, *14*(3), 473–495. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2005.00312.x

Wang, Q., Hou, Y., Koh, J. B. K., Song, Q., & Yang, Y. (2018). Culturally motivated remembering: The moderating role of culture for the relation of episodic memory to well-being. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *6*(6), 860–871. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702618784012

Wang, Q., & Leichtman, M. D. (2000). Same beginnings, different stories: A comparison of American and Chinese children's narratives. *Child Development*, *71*(5), 1329–1346. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00231

Wang, Q., & Song, Q. (2014). “Did you apologize?” Moral talk in European American and Chinese immigrant mother–child conversations of peer experiences. In C. Wainryb & H. Recchia (Eds.), *Talking about right and wrong: Parent-child conversations as contexts for moral development* (pp. 217–241). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139207072.012

Waters, T. E. A., Bohanek, J. G., Marin, K., & Fivush, R. (2013). Null’s the word: A comparison of memory quality for intensely negative and positive events. *Memory*, *21*(6), 633–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2012.745877

Waters, T. E. A., & Fivush, R. (2015). Relations between narrative coherence, identity, and psychological well-being in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Personality*, *83*(4), 441–451. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12120

Webb, M., Heisler, D., Call, S., Chickering, S. A., & Colburn, T. A. (2007). Shame, guilt, symptoms of depression, and reported history of psychological maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *31*, 1143–1153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.09.003

Welten, S. C. M., Zeelenberg, M., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2012). Vicarious shame. *Cognition & Emotion*, *26*(5), 836–846. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2011.625400

Wendel, C. J., Cundiff, J. M., Cribbet, M. R., Berryhill, M. B., & Smith, T. W. (2021). Early adversities and negative affect in young adulthood: Does family income matter? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *30*(12), 3040–3054. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-021-02108-w

Yenen, Z. B. (2023). *Adolescents’ Personal and Vicarious Life Stories: Thematic Coherence, Interpretations, and Connections* [Unpublished Master’s Thesis, Middle East Technical University].

Yıldırım, J., Kozak, E. D., & Türkarslan, K. K. (2020). The psychometric properties of the Turkish form of the Other as Shamer Scale-2. *Klinik Psikoloji Dergisi*, *5*(1), 13–26. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5455/kpd.26024438m000033

Yön, F. (2023). *Familial Memories of Young Adults: Do Family Climate and Self-Construals Predict Autobiographical Memories About the Family?* [Unpublished Master’s Thesis, Middle East Technical University].

Young, J. E. (1990). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema-focused approach*. Professional Resource Exchange, Inc.

Young, J. E., & Brown, G. (2005). *Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form; Version 3* [Dataset]. https://doi.org/10.1037/t67023-000

Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema Therapy: A Practitioner's Guide*. Guilford Press. https://www.guilford.com/books/Schema-Therapy/Young-Klosko-Weishaar/9781593853723?srsltid=AfmBOooXOYwbpFYuVhqSzFI7uZDkj-W3u9xl4EXuE4gL5ZVG3CIipJDw

Zaman, W., & Fivush, R. (2013). Stories of parents and self: Relations to adolescent attachment. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(11), 2047–2056. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032023

# APPENDICES

## A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

13 EKİM 2023

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

**Sayın** Doç. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN-ACAR

Danışmanlığını yürüttüğünüz Ekin Doğa KOZAK'ın ***"Investigating shame memories in young adults and their mothers"*** başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek **0448-ODTUİAEK-2023** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN
Başkan

Prof.Dr. İ. Semih AKÇOMAK
Üye

Doç. Dr. Ali Emre Turgut
Üye

Doç. Dr. Şerife SEVİNÇ
Üye

Doc.Dr. Murat Perit ÇAKIR
Üye

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Süreyya ÖZCAN KABASAKAL
Üye

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Müge GÜNDÜZ
Üye

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59


29 KASIM 2023

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

**Sayın** Doç. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN-ACAR

Danışmanlığını yürütttüğünüz Ekin Doğa KOZAK'ın *"Investigating shame memories in young adults and their mothers"* başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek 0474-ODTUİAEK-2023 protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN
Başkan

Prof.Dr. İ. Semih AKÇOMAK
Üye

Doç. Dr. Ali Emre Turgut
Üye

Doç. Dr. Şerife SEVİNÇ
Üye

Doç.Dr. Murat Perit ÇAKIR
Üye

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Süreyya ÖZCAN KABASAKAL
Üye

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Müge GÜNDÜZ
Üye

## B. INFORMED CONSENT

### Araştırmaya Gönüllü Katılım Formu

Bu araştırma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü öğretim üyesi Doç. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN-ACAR ve doktora öğrencisi Ekin Doğa KOZAK tarafından, Ekin Doğa KOZAK'ın doktora çalışması kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Bu form, sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

### Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Bu çalışmanın amacı, kadın üniversite öğrencileri ve onların annelerinin, otobiyografik anılarla alakalı deneyimlerini anlamaktır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda sizinle çevrimiçi platformda bir görüşme yapılacak ve bazı soruları yanıtlamanız istenecektir.

### Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Çalışmaya kadın üniversite öğrencileri ve onların anneleri katılabilirler. Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, bu anket çalışmasını tamamladıktan sonra sizinle telefon numaranız üzerinden irtibata geçilecek ve annenizle beraber olacağınız çevrimiçi görüşmenin planlaması yapılacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katılım çevrimiçi görüşmeyle beraber yaklaşık 30 dakika[2] sürmektedir.

### Sizlerden Topladığımız Bilgileri Nasıl Kullanacağız?

Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Ankette, sizden iletişim bilginiz çevrimiçi görüşmeyi ayarlayabilmek için istenecektir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

[2] Study 1 is estimated to require 10 minutes, while Study 2 and Study 3 are expected to take 20 and 30 minutes, respectively.

Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler toplu halde değerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Sağladığınız veriler iletişim bilgileri ile eşleştirilmeyecektir.

**Katılımınızla ilgili Bilmeniz Gerekenler**

Çalışma, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Çalışmanın objektif ve güvenilir sonuç verebilmesi için, soruları samimi olarak cevaplandırmanız son derece önemlidir. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Kendinize en yakın hissettiğiniz veya düşündüğünüz cevabı vermeniz yeterli olacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz: Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Ekin Doğa KOZAK ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.

## C. POST-NARRATIVE QUESTION

Bu anı yaşandığında siz kaç yaşındaydınız?

1. Bu olay esnasında kendiniz hakkında neler düşündünüz ve neler hissettiniz?
2. **Bu anı gerçekleştiği zaman**, aşağıdaki duygulardan hangisini ne yoğunlukta hissettiniz?

a. Utanç

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

b. Kaygı

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

c. Öfke

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

d. Aşağılanma

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

e. Rezil olma

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

f. Üzgünlük

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

g. Suçluluk

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

h. Başka?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

3. Bu olaydan sonra ne yaptınız? Olayla nasıl baş ettiniz?
4. Sizce ötekiler utancınızı fark etti mi?
    a. Evetse, sizce ne hissettiler?
5. Takip eden 4 hafta boyunca bu olayı ne sıklıkla düşündünüz?

| 0<br>Hiç | 1<br>Toplam 1-2 kez | 2<br>Haftada 1-3 kez | 3<br>Haftada 4-6 kez | 4<br>Her gün | 5<br>Her gün günde 1'den fazla |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. Hayatınız boyunca, bu olayla ilgili bir anda görüntülerin, duygularınızın ya da düşüncelerinizin aklınıza geldiği oldu mu?
7. Bu olayı daha önce birine anlattınız mı?
    a. Kime?
    b. Ne kadar zaman sonra?
    c. Ne sıklıkla?

- Bu anıyı ne sıklıkta hatırlamaktasınız?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hiç hatırlamam | | | Ne hatırlarım ne hatırlamam | | | Çok sık hatırlarım |

- Bu anıyı ne sıklıkta anlatırsınız?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hiç anlatmam | | | Ne anlatırım ne anlatmam | | | Çok sık anlatırım |

8. Şimdi günümüze gelmenizi istiyorum. Bu anıyı bugünkü siz olarak düşündüğünüzde yine aynı duyguları ne yoğunlukta hissettiğinizi öğrenmek istiyorum.

a. Utanç

| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |
|---|---|---|---|---|

b. Kaygı

| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |
|---|---|---|---|---|

c. Öfke

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

d. Aşağılanma

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

e. Rezil olma

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

f. Üzgünlük

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

g. Suçluluk

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

h. Başka?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 hiç yoğun değil | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 çok yoğun |

9. Anıya dair size bazı özellikler soracağım ve bunları bu sefer 7 puan üzerinden oylamanızı isteyeceğim.

- İlk olarak bu anı sizin için ne kadar önemli?

  1 hiç önemli değil 7 çok önemli olacak şekilde bu anıya kaç puan verirsiniz?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Hiç önemli değil | | | Ne önemli ne önemli değil | | | Çok önemli |

- Bu anı sizin için ne kadar olumlu veya olumsuz?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Çok olumsuz | | | Nötr | | | Çok olumlu |

- Bu anıyı paylaşmak sizin için ne kadar kolaydı?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Hiç kolay değildi | | | Nötr | | | Çok kolaydı |

- Bu anı sizin için ne kadar net?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Hiç net değil | | | | | | Çok net |

- Bu anı günümüze tarihsel olarak ne kadar uzak?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Çok eski bir tarihten | | | | | | Çok yeni deneyimlediğim bir olay |

- Bu anı sizin için ne kadar yoğun?

| Yoğunluk | 1 Aşırı hafif | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 Aşırı yoğun |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

- Bu anı sizin için ne kadar canlı?

| Canlılık | 1 Aşırı solgun | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 Aşırı canlı |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## D. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Çalışmanın bu bölümünde sizinle ilgili bazı temel bilgiler alınacaktır. Lütfen tüm bilgileri doğru bir şekilde doldurmaya çalışınız.

1) Yaşınız:

2) Şu an eğitim gördüğünüz seviye[3]/Eğitim seviyeniz[4]

○ İlkokul (1)

○ Ortaokul (2)

○ Lise (3)

○ Önlisans (4) (Hangi bölümde okuyorsunuz?)

○ Üniversite (5) (Hangi bölümde okuyorsunuz?)

○ Yüksek Lisans (6) (Hangi bölümde okuyorsunuz?)

○ Doktora (7) (Hangi bölümde okuyorsunuz?)

3) Çalışıyor musunuz?

4) Mesleğiniz :

5) Yaşamınızın büyük bölümünün geçtiği yer:

○ Büyükşehir (1)

○ İl Merkezi (2)

○ İlçe Merkezi (3)

○ Kasaba (4)

[3] The second and third questions were the questions for university students only, those who filled graduate schools where not included in the studies.
[4] This was the question for mothers only.

○ Köy (5)

6) Medeni Durumunuz:

○ Bekar (1)

○ Evli (2)

○ Boşanmış (3)

a. Şu anda romantik bir ilişki yaşıyor musunuz? (1) Evet (2) Hayır

b. Kaç çocuğunuz var?

7) Şu anda kimlerle yaşıyorsunuz?

○ Eş ve çocuklar (1)

○ Akrabalar _____ (lütfen belirtiniz)

○ Yalnız

○ Diğer

8) Büyüdüğünüz ailelerden aşağıdakilerden hangisi size uygun?

( ) Çekirdek aile (anne baba çocuklar) 1

( ) Geniş aile (anne baba çocuklar akrabalar) 2

( ) Boşanmış (siz kaç yaşında iken?) ..... 3

( ) Ölüm (hangi ebeveyn? Siz kaç yaşında iken?) 4

( ) Evlat edinilme (siz kaç yaşında iken?) 5

( ) Üvey anne-baba (siz kaç yaşında iken?) 6

9) Toplam kaç kardeşsiniz (siz dahil)

a. Siz kaçıncı sıradasınız?

10) Sizi yaş dönemlerine göre kim/kimler büyüttü? (Anne baba, büyükanne/büyükbaba, bakıcı, kreş, akraba)

a. 0-1 yaş.....
b. 1-3 yaş .....
c. 3-6 yaş .....
d. 6 yaş ve üzeri .....

11) Yaşamınızın ilk 5 yılında anne ya da babanızdan ayrıldığınız oldu mu? Ne zaman? Ne kadar?

_____
1 Evet
2 Hayır

12) Çocukluğundaki SES:

○ Çok düşük (1)

○ Düşük (2)

○ Orta (3)

○ Yüksek (4)

○ Çok Yüksek (5)

13) Güncel durumdaki SES: aylık kazancınızı düşündüğünüzde gelir durumunuzu nasıl tanımlarsınız?

○ Çok düşük (1)

○ Düşük (2)

○ Orta (3)

○ Yüksek (4)

○ Çok Yüksek (5)

14) Aylık gelir :

a. Toplam ortalama aylık gider____

15) Annenizin eğitim durumu

- İlkokul
- Ortaokul
- Lise

- Önlisans
- Üniversite
- Yüksek Lisans
- Doktora

16) Babanızın eğitim durumu

- İlkokul
- Ortaokul
- Lise
- Önlisans
- Üniversite
- Yüksek Lisans
- Doktora

## E. BALANCED-INTEGRATION DIFFERENTIATION SCALE

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelere size uygunluğu bakımından ne derece katıldığınızı veya katılmadığınızı verilen ölçek üzerinde işaretleyiniz (yana veya altına ilgili ölçek konacak). (*1 = kesinlikle katılmıyorum*, *5 = kesinlikle katılıyorum*).

1. Kendi kendime kaldığımda yapacak ilginç şeyler bulabilirim.
2. Kendimi aileme hep yakın hissedeceğime inanıyorum.
3. İnsanlarla ilişki kurmakta güçlük çekiyorum.
4. Kendi isteklerimi yapabilmek için kendime mutlaka zaman ve imkan tanımaya çalışırım.
5. Kendimi duygusal olarak toplumun dışında kalmış gibi hissediyorum.
6. Kendimi duygusal olarak aileme çok yakın hissediyorum.
7. Farklı olmaktansa, toplumla düşünsel olarak kaynaşmış olmayı tercih ederim.
8. Kendimi yakın çevremden duygusal olarak kopmuş hissediyorum.
9. Kendimi insanlardan olabildiğince soyutlayıp, kendi isteklerimi gerçekleştirmeye çalışırım.
10. Hayatta gerçekleştirmek istediğim şeyler için çalışırken, ailemin sevgi ve desteğini hep yanımda hissederim.
11. Kendimi yalnız hissediyorum.
12. Ailemle duygusal bağlarımın zayıf olduğunu hissediyorum.
13. Ailemle aramdaki duygusal bağların hayatta yapmak istediğim şeyler için bana güç verdiğini düşünüyorum.
14. Kendimi diğer insanlardan kopuk hissediyorum.
15. Toplumsal değerleri sorgulamak yerine benimsemeyi tercih ederim.
16. Kendimi sosyal çevreme duygusal olarak yakın hissediyorum.
17. Kendimi ilginç buluyorum.
18. İnsanın kendini kendi istediği gibi değil, toplumda geçerli olacak şekilde geliştirmesinin önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

19. İnsan geliştikçe, ailesinden duygusal olarak uzaklaşır.
20. İnsanın en önemli amacı sahip olduğu potansiyeli hakkıyla geliştirebilmek olmalıdır.
21. İnsanın kendi özelliklerini geliştirip ortaya çıkarabilmesi gerekir.
22. Kişinin kendine değil, topluma uygun hareket etmesi, uzun vadede kendi yararına olur.
23. İnsanın yapmak istediklerini yapabilmesi için, ailesiyle olan duygusal bağlarını en aza indirmesi gerekir.
24. Çevremdekilerin onayladığı bir insan olmak benim için önemlidir.
25. Zamanımızda insanlar arasında güçlü duygusal bağların olması, kendileri için destekleyici değil, engelleyici olur.
26. Sahip olduğum potansiyeli ve özellikleri geliştirip kendime özgü bir birey olmak benim için çok önemlidir.
27. Çevreme ters gelse bile, kendime özgü bir amaç için yaşayabilirim.
28. Herkesin kendi özelliklerini geliştirmeye uğraşması yerine toplumsal beklentilere uygun davranmaya çalışmasının daha doğru olduğu kanısındayım.
29. Toplumlar geliştikçe, insanlararası duygusal bağların zayıflaması doğaldır.

## F. YOUNG SCHEMA QUESTIONNAIRE

Yönerge: Aşağıda, kişilerin kendilerini tanımlarken kullandıkları ifadeler sıralanmıştır. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi okuyun ve sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığına karar verin. Emin olamadığınız sorularda neyin doğru olabileceğinden çok, sizin duygusal olarak ne hissettiğinize dayanarak cevap verin.

Birkaç soru, anne babanızla ilişkiniz hakkındadır. Eğer biri veya her ikisi şu anda yaşamıyorlarsa, bu soruları o veya onlar hayatta iken ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak cevaplandırın.

1'den 6'ya kadar olan seçeneklerden sizi tanımlayan en yüksek şıkkı seçerek her sorudan önce yer alan boşluğa yazın.

Derecelendirme:

1- Benim için tamamıyla yanlış

2- Benim için büyük ölçüde yanlış

3- Bana uyan tarafı uymayan tarafından biraz fazla

4- Benim için orta derecede doğru

5- Benim için çoğunlukla doğru

6- Beni mükemmel şekilde tanımlıyor

1. _____ Bana bakan, benimle zaman geçiren, başıma gelen olaylarla gerçekten ilgilenen kimsem olmadı.

2. _____ Beni terk edeceklerinden korktuğum için yakın olduğum insanların peşini bırakmam.

3. _____ İnsanların beni kullandıklarını hissediyorum

4. _____ Uyumsuzum.

5. _____ Beğendiğim hiçbir erkek/kadın, kusurlarımı görürse beni sevmez.

6. _____ İş (veya okul) hayatımda neredeyse hiçbir şeyi diğer insanlar kadar iyi yapamıyorum

7. _____ Günlük yaşamımı tek başıma idare edebilme becerisine sahip olduğumu hissetmiyorum.

8. _____ Kötü bir şey olacağı duygusundan kurtulamıyorum.

9. _____ Anne babamdan ayrılmayı, bağımsız hareket edebilmeyi, yaşıtlarım kadar, başaramadım.

10. _____ Eğer istediğimi yaparsam, başımı derde sokarım diye düşünürüm.

11. _____ Genellikle yakınlarıma ilgi gösteren ve bakan ben olurum.

12. _____ Olumlu duygularımı diğerlerine göstermekten utanırım (sevdiğimi, önemsediğimi göstermek gibi).

13. _____ Yaptığım çoğu şeyde en iyi olmalıyım; ikinci olmayı kabullenemem.

14. _____ Diğer insanlardan bir şeyler istediğimde bana "hayır" denilmesini çok zor kabullenirim.

15. _____ Kendimi sıradan ve sıkıcı işleri yapmaya zorlayamam.

16. _____ Paramın olması ve önemli insanlar tanıyor olmak beni değerli yapar.

17. _____ Her şey yolunda gidiyor görünse bile, bunun bozulacağını hissederim.

18. _____ Eğer bir yanlış yaparsam, cezalandırılmayı hakkederim.

19. _____ Çevremde bana sıcaklık, koruma ve duygusal yakınlık gösteren kimsem yok.

20. _____ Diğer insanlara o kadar muhtacım ki onları kaybedeceğim diye çok endişeleniyorum.

21. _____ İnsanlara karşı tedbiri elden bırakamam yoksa bana kasıtlı olarak zarar vereceklerini hissederim.

22. _____ Temel olarak diğer insanlardan farklıyım.

23. _____ Gerçek beni tanırlarsa beğendiğim hiç kimse bana yakın olmak istemez.

24. _____ İşleri halletmede son derece yetersizim.

25. _____ Gündelik işlerde kendimi başkalarına bağımlı biri olarak görüyorum.

26. _____ Her an bir felaket (doğal, adli, mali veya tıbbi) olabilir diye hissediyorum.

27. _____ Annem, babam ve ben birbirimizin hayatı ve sorunlarıyla aşırı ilgili olmaya eğilimliyiz.

28. _____ Diğer insanların isteklerine uymaktan başka yolum yokmuş gibi hissediyorum; eğer böyle yapmazsam bir şekilde beni reddederler veya intikam alırlar.

29. _____ Başkalarını kendimden daha fazla düşündüğüm için ben iyi bir insanım.

30. _____ Duygularımı diğerlerine açmayı utanç verici bulurum.

31. _____ En iyisini yapmalıyım, "yeterince iyi" ile yetinemem.

32. _____ Ben özel biriyim ve diğer insanlar için konulmuş olan kısıtlamaları veya sınırları kabul etmek zorunda değilim.

33. _____ Eğer hedefime ulaşamazsam kolaylıkla yılgınlığa düşer ve vazgeçerim.

34. _____ Başkalarının da farkında olduğu başarılar benim için en değerlisidir.

35. _____ İyi bir şey olursa, bunu kötü bir şeyin izleyeceğinden endişe ederim.

36. _____ Eğer yanlış yaparsam, bunun özrü yoktur.

37. _____ Birisi için özel olduğumu hiç hissetmedim.

38. _____ Yakınlarımın beni terk edeceği ya da ayrılacağından endişe duyarım

39. _____ Herhangi bir anda birileri beni aldatmaya kalkışabilir.

40. _____ Bir yere ait değilim, yalnızım.

41. _____ Başkalarının sevgisine, ilgisine ve saygısına değer bir insan değilim.

42. _____ İş ve başarı alanlarında birçok insan benden daha yeterli.

43. _____ Doğru ile yanlışı birbirinden ayırmakta zorlanırım.

44. _____ Fiziksel bir saldırıya uğramaktan endişe duyarım.

45. _____ Annem, babam ve ben özel hayatımız birbirimizden saklarsak, birbirimizi aldatmış hisseder veya suçluluk duyarız

46. _____ İlişkilerimde, diğer kişinin yönlendirici olmasına izin veririm.

47. _____ Yakınlarımla o kadar meşgulüm ki kendime çok az zaman kalıyor.

48. _____ İnsanlarla beraberken içten ve cana yakın olmak benim için zordur.

49. _____ Tüm sorumluluklarımı yerine getirmek zorundayım.

50. _____ İstediğimi yapmaktan alıkonulmaktan veya kısıtlanmaktan nefret ederim.

51. _____ Uzun vadeli amaçlara ulaşabilmek için şu andaki zevklerimden fedakarlık etmekte zorlanırım

52. _____ Başkalarından yoğun bir ilgi görmezsem kendimi daha az önemli hissederim.

53. _____ Yeterince dikkatli olmazsanız, neredeyse her zaman bir şeyler ters gider.

54. _____ Eğer işimi doğru yapmazsam sonuçlara katlanmam gerekir.

55. _____ Beni gerçekten dinleyen, anlayan veya benim gerçek ihtiyaçlarım ve duygularımı önemseyen kimsem olmadı.

56. _____ Önem verdiğim birisinin benden uzaklaştığını sezersem çok kötü hissederim.

57. _____ Diğer insanların niyetleriyle ilgili oldukça şüpheciyimdir.

58. _____ Kendimi diğer insanlara uzak veya kopmuş hissediyorum.

59. _____ Kendimi sevilebilecek biri gibi hissetmiyorum.

60. _____ İş (okul) hayatımda diğer insanlar kadar yetenekli değilim.

61. _____ Gündelik işler için benim kararlarıma güvenilemez.

62. _____ Tüm paramı kaybedip çok fakir veya zavallı duruma düşmekten endişe duyarım.

63. _____ Çoğunlukla annem ve babamın benimle iç içe yaşadığını hissediyorum-Benim kendime ait bir hayatım yok.

64. _____ Kendim için ne istediğimi bilmediğim için daima benim adıma diğer insanların karar vermesine izin veririm.

65. _____ Ben hep başkalarının sorunlarını dinleyen kişi oldum.

66. _____ Kendimi o kadar kontrol ederim ki insanlar beni duygusuz veya hissiz bulurlar.

67. _____ Başarmak ve bir şeyler yapmak için sürekli bir baskı altındayım

68. _____ Diğer insanların uyduğu kurallara ve geleneklere uymak zorunda olmadığımı hissediyorum.

69. _____ Benim yararıma olduğunu bilsem bile hoşuma gitmeyen şeyleri yapmaya kendimi zorlayamam.

70. _____ Bir toplantıda fikrimi söylediğimde veya bir topluluğa tanıtıldığımda onaylanılmayı ve takdir görmeyi isterim.

71. _____ Ne kadar çok çalışırsam çalışayım, maddi olarak iflas edeceğimden ve neredeyse her şeyimi kaybedeceğimden endişe ederim.

72. _____ Neden yanlış yaptığımın önemi yoktur; eğer hata yaptıysam sonucuna da katlanmam gerekir.

73. _____ Hayatımda ne yapacağımı bilmediğim zamanlarda uygun bir öneride bulunacak veya beni yönlendirecek kimsem olmadı.

74. _____ İnsanların beni terk edeceği endişesiyle bazen onları kendimden uzaklaştırırım.

75. _____ Genellikle insanların asıl veya art niyetlerini araştırırım.

76. _____ Kendimi hep grupların dışında hissederim.

77. _____ Kabul edilemeyecek pek çok özelliğim yüzünden insanlara kendimi açamıyorum veya beni tam olarak tanımalarına izin vermiyorum.

78. _____ İş (okul) hayatımda diğer insanlar kadar zeki değilim.

79. _____ Ortaya çıkan gündelik sorunları çözebilme konusunda kendime güvenmiyorum.

80. _____ Bir doktor tarafından herhangi bir ciddi hastalık bulunmamasına rağmen bende ciddi bir hastalığın gelişmekte olduğu endişesine kapılıyorum.

81. _____ Sık sık annemden babamdan ya da eşimden ayrı bir kimliğimin olmadığını hissediyorum.

82. _____ Haklarıma saygı duyulmasını ve duygularımın hesaba katılmasını istemekte çok zorlanıyorum.

83. _____ Başkaları beni, diğerleri için çok, kendim için az şey yapan biri olarak görüyorlar.

84. _____ Diğerleri beni duygusal olarak soğuk bulurlar.

85. _____ Kendimi sorumluluktan kolayca sıyıramıyorum veya hatalarım için gerekçe bulamıyorum.

86. _____ Benim yaptıklarımın, diğer insanların katkılarından daha önemli olduğunu hissediyorum.

87. _____ Kararlarıma nadiren sadık kalabilirim.

88. _____ Bir dolu övgü ve iltifat almam kendimi değerli birisi olarak hissetmemi sağlar.

89. _____ Yanlış bir kararın bir felakete yol açabileceğinden endişe ederim.

90. _____ Ben cezalandırılmayı hak eden kötü bir insanım.

## G. THE GUILT AND SHAME SCALE

Bu ölçeğin amacı bazı duyguların hangi durumlarda ne derece yoğun yaşandığını belirlemektedir. Aşağıda bazı olaylar verilmiştir. Bu olaylar sizin başınızdan geçmiş olsaydı, ne kadar rahatsızlık duyardınız? Lütfen her durumu dikkatle okuyup öyle bir durumda ne kadar rahatsızlık duyacağınızı aşağıdaki ölçekten yararlanarak maddelerin yanındaki sayıları işaretleyiniz.

1.Hiç rahatsızlık duymazdım
2.Biraz rahatsızlık duyardım
3. Oldukça rahatsızlık duyardım
4. Epey rahatsızlık duyardım
5. Çok rahatsızlık duyardım

1. Bir tartışma sırasında büyük bir hararetle savunduğunuz bir fikrin yanlış olduğunu öğrenmek.
2. Evinizin çok dağınık olduğu bir sırada beklenmeyen bazı misafirlerin gelmesi.
3. Birinin size verdiği bir sırrı istemeyerek başkalarına açıklamak.
4. Birinin kalabalık bir yerde herkesin dikkatini çekecek şekilde size açıkça ilgi göstermesi.
5. Giysinizin, vücudunuzda kapalı tuttuğunuz bir yeri açığa çıkaracak şekilde buruşması ya da kıvrılması
6. Bir aşk ilişkisi içinde sadece kendi isteklerinizi elde etmeye çalıştığınızı ve karşı tarafı sömürdüğünüzü fark etmeniz.
7. Sorumlusu siz olduğunuz halde bir kusur ya da bir yanlış için bir başkasının suçlanmasına seyirci kalmak.
8. Uzman olmanız gereken bir konuda, bir konuşma yaptıktan sonra dinleyicilerin sizin söylediğinizin yanlış olduğunu göstermesi.

9. Çok işlek bir iş merkezinin bulunduğu bir köşede herkesin size bakmasına sebep olacak bir olay yaşamak.
10. Lüks bir restoranda başkaları size bakarken çatal bıçak kullanmanız gereken yerde elle yemek yediğinizi fark etmek.
11. Başkalarını aldatarak ve onları sömürerek büyük kazanç sağlamak.
12. İşçilerinizin sağlığına zarar vereceğini bildiğiniz halde bir yönetici olarak çalışma koşullarında bir değişiklik yapmamak.
13. Sözlü bir sınav sırasında kekelediğiniz ve heyecandan şaşırdığınızda hocanızın sizin bu halinizi kötü bir sınav örneği olarak bütün sınıfa göstermesi.
14. Tanıdığınız birinin sıkıntıda olduğunu bildiğiniz ve yardım edebileceğiniz halde yardım etmemek.
15. Bir partide yeni tanıştığınız insanlarla açık saçık bir fıkra anlattığınızda birçoğunun bundan rahatsız olması.
16. Aklınızca, bencilce ya da gereksizce büyük bir harcama yaptıktan sonra ebeveyninizin mali bir sıkıntı içinde olduklarını öğrenmek.
17. Arkadaşınızdan bir şeyler çaldığınız halde arkadaşınızın hırsızlık yapanın siz olduğunu hiçbir zaman anlamaması.
18. Bir davete ya da toplantıya rahat, gündelik giysilerle gidip herkesin resmi giyindiğini görmek.
19. Bir yemek davetinde bir tabak dolusu yiyeceği yere düşürmek.
20. Herkesten sakladığınız ve hoş olmayan bir davranışın açığa çıkarılması.
21. Bir kişiye hak etmediği halde zarar vermek.
22. Alışveriş sırasında paranızın üstünü fazla verdikleri halde sesinizi çıkarmamak.
23. Ailenizin sizden beklediklerini yerine getirememek.
24. Çeşitli bahaneler bularak yapmanız gereken işlerden kaçmak.

## H. GUILT AND SHAME PRONENESS SCALE

Bu ankette insanların günlük yaşamlarında karşılaşması muhtemel olan bazı durumları ve bu durumlara verilen yaygın tepkileri okuyacaksınız. Her bir senaryoyu okurken kendinizi o durumda hayal etmeye çalışın. Daha sonra tarif edilen şekilde tepki verme olasılığınızı belirtin. (*1 = hiç olası değil*, *5 = tamamen olası*).

1. Bir dükkânda çok fazla para üstü almış olduğunuzu fark ettikten sonra kasiyer durumu fark etmediği için parayı geri vermemeye karar veriyorsunuz. Parayı geri vermemekle ilgili kendinizi rahatsız hissetme olasılığınız nedir?
2. Okulu birçok kez astığınız için arkadaş grubunuzda onur öğrencisi olmayı başaramayan tek kişinin siz olduğunuz konusunda özel olarak bilgilendiriliyorsunuz. Bu durumun okula devam konusunda daha sorumlulu sahibi olmanıza yol açma olasılığı nedir?
3. Kütüphanedeki bir dergiden bir makaleyi koparıyorsunuz ve yanınızda götürüyorsunuz. Öğretmeniniz yaptığınızı fark edip kütüphane görevlisine ve tüm sınıfa bunu söylüyor. Bu olayın size kendinizi kötü biriymiş gibi hissettirme olasılığı nedir?
4. İşinizde insanların size bel bağlamış olduğu önemli bir projede büyük bir hata yaptıktan sonra, patronunuz çalışma arkadaşlarınızın önünde sizi eleştiriyor. Hasta numarası yapıp iş yerinden çıkıp gitme olasılığınız nedir?
5. Bir arkadaşınızın bir sırrını ifşa ediyorsunuz, gerçi arkadaşınız bu durumu asla öğrenmiyor. Bu sırrı tutmaktaki başarısızlığınızın gelecekte sır tutmak için fazladan çaba harcamanıza yol açma olasılığı nedir?
6. İş yerinde kötü bir sunum yapıyorsunuz. Sonrasında patronunuz çalışma arkadaşlarınıza şirketin sözleşmeyi kaybetmesinin sizin hatanız olduğunu söylüyor. Kendinizi yetersiz hissetme olasılığınız nedir?
7. Arkadaşınız size kendinizle çok fazla övündüğünüzü söylüyor. Bu arkadaşınızla vakit geçirmeyi bırakma olasılığınız nedir?
8. Eviniz çok dağınık ve beklenmedik misafirler kapınızı çalıp kendilerini içeri davet ettiriyorlar. Misafirler gidene kadar onlardan uzak durmaya çalışma olasılığınız nedir?

9. Ağır bir suçu gizlice işliyorsunuz. Yasaları çiğnemekle ilgili vicdan azabı duyma olasılığınız nedir?
10. Bir davada uğramış olduğunuz hasarı abartarak tazminat almayı başarıyorsunuz. Aylar sonra yalanlarınız ortaya çıkıyor ve yalan beyan vermekle suçlanıyorsunuz. Adi bir insan olduğunuzu düşünme olasılığınız nedir?
11. Bir tartışmada bir görüşü şiddetle savunuyorsunuz. Kimse farkında olmasa da siz yanıldığınızın farkına varıyorsunuz. Bu durumun konuşmadan önce daha dikkatlice düşünmenize yol açma olasılığı nedir?
12. Büro malzemelerini kişisel kullanımınız için eve getiriyorsunuz ve patronunuz tarafından yakalanıyorsunuz. Bu olayın işinizi bırakmanıza neden olma olasılığı nedir?
13. İş yerinde bir hata yapıyorsunuz ve bu hata için bir iş arkadaşınızın suçlandığını öğreniyorsunuz. Daha sonra iş arkadaşınız sizi hatanızla yüzleştiriyor. Korkak biriymiş gibi hissetme olasılığınız nedir?
14. Bir iş arkadaşınızın yeni taşındığı evde verdiği partide krem rengi yeni halısının üzerine kazayla kırmızı şarap döküyorsunuz. Sebep olduğunuz kirliliği kimse görmesin diye lekeyi bir sandalye ile kapatıyorsunuz. Davranış şeklinizin acınası olduğunu hissetme olasılığınız nedir?
15. Arkadaşlarınızla bir konuda hararetli bir şekilde tartışırken birdenbire kimse fark etmemiş görünse de, siz bağırıyor olduğunuzu fark ediyorsunuz. Arkadaşlarınıza karşı daha düşünceli davranmaya çalışma olasılığınız nedir?
16. İnsanlara yalan söylüyorsunuz, ancak bunu hiçbir zaman öğrenmiyorlar. Söylediğiniz yalanlarla ilgili çok kötü hissetme olasılığınız nedir?

# I. CURRICULUM VITAE

Ekin Doğa Kozak

Education

- **Ph.D. Middle East Technical University (2020-2026)**
  *Developmental Psychology*
  Thesis: Shame Memories Across Generations: Studies on University Students and Their Mothers
  Thesis advisor: Prof. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar
- **MSc. Bahçeşehir University (2016-2019)**
  *Clinical Psychology*
  Thesis: The Relationships Between Balanced Integration Differentiation Model with Well-Being and Dependent Personality Characteristics Mediated by Interpersonal Problems and Attachment
  Thesis advisor: Assoc. Prof. Arzu Karakulak-Aydınlı
- **BSc. Middle East Technical University (2010-2015)**
  *Psychology*
- **Büyükşehir Hüseyin Yıldız Anatolian High School - İstanbul, Turkey (2006 – 2010)**

Experience

- **Hacettepe University (2022 - )**
  *Research Assistant - Department of Psychology*
- **Boğaziçi University Student Counseling and Psychological Support Center (2019 - 2022)**
  *Volunteer Clinical Psychologist*
- **İstanbul Kültür University (2017 - 2021)**
  *Research Assistant - Department of Psychology*

- **French Lape Hospital (2016 - 2017)**
  *Clinical Internship*
- **Bakırköy Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman Psychiatric Hospital (2014)**
  *Clinical Internship*

Publications

**SSCI/SCI-E:**

1. Türkarslan, K. K., **Kozak, E. D.,** & Yıldırım, J. C. (2023). Psychometric properties of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS-13) and the prediction of pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 92*, 102147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2023.102147
2. Dırıcan, A. H., **Kozak, E. D.,** Kavakcı, Ö., & Sönmez, B. (2023). The association of child abuse experiences and intolerance of uncertainty in young adults. *Psychiatry, 86*(3), 214–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.2023.2205800

**E-SCI/Scopus:**

1. **Kozak, E. D.,** Halimoğlu, G., & Kavakcı, Ö. (2025). Improv intervention for obsessive-compulsive symptoms: A pilot study from Turkey. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 20*(1), 60–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/15401383.2024.2319825
2. Türkarslan, K. K., & **Kozak, E. D.** (2025). Exploring the evil eye beliefs: A quantitative study. *Spiritual Psychology and Counseling*, *10*(2), 313-328. https://doi.org/10.37898/spiritualpc.1587623
3. Türkarslan, K. K. & **Kozak, E. D.** (2024). Envious gazes and evil eye beads: A self-psychological perspective on the evil eye. *Psychoanalysis, Self and Context, 19*(2), 229-245. 10.1080/24720038.2023.2299702
4. Yıldırım, J. C., **Kozak, E. D.,** & Türkarslan, K. K. (2021). Utandıran Diğeri Ölçeği-2'nin Türkçe formunun psikometrik özellikleri [The psychometric properties of the Turkish form of the Other as Shamer Scale-2]. *Klinik Psikoloji Dergisi*, *5*(1), 13-26. https://doi.org/10.5455/kpd.26024438m000033

**Book Chapters:**

1. Türkarslan, K. K., **Kozak, E. D.,** & Canel-Çınarbaş, D. (2024). Social class aware psychotherapy and counseling in Türkiye. In Ş. Poyrazlı & A. Çiftçi (Eds.), *Multicultural issues in counseling and therapy: Global perspectives* (pp. 228-244). Anı Yayıncılık.
2. Zeybek, S. G., **Kozak, E. D.,** & Selçuk, O. C. (2022). Türkiye'de sınıf ve psikoterapi [Class and psychotherapy in Turkey]. In D. Canel-Çınarbaş, D. Hasdemir, & G. B. Kumpasoğlu (Eds.), *Psikoterapide kültürel konular [Cultural issues in psychotherapy]* (pp. 199-232). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Projects

1. The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK). (2025 May –2028 May). *Ebeveynlere yönelik bağ odaklı doğum öncesi müdahale programının anne-baba-bebek bağlanması ile bebeğin bilişsel ve sosyo duygusal gelişimi üzerindeki boylamsal etkisi* (Project No. 124K964) [1001 Program, Researcher].
2. The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK). (2025 May-December). *Üniversite öğrencileri ve annelerinin utanç anılarının araştırılması* (Project No. 424K133) [1002-B Emergency Support Module, Project Coordinator].

Conference Presentations

**International:**

1. **Kozak, E. D.,** & Şahin-Acar, B. (2025, August 25-29). *Personal shame memories of mother and daughter dyads* [Oral presentation]. 22nd European Congress of Developmental Psychology 2025, Vilnius, Lithuania.
2. **Kozak, E. D.,** Kıyak-Yılmaz, B., Onursal-Özer, B., Durmuş, R., Zeybek, S. G., Şahin-Acar, B., & Kazak Berument, S. (2025, May 1-3). *A qualitative attempt to discover the parenthood dynamics in a nonWEIRD culture: Türkiye* [Poster presentation]. Society for Research on Child Development (SRCD) 2025, Minneapolis, MN, United States.

3. **Kozak, E. D.,** Halimoğlu, G., & Kavakcı, Ö. (2023, July 3–6). *Improv intervention for obsessive-compulsive symptoms: A pilot study* [Oral presentation]. 18th European Congress of Psychology, Brighton, United Kingdom.
4. **Kozak, E. D.,** Türkarslan, K. K., Zeybek, S. G., & Canel-Çınarbaş, D. (2023, June 21–24). *Class as a cultural variable in psychotherapy* [Oral presentation]. 54th International Annual Meeting of the Society for Psychotherapy, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
5. Akay, N., Borhan, N., Alkış, A., İlgün, Y., Yenen, Z. B., Yön, F., Yiğit, B., Ersoy, H., **Kozak, E. D.,** Zeybek, S. G., Aydın, Ç., & Şahin-Acar, B. (2023, March 23–25). *The role of family alliance on child well-being* [Poster presentation]. Society for Research in Child Development, Salt Lake City, UT, United States.
6. **Kozak, E. D.,** & Yıldırım, J. C. (2019, July 2–5). *Examining borderline personality beliefs in terms of shame, guilt and compassion* [Oral presentation]. 16th European Psychology Congress, Moscow Public University, Moscow, Russia.

**National:**

1. **Kozak, E. D.,** & Şahin-Acar, B. (2024, September 10–11). *Üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar ve annelerinde utanç anıları ve bu anıların sosyoekonomik seviyeye göre incelenmesi* [Poster presentation]. 4th Developmental Psychology Symposium, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
2. **Kozak, E. D.,** Zeybek, S. G., Türkarslan, K. K., & Canel-Çınarbaş, D. (2023, June 1–2). *Class as a cultural variable in psychotherapy* [Panel presentation]. X. Işık Savaşır Clinical Psychology Symposium, İzmir, Turkey.
3. Türkarslan, K. K., & **Kozak, E. D.** (2023, June 1–2). *Aspects of the evil eye belief in psychotherapy: "I'll tell you, but I'm afraid of the evil eye"* [Panel presentation]. X. Işık Savaşır Clinical Psychology Symposium, İzmir, Turkey.
4. **Kozak, E. D.,** & Türkarslan, K. K. (2022, November 13–16). *(If you like what I've done) don't touch your evil eye (on it), work for it! Investigating the evil eye belief with the variables of individualism-collectivism, being*

*religious and spiritual, and envy* [Oral presentation]. 21st National Psychology Congress, Doğuş University, İstanbul, Turkey.

5. Yıldırım, J. C., & **Kozak, E. D.** (2018, November 15–17). *Investigation of the relationship between self-consciousness emotions, personality traits, and self-compassion* [Poster presentation]. 20th National Psychology Congress, TED University, Ankara, Turkey.

## Trainings

- Lausanne Trilogue Play (LTP) and the Family Alliance Assessment Scales (FAAS) Certified user for both clinical and research work, Hervé Tissot, Ph.D. – February 2022 (Online Training).
- Self Psychology Training for Clinicians, Anatolian Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Association February 2021 – June 2022 (Online Training).
- Supportive Psychotherapy Training for Clinicians, Prof. Dr. Cem Kaptanoğlu, 2017 September – 2020 June.
- Family and Marriage Psychotherapy Training, Prof. Dr. Hürol Fışıloğlu, February 02 – 06, 2015 (The first level), September 14-18, 2015 (The second level).

# J. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

## 1.2. Otobiyografik Bellek Gelişimi

Geçmişi hatırlamamız küçük yaşlarda başlar. Çocuklar 16 - 18 aylık olduklarında, etraflarıyla yavaş yavaş sözel olarak iletişim kurmaya ve böylece geçmiş olaylar hakkındaki konuşmalara da katılmaya başlarlar (Fivush, 2007). Geçmişteki duygusal bir deneyim hakkında konuşurken, çocuğun olayı ve duygusal tepkisini hatırlamasının yanı sıra bu deneyim hakkında düşünmesi ve deneyimi anlamlandırması gerekir (Dunn ve ark., 1991). Küçük çocukların, konuşmanın yönlendirilmesi ve onlara yol gösterilmesi için yaşça daha büyük, daha deneyimli yetişkinlerin rehberliğine ve desteğine ihtiyaçları vardır. Sosyal ve bilişsel becerilerimiz, kişiler arası etkileşimlerden kaçınılmaz olarak etkilenir ve daha sonra bireysel beceriler olarak gelişir (Vygotsky, 1978). Aynı zamanda kültürün, bireyleri; içinde bulundukları kültürün yetkin üyeleri olmaları için gerekli olan beceri ve araçlarla donattığı hatırlanırsa (Fivush, 2013), bu beceri ve araçların aynı zamanda neyin hatırlanmaya veya konuşmaya değer olduğu üzerindeki etkisinden söz edebiliriz (Nelson ve Fivush, 2004). Gelişim psikolojisi literatüründe önemli bir yere sahip olan otobiyografik bellek konuşmalarına odaklanan araştırmalar; ebeveynlerin geçmiş olaylar hakkında konuşma biçimlerinin, çocukların otobiyografik bellek özellikleri üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermektedir.

## 1.3. Anlatı Kimliği

Thomsen'in (2025) belirttiği gibi, 1980'lerin sonunda psikoloji alanında insanları birer hikaye anlatıcısı olarak görmeye dair bir anlayış değişimi yaşanmıştır. Bu değişimde felsefe, psikanaliz ve bilişsel bilimler gibi birçok alanın etkisi bulunmaktadır. Araştırmacılar ve klinisyenler insan hayatını kişisel deneyimler, inançlar ve kültürel etkilerle şekillenen bir anlatı gibi ele alırlar. Anlatı kimliği, deneyimlerimizi başkalarına anlattıkça ve başkalarıyla beraber konuştukça gelişip değişir (McAdams

ve McLean, 2013). Zamanla hikayeler yaratırız ve bu hikayeler de bizi yaratır (McAdams ve McLean, 2013; McLean et al., 2007). Bu hikayeler yeniden yapılandırılıp yorumlandıkça ve anlatıldıkça yavaş yavaş gelişen daha geniş bir anlatı kimliğimizi oluşturur (McAdams ve McLean, 2013).

Sadece anlatılanlar değil, McLean ve arkadaşlarının (2007) belirttiği gibi anlatılmayan hikayeler de araştırılmalıdır. Anlatılmayan hikayelerin, anlatı kimliğimize dahil olması engellenmektedir (Fivush, 2004; McLean ve ark., 2007).

### 1.4. Kişisel ve Dolaylı Anılar

Tipik bir aile akşam yemeğinde her 5 dakikada bir aile üyelerinden birinin geçmiş deneyimlerinin konuşulduğunu gösteren çalışmalar mevcuttur (Bohanek ve ark., 2009). Aile, hikaye anlatımları aracılığıyla oluşur, yeniden şekillenir ve sunulur (Fivush, 2019). Otobiyografik anılar, içselleştirilmiş ve değişim halinde olan anlatı kimliklerimiz için temeldir (Adler, 2012). Fakat sadece doğrudan kendi deneyimlerimiz değil, başkalarının deneyimledikleri ve *dolaylı anılar* olarak adlandırılan anıların da anlatı kimliğimiz ve duygusal gelişimimiz üzerinde etkisi bulunmaktadır (Hirst ve Manier, 2008; Pasupathi, 2001; Pillemer ve ark., 2024). Dolaylı anılarla birlikte kişiler başkalarının hayatlarından ve deneyimlerinden de öğrenebilme fırsatına sahip olurlar (Pillemer ve ark., 2024). Bu anlatı çerçevelerinin aktarımı, erken dönem etkileşim ortamlarıyla ilişkilidir.

### 1.5. Anı Konuşmaları Özelliklerinin Rolü

Anlatı kimliğinin izi, çocuk ve bakımverenleri arasındaki etkileşimlere dayanır (Fivush, 2019, Fivush ve ark., 2011, McLean ve ark., 2007). Alan yazın ebeveynlerin konuşkanlık düzeylerinden bağımsız olarak çocuklarına karşı yüksek veya düşük detaylandırıcı şekillerde yaklaşabileceklerini ortaya koymuştur. Bu konuşmalar çocuğa iskele kurarak özellikle negatif duyguların konuşulması ve anlaşılmasında çocuklara yol gösterir (Salmon ve Reese, 2015). Duygusal deneyim ile belleğin oluşturulması arasında önemli bir ilişki vardır.

### 1.6. Otobiyografik Bellekte Duyguların Rolü

Geçmiş hakkında konuşurken genellikle duygularımızdan bahseder ve gün boyunca sık sık kişisel deneyimlerimiz hakkında konuşuruz. Araştırmalar, insanların günlük duygusal deneyimlerinin %90'ından fazlasını olayın gerçekleşmesinden sonraki 48 saat içinde bir başkasıyla konuşma eğiliminde olduğunu göstermektedir (Rimé, 2007). Yaşadıklarımızı başkalarıyla paylaşarak, kişisel tarihimizi ve bunlara bağlı duygularımızı daha iyi anlayabiliriz.

Alan yazında genel olarak olumlu ve olumsuz anılar olarak ele alınan duygu yüklü anılar, otobiyografik bellek araştırmalarında önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Otobiyografik bellek araştırmacıları farklı duygu yüklü anılarda (mutluluk, korku, öfke ve üzüntü gibi) ebeveynlerin anı konuşmaları sırasında çocuklarıyla nasıl konuştuklarını incelemişlerdir (Fivush ve ark., 2003; Reese ve ark., 2019; Wang ve ark., 2010). Anı konuşmaları sırasında farklı duyguları konuşmanın farklı amaçlara hizmet ettiği düşünülmektedir: Olumlu duyguların yer aldığı anıları konuşmak, paylaşılan ortak geçmiş duygusu aracılığıyla duygusal bağlar oluşturmaya hizmet edebilirken; olumsuz deneyimleri konuşmak duyguları anlamaya ve çözmeye yardımcı olabilir (Fivush ve ark., 2003).

Bu doktora tezinde ele alınan konu ise, bahsedilen otobiyografik bellek araştırmalarından beslenen ancak daha önce gelişim psikolojisi alanında çok az çalışılmış olan utanç anılarıdır. Utanç duygusu *duyguların sosyal paylaşımı* açısından (Rimé, 2007) değerlendirildiğinde diğer duygulardan farklı bir şekilde konumlanan, paylaşılmayı değil de saklanmayı isteyen, sosyal açıdan son derece önemli olan (Gilbert, 2003; Tangney ve Dearing, 2002) ve kişinin kimlik duygusu üzerinde derin etkileri olan (Gilbert, 1998; Nathanson, 1996) bir duygudur. Utanç duygusu sosyal durumlarda nasıl davrandığımızı, benlik algımızı ve sosyal konumumuzu etkileyebilir. Ayrıca kimlik ve arzu edilebilirlik duygumuzu da şekillendirebilir (Gilbert, 1998; Tangney ve Dearing, 2002). Lewis (1992) ve Nathanson (1994), bireyin aşırı utanç duyma eğiliminin, geçmişte utanç duyma deneyimleriyle ilişkili olarak gelişen olumsuz benlik imgelerinden kaynaklanabileceğini öne sürmektedir. Buna ek olarak, utanç eğilimi çocukluk dönemindeki olumsuz yetiştirme deneyimleriyle, özellikle de

eleştirel ve sert ebeveynlik tarzlarıyla ilişkilendirilmektedir (Claesson ve Sohlberg, 2002; Webb ve ark., 2007).

### 1.6.1. Kendilik Bilinci Duyguları

Lewis (1992, 2016) duyguları iki temel kategoride ele alır: temel duygular ve kendilik bilinci duyguları. Temel duygular bebeklerde ilk altı ay içinde görülür ve insan dışındaki diğer canlılarda da ortaktır (mutluluk, üzüntü, korku vb). Kendilik bilinci duyguları ise yaklaşık iki yaş civarında görülür ve bu duyguların ortaya çıkması için kişinin öz farkındalığının gelişmiş olması gerekir (utanç, gurur, suçluluk vb).

Duygular söz konusu olduğunda diğerlerinin varlığı önemlidir ancak kendilik bilinci duyguları kendine ve başkalarına dair karşılıklı bir değerlendirme içerdiğinden, başkalarının varlığı kendilik bilinci duyguları için daha önemlidir diyebiliriz.

Kendilik bilinci duyguları içinde utanç özel bir yere sahiptir. Utanç duygusu, kişinin kendisini başkalarının zihninde çirkin, nahoş, yetersiz ve kusurlu (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996) olarak algılamasıyla ilişkilendirilmiştir (Gilbert ve McGuire, 1998; Keltner ve Harker, 1998).

### 1.6.2. Utanç Anıları

Daha önce ağırlıklı olarak klinik psikoloji alanında ve nicel özellikleri üzerinden çalışılmış olan utanç duygusu (Ferreira ve ark., 2014; Matos ve ark., 2017; Matos ve Pinto-Gouveia, 2010, 2014; Pinto-Gouveia ve Matos, 2011) otobiyografik bellek özellikleri açısından daha önce pek çalışılmamıştır. Utanç psikopatolojiyle yakından ilişkili bulunmaktadır (Gilbert, 1998; Tangney ve Dearing, 2002). Matos ve Pinto-Gouveia (2010) içsel utanç, dışsal utanç ve travmatik utanç anılarının kişilerin depresyon düzeylerini yordamada anlamlı bir model oluşturduğunu ve kişilerin depresyonuna ilişkin varyansın %26.5'ini bu üç değişkenin açıkladığını belirtmişlerdir (Matos ve Pinto-Gouveia, 2010). Başka bir çalışmalarında ise Pinto-Gouveia ve Matos (2011) utanç anılarının merkeziyetinin, travmatik stres tepkileriyle yüksek düzeyde ilişkili olduğunu bulmuşlardır. Aynı zamanda içsel utanç, dışsal utanç ve olayın merkeziyetinin kişilerdeki depresyonun %25'ini, kaygının %21'ini ve stresin %19'unu

açıkladığı bir model ortaya koymuşlardır (Pinto-Gouveia ve Matos, 2011). Bu bulgular, utancın bu duyguyu hisseden kişiler üzerindeki etkilerine dair öneme işaret etse de bir otobiyografik anı araştırmacısının anının özelliklerini daha derinlemesine inceleyen yaklaşımı açısından bakıldığında büyük eksiklikler barındırmaktadır.

Yakın zamanda, gelişim psikolojisi bakış açısıyla Türe (2021), annelik pratikleri üzerinden anneleri utandıran anıların içeriklerini ortaya koyduğu bir doktora çalışması yapmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları göstermektedir ki, anneleri utandıran anıların içeriği, genellikle çocuk yetiştirme uygulamaları (özellikle dikkatsiz/özenli olmamak ve aşırı endişeli olmakla ilgili eleştiriler) ve yetersiz beslenme (özellikle emzirememe ve yetersiz anne sütü) ile ilgilidir. Çalışmanın niteliksel bulguları, ideal annelik standartlarına uymaya çalışmanın kadınlarda olumsuz duygusal tepkilere yol açabileceğini göstermektedir (Türe, 2021).

### 1.7. Anne-Kız Çiftleri Bağlamında Otobiyografik Bellek

Çocuklarda otobiyografik bellek gelişimi, ebeveyn-çocuk arasında gözlemlenebilen, geçmişi konuşma stillerinden derinden etkilenmektedir (Fivush, 2019; Nelson ve Fivush, 2004). Ebeveynler, geçmişi hatırlar ve konuşurken çocuklarına hangi bilgilerin önemli olduğunu ve hikayelerin nasıl yapılandırılması gerektiğini öğreterek çocukların anlatılarına iskele kurma rolü üstlenirler (Fivush ve Nelson, 2006; Peterson ve Roberts, 2003). Bu süreçte, özellikle yaşça daha büyük kız çocuklarına sahip anne-kız çiftlerinin anlatı stillerinde belirgin bir uyum gözlenmektedir; bu durum Chodorow'un (1978) kimlik teorisi ve annelerin kızlarıyla oğlan çocuklarına kıyasla daha fazla konuşması gibi toplumsal cinsiyet sosyalleşmesi pratikleriyle açıklanmaktadır (Fivush ve ark., 2000, 2003; Leaper ve ark., 1998; Peterson ve Roberts, 2003). Ailenin *duygu tarihçileri* olan annelerin, özellikle olumsuz duygu yüklü anılar üzerine yüksek düzeyde detaylandırma içeren ve duygu odaklı diyalogları hassasiyetle yönlendirmesi, çocukların uzun vadeli duygusal gelişimi, güvenli bağlanma temsilleri ve anlatı tutarlılığı üzerinde kalıcı etkilere sahiptir (Fivush ve ark., 2009; Laible, 2011; Tamari ve ark., 2024). Çocuk büyüdükçe ortak bir geçmiş inşa etme ve sosyal bağları güçlendirme işlevi gören bu ortak kurgu süreci, sadece iki kuşak arasında sınırlı kalmayıp, anneannelerden annelere ve kız çocuklarına aktarılan kuşaklararası bir

sosyalleşme örüntüsü ve anlatı benzerliği de sergilemektedir (Nelson, 2003; Reese ve Brown, 2000; Şahin-Acar ve ark., 2017). Tüm bu bireysel ve ailevi dinamiklerin ötesinde, otobiyografik bellek ve anı konuşmaları yazınını şekillendiren kültürel çerçeveler de bu süreçte göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır.

### 1.8. Kültür Bağlamında Otobiyografik Bellek

Kültürel bağlamlar, toplumsal değerler ve sosyoekonomik düzey (SED), çocukların otobiyografik bellek ve anlatı becerilerinin gelişimini, hem kültürler arası hem de kültür içi dinamikler düzeyinde derinlemesine şekillendirir (McLean ve ark., 2018; Ross ve Wang, 2010; Wang, 2021; Wang ve ark., 2018). Araştırmalar, geleneksel cinsiyet rollerine sahip İspanyol aileler ile eşitlikçi İskandinav ailelerinin geçmişi konuşma tarzlarının farklılaştığını (Aznar ve Tenenbaum, 2013, 2015; Svane ve ark., 2021); benzer şekilde Avrupa-Amerikan, Çin, Alman, Kosta Rika ve Meksika aileleri arasında da iletişim amaçları ve sosyal odak açısından belirgin ayrışmalar olduğunu göstermektedir (Schröder ve ark., 2013; Wang, 2013). Bu pratiklerin karmaşık ve akışkan yapısı, Türkiye'nin farklı bölgelerindeki annelerin detaylandırma düzeylerinde, Māori ailelerinin kültürel aidiyet derecelerinde ve benzer otonomi değerlerini paylaşan bazı Avrupa ülkelerindeki annelerin anlatılarında görülen kültür içi varyasyonlarla da desteklenmektedir (Reese ve Neha, 2015; Şahin-Acar ve Leichtman, 2015; Tõugu ve ark., 2011). Diğer taraftan güçlü bir sosyokültürel bağlam sunan SED unsuru da ebeveyn konuşmasının niceliğini, sözcük zenginliğini ve cümle karmaşıklığını etkileyerek düşük SED grubundaki çocukların dil ve anlatı gelişimini dezavantajlı kılabilmektedir (Hoff, 2003, 2013; Vernon-Feagans ve ark., 2001). Sunulan çalışmaların genellenebilirliği bu kültürel faktörlerden doğrudan etkilenmekte olup (Aznar ve Tenenbaum, 2013; Graneist ve Habermas, 2020; Kuebli ve Fivush, 1992; Liang ve Van Leeuwen, 2024; Svane ve ark., 2021), mevcut araştırmaların ilk çalışması SED ile anlatı özellikleri arasındaki ilişkiye dair öncül bulgular sağlarken, sonraki çalışmalar ağırlıklı olarak kültürel dinamiklerin benlik kurguları aracılığıyla anlatı özellikleri üzerindeki etkilerini incelemeye odaklanmıştır.

### 1.8.1. Benlik Kurguları ve Otobiyografik Bellek

Markus ve Kitayama (1991, 2010) tarafından tanımlanan benlik kurgusu, bireyin kendini tanımlama ve yapılandırma biçimi olup en temel bileşeni belirli bir çevre içindeki sosyal etkileşimlerdir. İmamoğlu'nun (1998, 2003) Dengeli Bütünleşme-Ayrışma (Denge) modeli ise ilişkisellik (kişilerarası bütünleşme) ve bireyleşme (kişisel ayrışma) boyutlarının düzeylerine göre dört benlik kurgusu türü sunar: ilişkili-bireyleşmiş (dengeli; her iki boyutta da yüksek), ilişkili-kalıplaşmış (ilişkisellik yüksek, bireyleşme düşük), ayrışmış-bireyleşmiş (ilişkisellik düşük, bireyleşme yüksek) ve ayrışmış-kalıplaşmış (dengesiz; her iki boyutta da düşük). Modele göre, optimal psikolojik gelişim hem ilişkisellik hem de bireyleşme ihtiyacının karşılandığı ilişkili-bireyleşmiş benlik kurgusuna bağlıyken, her iki ihtiyacın da karşılanmadığı ayrışmış-kalıplaşmış benlik kurgusu en dengesiz olanıdır.

Yapılan çalışmalar bu benlik kurgularının otobiyografik bellek ve dil kullanımı üzerinde önemli etkileri olduğunu göstermektedir. Örneğin, ilişkili-bireyleşmiş öğrencilerin hatırladıkları ilk çocukluk anılarını çok daha erken bir yaşa tarihlendirdikleri ve bu anıları daha kolay betimledikleri bulunmuştur (Şahin ve Mebert, 2013). Genel olarak ilişkisellik boyutu yüksek olan bireyler; anılarını daha önemli algılamakta, daha çok hatıra eşyası saklamakta ve deneyimlerini daha sık paylaşmaktadır (Şahin ve Mebert, 2013). Bireyleşme boyutu ise gelecek olaylar hakkında daha ayrıntılı konuşma ve daha az tekrara düşme ile ilişkilidir. Ayrıca dengeli benlik kurgusuna sahip annelerin çocukları, geçmiş olaylar hakkındaki konuşmalarda daha fazla evet/hayır sorusuna dahil olmaktadır (Şahin-Acar ve Leichtman, 2015). Son olarak, kültürel ve alt kültürel farklar incelendiğinde, Türkiye'nin batısındaki anneler ile Amerikalı annelerin bireyleşme ve ilişkisellik puanlarının farklılaşmadığı, ancak Türkiye'nin batısındaki annelerin doğusundaki annelere kıyasla her iki boyutta da daha yüksek puanlar aldığı ve bu durumun aynı ülke içindeki alt kültürel farklılıklara işaret etmektedir (Şahin-Acar ve Leichtman, 2015).

Özgül olarak çalışmaların ayrıntılarına geçmeden önce, otobiyografik bellek kodlamalarına ve spesifik özelliklerine göz atmak faydalı olacaktır.

## 1.9. Otobiyografik bellek kodlamaları ve özellikleri

### 1.9.1. Anlatı Bütünlüğü

Anlatı bütünlüğü, olayların zaman ve mekân belirtilerek mantıksal bir sıra içinde aktarılması, bir sonuca bağlanması ve öznel perspektifler içermesidir (Reese ve ark., 2011). Kronoloji, bağlam ve tema olmak üzere üç boyuttan oluşur. Yaşam öykülerindeki anlatı bütünlüğü, özellikle kimlik inşasının ön planda olduğu ergenlik ve beliren yetişkinlik dönemlerinde psikolojik sağlık ve etkili baş etme becerileriyle güçlü bir şekilde ilişkili bulunurken, bütünlüğün düşük olması psikiyatrik sorunlara ve ruminasyona işaret edebilir (Adler, 2012; Waters ve Fivush, 2015). Anlatı bütünlüğü 8 yaşında neredeyse hiç yokken ergenlikte ortaya çıkar, 40 yaşına kadar olgunlaşır ve geç yetişkinlikte azalma gösterebilir (Köber ve ark., 2015). Ayrıca eğitim seviyesi yüksek olanlar daha bütünsel anlatılar üretir (Bakır-Demir, 2021). Bununla birlikte, çalışmalar göstermiştir ki kadın olmak, hem kişisel hem de dolaylı anılarda anlatı bütünlüğünün en önemli olumlu yordayıcısıdır (Fivush ve ark., 2011). Kültürel olarak incelendiğinde, Türk kadınlarının aile öykülerinin, Yeni Zelandalı kadınlara kıyasla daha yüksek anlatı bütünlüğü gösterdiği bulunmuştur (Bakır-Demir ve ark., 2023).Son olarak bireyselleşme yönelimi yüksek, ilişkisellik yönelimi düşük olan genç yetişkinlerin daha bütünsel anılar paylaştığı görülmüştür (Aytuglu ve ark., 2023).

### 1.9.2. Öznel Perspektif

Öznel perspektif kodlaması, anlatıcıların hikayedeki karakterlerin duygu ve düşüncelerini ne derece aktardığını ifade eder (Reese ve ark., 2017). Bu, bilişsel (düşünme, fark etme vb.) ve duygusal (mutluluk, kavga etme vb.) kelimelerin kodlanmasını içerir. Geçmiş olayları bu terimlerle yorumlamak ergenler için gelişimsel bir başarı olarak kabul edilir ve ergenlerin özsaygısıyla ilişkili bulunmuştur (Chen ve ark., 2021; Habermas ve de Silveira, 2008). Kadınlar erkeklere, genç yetişkinler ise ileri yetişkinlere kıyasla aile öykülerinde daha fazla öznel perspektif terimi kullanır; ayrıca bu terimlerin kullanımı yaşla birlikte artar (Bakır-Demir ve ark., 2021; Reese ve ark., 2017). Yön'ün (2023) çalışmasında bireyleşme yönelimi yüksek olan kişilerin aile anlatılarında daha fazla öznel perspektif kullandığı görülmüştür.

### 1.9.3. Kimlik Bağlantıları

Kimlik bağlantıları kodlaması, anlatılan karakterin hikayesi ile anlatıcının kendi kimliği arasında kurulan bağlantıları (hayat dersleri veya karşılaştırmalar gibi) ifade eder. Bu bağlantılar, bireyin kendini başkalarıyla ilişkisi içinde tanımlamasına yardımcı olur; yüksek kimlik keşfi, bağlılık ve özsaygı ile ilişkili bulunmuştur (Merrill ve Fivush, 2016; Reese ve ark., 2017). Genel olarak hem kişisel hem de nesiller arası anlatılarda bu bağlantıların sayısı düşüktür; ancak karşılıklı bağımlı (toplulukçu) kültürlerden gelenlerin (Māori ve Çinli ergenler gibi) ve kadınların bu bağlantıları daha sık kullandığı bulunmuştur (Reese ve ark., 2017; Yenen, 2023).

### 1.9.4. İlişkiler / Sosyal etkileşim

Bu kodlama, anlatıların yakınlık ve sosyal bağ kurma ihtiyacını (ortaklaşalık temasını) ve hikayelerdeki sosyal etkileşim düzeyini değerlendirir (McAdams ve ark., 1996; Reese ve ark., 2017). Araştırmalar, kız çocuklarının oğlanlara kıyasla ilişkiler hakkında daha fazla anlamlandırma ifadesi kullandığını göstermektedir (Reese ve ark., 2017). Kültürel olarak ise Türk kadınlarının anne anlatılarında sosyal etkileşimlere Yeni Zelandalı kadınlardan daha fazla odaklandığı ve daha uzun aile hikayelerinin daha fazla sosyal etkileşim içerdiği bulunmuştur (Bakır-Demir ve ark., 2023).

### 1.9.5. Sebep

Sebep kodlaması, anlatıcıların, karşısındaki kişinin bu hikayeyi kendisiyle neden paylaştığına dair algısını yansıtır. Kültürel olarak bireysel kültürlerdeki insanlar (örneğin Avrupa kökenli Amerikalılar) anıları ilişkileri güçlü tutmak ve eğlence için paylaşırken, toplulukçu kültürlerdeki bireyler (örneğin Asyalı Amerikalı ve Türk grupları) ilişkileri zaten güvende gördüklerinden, bu paylaşımların arkasındaki gelişimsel, öğretici ve duygu ifade etme amaçlarını daha çok fark ederler (Bakır-Demir ve ark., 2023; Wang, 2013). Ayrıca yaş büyüdükçe dolaylı anıların, *aile tarihini zenginleştirme* amacıyla anlatıldığı fikri artarken, küçük yaşlarda *öylesine/bir sebep* olmadan anlatıldığı düşüncesi daha yaygındır (Reese ve ark., 2017).

### 1.9.6. Fenomenolojik özellikler

Otobiyografik belleğin fenomenolojisi, anıların zihinde yeniden yaşanması ve deneyimlenmesi sırasındaki öznel bilinç sürecidir (Rubin, 2005; Tulving, 2002). Anıların canlılığı, erişilebilirliği, zamansal yakınlığı, inanç derecesi, duyusal detayları, duygusal yoğunluğu ve mesafesi gibi boyutlarla ölçülür (Boyacıoğlu ve Akfırat, 2015; Sutin ve Robins, 2007). Depresyon veya travma sonrası stres bozukluğu semptomları olan kişilerin anıları daha az yoğun, daha genel ve özellikle olumlu anılar bağlamında daha az canlı ve erişilebilir değerlendirdikleri bulunmuştur (Borrelli ve ark., 2024; Contractor ve ark., 2020). Bunlara ek olarak, güçlü duygusal yüke sahip anılar daha canlı ve kolay hatırlanır (Buchanan, 2007). Demografik olarak ise kadınların anlatıları erkeklere göre; yaşça büyük bireylerin anlatıları ise gençlere göre algılanan canlılık, bütünlük ve erişilebilirlik boyutlarında daha yüksek puanlar almaktadır (Luchetti ve Sutin, 2018; Vanden Poel ve Hermans, 2019).

### 1.9.7. Anlatı özellikleri

Anlatı özellikleri; anının hacmi (kelime sayısı), toplam duygu kelimeleri ve kullanılan özgün duygu kelimeleri gibi yapısal unsurları inceler. Yoğun olumsuz olaylara dair anlatılar, olumlu olaylara kıyasla daha uzun olma, daha fazla bilişsel işleme kelimesi ve daha yüksek duygusal yoğunluk içerme eğilimindedir (Bohanek ve ark., 2005; Waters ve ark., 2013). Ayrıca yüksek depresyon semptomları daha sık olumsuz duygu kelimesi kullanımıyla ilişkili bulunmuştur (Mariani ve ark., 2020). Kadınlar erkeklere kıyasla daha uzun anılar anlatır ve daha fazla duygu terimi kullanır (Bohanek ve Fivush, 2010). Çocuklarda da kız çocuklarının oğlan çocuklarına kıyasla daha fazla özgün duygu kelimesi kullandığı görülmüştür (Çeviker, 2022). Ebeveyn-çocuk anı konuşmalarında, özgün duygu kelimesi çeşitliliği annenin yüksek detaylandırma eğilimi ve bireyleşme düzeyi ile ilişkilidir (Fivush, 2007).

## 1.10. Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemalar ve Şema Alanları

Beck'in (1967) çalışmalarına dayanan Young ve ark. (2003), çocukluktaki temel duygusal ihtiyaçların karşılanmaması sonucu yetişkinlikte de devam eden işlevsiz inanç ve anı kalıplarını Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemaları (EDUŞ) olarak tanımlamıştır

(Rafaeli ve ark., 2011). Şemalar, çocukluktaki ihtiyaçların engellenmesi, travma, aşırı şımartılma veya ebeveyn modellerinin içselleştirilmesiyle oluşur ve Soygüt ve ark. (2009) tarafından Türkçe uyarlaması yapılan beş ana alanda (kopukluk/reddedilmişlik, zedelenmiş özerklik, yetersiz sınırlar, başkalarına yönelimlilik, aşırı tetikte olma) gruplanır (Rafaeli ve ark., 2011; Young ve ark., 2003). Dünyayı tahmin edilebilir kılmak için bilgiyi filtreleyen bu yapılar, gerçekliği çarpıtarak çeşitli psikopatolojilere zemin hazırlar (Beck ve ark., 2004; Dostal ve Pilkington, 2023). Nesiller arası aktarım çalışmalarında, anne ve babaların özellikle kopukluk ve yetersiz sınırlar alanlarındaki yüksek şema puanlarının, çocuk yetiştirme tutumlarını etkileyerek çocuklarında hem benzer uyumsuz şemaların hem de içselleştirme ve dışsallaştırma problemlerinin oluşmasını doğrudan yordadığı bulunmuştur (Mącik ve ark., 2016; Şahin-Acar, 2024).

## 2. Mevcut Çalışmalar

Bu doktora tezi kapsamında birbiriyle ilişkili 3 çalışma ile utanç anıları çeşitli bağlamlarda ele alınmış; hem kişisel ve dolaylı anılar, hem de anı konuşmaları aracılığıyla otobiyografik bellek araştırmaları alan yazınına katkı sağlamayı hedeflemiştir.

Çalışma 1 pilot çalışma niteliğinde olup katılımcıların kişisel utanç anılarının temalarının belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu temaların katılımcı türü (üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar ve anneleri) ile algılanan sosyoekonomik düzeye göre (düşük ve orta-yüksek) değişip değişmediği incelenmiştir.

Çalışma 2 ile üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar ve annelerinin kişisel utanç anıları ve dolaylı utanç anılarının bellek özellikleri incelenmiştir. Katılımcıların bireysel özelliklerinin kişisel ve dolaylı anı konuşmalarına dair gösterdikleri özellikleri yordamak için modeller kurulmuştur.

Son olarak Çalışma 3 ile, üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar ve onların annelerinin birbirleriyle utanç anılarını konuşurken, bu konuşmanın anı konuşmaları çerçevesinde nasıl şekillendiğinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Çalışma 2'nin gösterdiği bulgular doğrultusunda katılımcıların bireysel özelliklerinin bu anı konuşmalarına dair gösterdikleri özellikleri yordamak amacıyla modeller test edilmiştir.

## Çalışma 1

Pilot çalışma niteliğindeki ilk çalışmanın amacı, katılımcıların araştırmacıya kişisel utanç anılarını anlatıp anlatmadıklarını görmek ve eğer anlattıkları gözlemlenirse bu anıların özelliklerini ortaya koymaktır.

### 3.1. Yöntem

#### 3.1.1. Katılımcılar

Bu çalışmaya 10'u düşük sosyoekonomik düzeyden ve 11'i orta-yüksek sosyoekonomik düzeyden olmak üzere toplam 21 üniversite öğrencisi (yaş aralığı 19-24, *Ort.* = 20.86, *SS* =1.53) ve onların annelerinden oluşan (yaş aralığı 38-57, *Ort.* = 48.76, *SS* = 4.57) çift katılmıştır. Kolayda örnekleme yöntemiyle veri toplanmış olup; 2023-2024 Bahar Döneminde ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümünde açılan "PSY 3396 Gelişim Psikolojisinde Alan Çalışmaları" dersi kapsamında dersi alan öğrencilerin araştırmacıya anne-kız çiftleri yönlendirmeleri istenmiştir. Ders kapsamında yönlendirme yapan öğrenciler annesiyle birlikte bir çalışmaya katılmayı kabul eden üniversite öğrencilerine çalışmaya başvuru formu niteliğinde olan *ilk temas formunu* iletmişlerdir. Bu form; katılımcı adaylarının çalışmaya katılım ile ilgili onam formu, demografik bilgileri, katılımcı kodları ve iletişim bilgilerini içermektedir. İletişim bilgileri kısmından formu dolduran üniversite öğrencisiyle iletişime geçen araştırmacı, katılımcı adayına araştırma hakkında teknik bilgilendirme yapmış (ses kaydı alınacak ve ayrı gerçekleşecek olan çevrimiçi görüşmeler) ve varsa sorularını yanıtlamıştır. Bu noktadan sonra hala istekli olan katılımcı adayına araştırmacıyla yarı yapılandırmış görüşmeye katılabilmesi için randevu oluşturabileceği bir form iletilmiştir. Çalışmaya katılan annelerden yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmenin başında onam formunu tamamlamaları istenmiştir. Üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar ve anneleriyle bireysel çevrimiçi görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 için de veri toplama süreci benzer olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Çalışma 1 için veri toplama süreci Şubat 2024'te başlayıp Nisan 2024'te tamamlanmıştır.

### 3.1.2. İşlem

ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu'ndan veri toplama aşamasına ilişkin gerekli etik izin alınmıştır (Protokol No. 0448 ve 0474-ODTUİAEK-2023). Kadın üniversite öğrencileri anneleriyle beraber otobiyografik anılarla ilgili çevrimiçi bir çalışmaya katılmaya davet edilmiştir. Öğrenciler ve stajyerler yönlendirmeleri yapmadan önce yönlendirme süreci hakkında eğitilmiş ve kendileriyle yapılandırılmış formda davet metinleri paylaşılmıştır.

Kadın üniversite öğrencileri *ilk temas formu* adı verilen başvuru formu aracılığıyla başvuruda bulunmuştur. Çalışmaya katılım koşulları ve teknik bilgilendirme sonrasında randevu oluşturmak isteyen katılımcı adaylarına randevu oluşturabilecekleri bir form gönderilmiştir. Çalışma 1 ve Çalışma 2 için üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar ve anneleriyle görüşmeler ayrı ancak sırasıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Üniversite öğrencisi kadın müsait zamanlar havuzundan bir saat seçtiğinde yarım saat sonraki randevu otomatik olarak annesi için rezerve ediliyor ve randevuya ait görüşme bağlantısı hem randevuyu oluşturan kişinin girdiği e-posta adresine hem de araştırmacının e-posta adresine iletiliyordu. Çalışma 3 içinse bu sefer beraber çalışmaya katılacakları için yarım saatlik bir rezervasyon oluşturulması ve oluşturulan randevuya ait görüşme bağlantısının yine hem randevuyu oluşturan kişinin girdiği e-posta adresine hem de araştırmacının e-posta adresine iletilmesi sağlanmıştır. Ayrı yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerin yapıldığı Çalışma 1 ve Çalışma 2 kapsamında, kadın üniversite öğrencisiyle olan görüşme tamamlandıktan sonra araştırmacı, anne ile yapılacak ikinci görüşmenin bağlantısını kendisi oluşturmuş ve üniversite öğrencisinden annesine çalışma hakkında bir bilgi vermemesi ve oluşturulan bağlantıyı annesine iletmesi istenmiştir. Bu oluşturulan bağlantı aracılığıyla anneyle çevrimiçi görüşme başlıyor ve çalışmaya katılan annelerden yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmenin başında onam formunu tamamlamaları istenmiştir. Çalışma 3'te randevu oluştururken randevu sisteminin oluşturduğu bağlantı üzerinden yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler tamamlanmıştır.

Microsoft Teams üzerinden gerçekleştirilen çevrimiçi görüşmelerin hepsinin 2 ana kısmı bulunuyordu: (1) katılımcıların otobiyografik anılarını anlatmaları ve (2)

otobiyografik anı özelliklerinin toplandığı ikinci kısım. Araştırmacı, katılımcılardan kendisiyle/birbirleriyle utanç anısı paylaşmalarını istemiştir. Çalışma 1 ve Çalışma 2 için otobiyografik anı özelliklerini araştırmacı soruları katılımcıya yönelterek kendisi toplamış, Çalışma 3'te bunu katılımcıların kendilerine iletilen formlar aracılığıyla tamamlamalarını istenmiştir.

Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 kapsamında yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler bittikten sonra, anneler ve kızları için ayrı ayrı oluşturulan soru paketlerini katılımcıların kendilerine iletilen katılımcı kodlarını girerek doldurmaları istenmiştir.

### 3.1.3. Ölçüm Araçları

Microsoft Teams üzerinden gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış çevrimiçi görüşmelerden sonra pilot çalışma niteliğindeki Çalışma 1 kapsamında kişilerden sadece demografik bilgileri alınmıştır.

#### 3.1.3.1. Demografik Bilgi Formu

Araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan demografik bilgi formu; yaş, cinsiyet, eğitim seviyesi, meslek, ekonomik düzey ve aile özelliklerini (örneğin; medeni durum, ebeveynlerin eğitim düzeyi, kardeş sayısı, doğum sırası) içeren sorulardan oluşmaktadır. Üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar için demografik bilgi formu ilk temas formunda yer alıyorken, annelerin demografik bilgi formu Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 için yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmeler tamamlandıktan sonra kendilerine iletilen görüşme sonrası soru paketinde yer almaktadır. Çalışma 1 kapsamında ise annelerin demografik bilgileri çalışmanın otobiyografik anı anlatımı kısmı tamamlandıktan sonra doğrudan araştırmacı tarafından katılımcıya yöneltilerek Word dosyası üzerinden işaretlenmiştir.

#### 3.1.3.2. Anlatı Sonrası Sorular

Her çalışmada (eğer bir anı paylaşımı yapıldıysa) anı paylaşım kısmı bittikten sonra alan yazında var olan boyutlardan yararlanarak (Boyacıoğlu ve Akfırat, 2015; Sutin ve Robins, 2007) anıların fenomenolojik özellikleri ile (anının duygusal yükü, canlılığı vb.) anıların değerlendirmeye dayalı karakteristiklerine (anıyı yaşarken kişinin

geçmişteki ve şimdiki utanç düzeyi, kaygı düzeyi vb.) ilişkin bilgilerin toplandığı bir standart ölçüm aracı oluşturulmuştur (Ek C).

Seçilen veya anlatılan anıda katılımcının yaşı ve anıya ait geçmişteki duygusal değerlendirmeleri alınmıştır. Duygusal değerlendirmeler 5 puanlı ölçüm üzerinden (*1=hiç yoğun değil, 5= çok yoğun*) hem anıyı deneyimlerken (geçmişteki) hem de bugün araştırmacıya anlatırken hissettikleri yoğunluk (şimdiki) üzerinden puanlanmıştır. Ayrıca anı sahibine bu yaşanan olayda kendisinin algıladığı sorumluluk yüzdesi ile bu olayın gerçekleşmesinde yüzde kaç kasıtlı davrandığı sorulmuştur. Bu değerlendirmelere ek olarak kişisel anılar ve anı konuşmalarında katılımcıların seçmiş oldukları anıyı ne kadar önemli buldukları (*1=hiç önemli değil, 7= çok önemli*) , bu anıyı anlatmayı ne kadar kolay buldukları (*1=hiç kolay değil, 7= çok kolay*), anının netliği (*1=hiç net değil, 7= çok net*), anının uzaklığı (*1= çok uzak bir zamanda gerçekleşmiş, 7= çok yakın zamanda gerçekleşmiş*), anının yoğunluğu (*1=hiç yoğun değil, 7= çok yoğun*) ve anının canlılığı (*1=hiç canlı değil/ çok solgun, 7= çok canlı*) bilgileri alınmıştır. Çalışma 2 kapsamında sorulan dolaylı anılar için dolaylı anının hatırlanma ve anlatılma sıklığına ek olarak (*1=hiç anlatmam/hatırlamam, 7= çok sık anlatırım/hatırlarım*) dolaylı önemi kişi için önem, duygusal yükü, anlatılma kolaylığı, netliği ve uzaklığı bilgileri sorulmuştur. Çalışma 3 kapsamında anı konuşmasında seçilen anının özelliklerine ek olarak üniversite öğrencilerine utanç anılarını annelerine genel olarak değerlendirdiklerinde ne sıklıkla anlattıkları ve annelere de utanç hissetikleri anılarını kızlarına genel olarak değerlendirdiklerinde ne sıklıkla anlattıkları 7'li ölçüm üzerinden (*1=hiç anlatmam, 7=çok sık anlatırım*) sorulmuştur.

## 3.2. Veri Analizi

### 3.2.1. Tematik Analizler

İlk çalışma kapsamında yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerin verilerini analiz etmek için Tematik Analiz yöntemi kullanılmıştır (Braun ve Clarke, 2006). Bu yöntem, veri seti genelinde temaları ve anlam kalıplarını belirlemek için uygun olduğundan, Braun ve Clarke'ın (2006) önerileri doğrultusunda, analiz altı adımda gerçekleştirilmiştir: Öncelikle, transkripsiyonlar tekrar tekrar okundu ve görüşmeci tarafından ilk

düşünceler not alındı. Daha sonra, katılımcıların ifadelerini tam olarak kapsayabilmek için mümkün olduğunca fazla çeşitlilik içerecek şekilde ilk kodlar oluşturuldu. Tüm kodlamalar tamamlandıktan sonra, kodlar sıklıklarına ve katılımcıların deneyimlerini ne ölçüde yansıttıklarına göre tekrar incelenerek potansiyel temalar ve alt temalar ortaya çıkarıldı. Bu temalar daha sonra veriler doğrultusunda gözden geçirildi ve gerekli yerlerde yeniden düzenlendi. Tematik analiz kodlamaları ve temalaştırma aşaması MAXQDA 24 yazılım programı kullanılarak yapılmıştır. İlk çalışma pilot çalışma niteliğinde olup katılımcıların araştırmacıya utanç anılarını anlatıp anlatmayacaklarını görmek en temel araştırma sorusuydu. Eğer anlatırlarsa, temalar arasında katılımcı türüne (üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar) ve algılanan sınıfa göre (düşük ve orta-yüksek) bir fark olup olmadığı araştırma sorularını oluşturmaktadır.

### 3.3. Temel Bulgular

Bu anılardaki: (1) ilişkisel ortamın (*relational context of memories*) ve (2) utanç anısının içeriğinin (*content of memories*) belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. 42 katılımcı tarafından anlatılan 40 utanç anısında yer alan ilişkisel ortam analizi sonuçları 6 farklı ilişkisel ortamı ortaya koymuştur: (1) Aile Bağlamı (%40), (2) Eğitim Bağlamı (%22.5), (3) Akran Bağlamı (%12.5), (4) Profesyonel Ortam (%12.5), (5) Kamuya Açık Alan (%10) ve (6) Kişilerarası Bağlam (%2.5).

Aynı 42 katılımcı tarafından anlatılan 40 utanç anısının içeriği kodlandığında ise ortaya sıklık sırasına göre 5 farklı utanç anısı içeriği çıkmıştır: (1) Aksilikler ve Hatalar (%42.5; üç alt tema ile), (2) Saldırganlık (%25; üç alt tema ile), (3) Performans Barındıran Durumlar (%22.5; üç alt tema ile), (4) Cinsellik (%5) ve (5) Beden İmgesi İle İlişkili Durumlar (%5).

İlişkisel ortam sonuçlarında katılımcı türüne göre farklılıklar gözlemlenmiş, sosyoekonomik düzey anlatılan ilişki ortamı sıklıklarında bazı farklılıklara yol açmıştır. Anı içerikleri ise katılımcı türü ve sosyoekonomik düzeyden bağımsız bir şekilde en sık *Aksilikler ve Hatalar* temalarında anlatılmıştır.

## Çalışma 2

İkinci çalışma, anne-kız çiftlerinin hem kişisel hem de dolaylı utanç anılarını anlatma durumlarını ve bunların anlatı kimliği üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektedir. Alan yazın, olumlu anıların bağ kurmaya, olumsuz anıların ise duyguları anlamlandırmaya hizmet ettiğini; kişisel anıların dolaylı anılara kıyasla daha canlı, duygusal ve kişisel olarak daha anlamlı algılansa da her iki türün de benzer fenomenolojik özellikler taşıdığını göstermektedir (Fivush, 2007; Pond ve Peterson, 2020; Rasmussen ve Berntsen, 2009). Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, üniversite öğrencilerinin ve annelerinin kişisel ve dolaylı utanç anılarının anlatı özelliklerini (anlatı bütünlüğü, öznel perspektif, kimlik bağlantıları, sosyal etkileşim ve sebep) Batılı olmayan (non-WEIRD) bir örneklemde incelemektir. Ön korelasyon analizlerine dayanarak oluşturulan hiyerarşik regresyon modellerinde; öğrencilerin anlatı özelliklerinin sırasıyla bireyleşme, yetersiz sınırlar şema alanı ve utanç/suçluluk değişkenleri tarafından; annelerin anlatı özelliklerinin ise belirli şema alanları (yüksek standartlar, yetersiz sınırlar, başkalarına yönelimlilik) ve utanç/suçluluk değişkenleri tarafından aşamalı olarak yordanacağı hipotez edilmiştir. Ayrıca anne ve kızların anıları paylaşma sebeplerinin kodlamaları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark olması beklenmektedir.

### 4.1. Yöntem

#### 4.1.1. Katılımcılar

69 üniversite öğrencisi (yaş aralığı 18-25, *Ort.* = 21.31, *SS* =1.52) ve onların annelerinden oluşan (yaş aralığı 40-60, *Ort.* = 48.86, *SS* = 5.01) çift katılmıştır.

#### 4.1.2. Ölçüm Araçları

##### 4.1.2.1. Demografik Bilgi Formu

Çalışma 1 ile aynıdır.

#### 4.1.2.2. Dengeli Bütünleşme Ayrışma (Denge) Ölçeği

Denge Ölçeği, İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) tarafından Dengeli Bütünleşme-Ayrışma Modeli'nde ele alınan benlik kurgularını ölçmek için geliştirmiştir. Ölçekteki maddeler 1'den 5'e kadar puanlanmaktadır (*1 = kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 5 = kesinlikle katılıyorum*). Ölçeğin; ilişki yönelimi (*relatedness*) 16 madde ile (yüksek puanlar yüksek ilişki yönelimine işaret etmektedir) ve gelişme yönelimi (*individuation*) 13 madde ile (yüksek puanlar yüksek kendileşmeye işaret etmektedir) ölçülmekte olup iki alt ölçekten oluşmaktadır. İlk alt ölçeğin Cronbach alfa katsayısı α = .80 ve α = .91, ikinci alt ölçeğin ise α = .71 ve α = .82 arasındadır (İmamoğlu, 1998, 2003).

Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 kapsamında hem üniversite öğrencileri için hem de onların anneleri için ilişki yönelimi ve gelişme yönelimi alt ölçeklerine ait Cronbach alfa katsayıları kabul edilebilir düzeylerde bulunmuştur.

#### 4.1.2.3. Young Şema Ölçeği

Young Şema Ölçeği Kısa Form 3 (YŞÖ-KF3) Jeffrey Young'ın Şema Terapi (1990, 2003) temelinde geliştirmiştir. Türkçe uyarlaması Soygüt ve ark. (2009) tarafından yapılan formda, "Zedelenmiş otonomi", "Kopukluk", "Yüksek standartlar", "Zedelenmiş sınırlar" ve "Diğeri yönelimlilik" şema alanlarını oluşturan 14 şema önerilmektedir.

90 maddeden oluşan ölçekte katılımcılar, her bir maddeyi 6'lı Likert üzerinde (*1 = Benim için tamamıyla yanlış, 6 = Beni mükemmel şekilde tanımlıyor*) derecelendirmektedir. Belirlenen şema alanlarının Cronbach Alpha iç tutarlık katsayıları ise α = .53 - .81 arasında değişmektedir. Buna göre ölçeğin orta düzeyde iç tutarlık katsayısına sahip olduğu söylenebilir (Soygüt ve ark., 2009).

Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 kapsamında hem üniversite öğrencileri için hem de onların anneleri için şema alanlarına ait alt ölçeklerine ait Cronbach alfa katsayıları kabul edilebilir düzeylerde bulunmuştur.

#### 4.1.2.4. Utandıran Diğeri Ölçeği 2

Utandıran Diğeri Ölçeği 2, diğer insanların kişinin kendisini nasıl değerlendirdiğine dair inançlarına odaklanan ve sürekli utancı (*trait shame*) ölçen bir öz-bildirim ölçeğidir (Matos ve ark., 2015). Türkçe uyarlaması Yıldırım ve ark. (2021) tarafından gerçekleştirilmiş olup 5'li Likert tipinde puanlanmakta (*0 = hiç, 4 = neredeyse her zaman*) ve yüksek puanlar dışsal utancın yüksekliğine işaret etmektedir. Orijinal ölçüm aracındaki yedi maddeden ve tek faktörden oluşan formu korunmuş olup Türkçe adaptasyon için Cronbach alfa katsayı α = .85 bulunmuştur (Yıldırım ve ark., 2021).

Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 kapsamında hem üniversite öğrencileri için hem de onların anneleri için dışsallaştırılmış utanç puanına ait ölçeğine ilişkin Cronbach alfa katsayıları yüksek düzeylerde bulunmuştur.

#### 4.1.2.5. Suçluluk ve Utanç Ölçeği

Şahin ve Şahin (1992) tarafından çeşitli koşullar altında suçluluk ve utancı ölçmek için geliştirmiştir. 12 utanç ve 12 suçluluk sorularından toplam 24 sorudan oluşan ölçek *hiç* ile *son derece* arasında değişen 5'li Likert tipindedir. Yüksek puanlar daha yüksek suçluluk ve utanç düzeyine işaret etmektedir.

Ölçeğin toplam iç tutarlılığı α = .89 ve hem suçluluk hem de utanç alt ölçeğinin Cronbach alfa değerleri sırasıyla α = .81 ve α = .80 olarak bulunmuştur (Şahin ve Şahin, 1992).

Çalışma 2 ve Çalışma 3 kapsamında hem üniversite öğrencileri için hem de onların anneleri için suçluluk ve utanç alt ölçeklerine ait Cronbach alfa katsayıları kabul edilebilir düzeylerde bulunmuştur.

#### 4.1.2.6. Utanç ve Suçluluk Eğilimi Ölçeği

Utanç ve Suçluluk Eğilimi Ölçeği, utanç ve suçluluk deneyimi eğilimini ölçmek için Cohen ve ark. (2011) tarafından geliştirilen 16 maddeden oluşan bir ölçektir. Ölçeğin Türkçe adaptasyonu Topçu tarafından yapılmış (2019) ve psikometrik özellikleri uygun olarak belirtilmiştir. 4 alt ölçekten oluşan [Suçluluk - ODD (Olumsuz Davranış

Değerlendirmeleri), Suçluluk-Onarım, Utanç- OBD (Olumsuz Benlik Değerlendirmeleri), Utanç-Geri Çekilme] ölçüm aracı 7'li Likert tipindedir (*1 = hiç olası değil, 7 = çok olası*). Alt ölçeklerden yüksek puan almak, yüksek eğilime işaret etmektedir.

Çalışma 2 kapsamında Utanç ve Suçluluk Eğilimlerine ait alt ölçeklerin Cronbach alfa katsayıları kabul edilebilir düzeylerde bulunmasına karşın Çalışma 3 kapsamında utanç ile ilişkili ölçümlere ait katsayılar güvenilir çıkmamış bu sebeple son çalışmaya bu ölçüm aracı dahil edilmemiştir.

### 4.2. Veri Analizi

İkinci çalışma kapsamında bu sefer toplam 69 anne-kız çiftiyle yine çevrimiçi ortamda randevu düzenlenerek katılımcılarla ayrı ayrı görüşülmüştür. Görüşme süresince katılımcılardan hem kişisel utanç anıları hem de dolaylı utanç anılarını anlatmaları istenmiştir. Anlatılan kişisel utanç anıları için anlatı bütünlüğü (*thematic coherence*) ve öznel perspektif (*subjective perspective*) kodlamaları yapılmıştır. Dolaylı utanç anıları içinse anlatı bütünlüğü ve öznel perspektif kodlamalarına ek olarak kimlik bağlantıları (*identity connections*) ve sosyal etkileşim / ilişkiler (*social interaction coding / relationships*) kodlamaları tamamlanmıştır. Bu kodlamalara ek olarak dolaylı anılarını anlatabilen katılımcılara "Sizce bu anının sahibi (üniversite öğrencisi kadınlar için anneleri ve anneler için kızları) size bu anıyı neden anlattı?" diye sorularak yanıtları sebepler (*reasons*) kodlaması uyarınca kodlanmıştır. Tüm veri seti iki kodlayıcı tarafından kodlanmış olup her bir kodlama değişkeni için kodlayıcılar arası uzlaşma değerleri yüksek düzeyde bulunmuştur.

### 4.3. Temel Bulgular

Bu çalışmada anneler ve kızları için ayrı ayrı modeller kurulmuş olup üniversite öğrencilerinin modellerinde bireyselleşme, zedelenmiş sınırlar ve utanç ile ilişkili değişkenler yer alırken; annelerinin modellerinde şema alanları ve utanç ile ilişkili değişkenler yordayıcı rolünde olmuştur. Üniversite öğrencilerinin modelleri anlatı bütünlüğü ve öznel perspektif değişkenleri için istatistiksel olarak anlamlı sonuçlar vermiştir. Buna göre üniversite öğrencilerinin bireyselleşme puanlarındaki yükseklik

anlatı bütünlüğü (hem kişisel hem dolaylı anılar için) ve öznel perspektif – duygu kelimelerini (kişisel anılar için) pozitif yönde anlamlı şekilde yordamıştır. Annelerde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı çıkan tek bir yordayıcı olmuştur, o da utanca ilişkin geri çekilme eğilimleridir. Bu yordayıcı değişken annelerin kişisel anılarındaki anlatı bütünlüğünü olumsuz olarak yordamıştır.

Bu bulgular ilgili alan yazın çerçevesinde ele alınmıştır.

**Çalışma 3**

İlk iki çalışmada katılımcıların utanç anılarını bir araştırmacıya anlatması sağlanmıştır. Ancak utancın kişilerarası ve sosyal bir duygu olması nedeniyle, üçüncü çalışmada daha doğal bir ortam yaratılmak istenmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, araştırmacı ortamda bulunmaksızın anne-kız çiftlerinin karşılıklı anı konuşmaları ve bu konuşmaların beraber inşası incelenmiştir.

### 5.1. Katılımcılar

Çalışma 3'e 188 üniversite öğrencisi (yaş aralığı 18-26, *Ort.* = 21.43, *SS* = 1.48) ve onların annelerinden oluşan (yaş aralığı 37-62, *Ort.* = 49.09, *SS* = 5.39) çift katılmıştır. Çalışma 3 için veri toplama süreci Nisan 2024'te başlayıp Eylül 2024'te tamamlanmıştır.

### 5.2. Veri Analizi

Üçüncü çalışma kapsamında toplam 188 kadın üniversite öğrencisi ve onların annelerininden oluşan çiftlerle çevrimiçi ortamda randevu düzenlenerek buluşulmuştur. Yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmede katılımcılardan birazdan birbirleriyle konuşmak üzere birer utanç anısı seçmeleri istenmiş olup seçimlerinin tamamlandığı bilgisi iletilince araştırmacı mikrofonunu ve kamerasını kapatarak anne kızı yalnız bırakmıştır. Araştırmacı ayrılmadan önce çifte, onları duyabilecek bir mesafede bekleyeceğini, konuşmaları tamamlanınca kendisine haber vermelerini istediğini söylemiştir. Yapılan anı konuşmaları, otobiyografik bellek özelliklerini ortaya çıkarabilmek için hem üniversite öğrencisi kadın için hem de onların anneleri için ayrı ayrı kodlanmıştır: anının hacmi, toplam duygu kelimeleri, özgün duygu kelimeleri,

utanç ile ilişkili kelimeler ve sıra alma kodlamaları tamamlanmıştır. Bu değişkenlerin yordanması için kurulan modele bireyselleşme, şema alanları ve dışsallaştırılmış utanç değişkenleri eklenmiştir. Analizler için, bireylerin hem kendi özelliklerinin, hem de partnerlerin etkilerinin sonuç değişkenler üzerindeki etkilerinin göz önünde bulundurulduğu Aktör Partner Karşılıklı Bağımlılık Modeli kullanılmıştır. Bu istatistiki modeller R programının lavaan paketiyle test edilmiştir. Sıra alma sonuç değişkeni içinse regresyon modelleri kurulmuştur.

### 5.3 Temel Bulgular

Bu çalışma kapsamında anının hacmi (kelime sayısı) kontrol edilerek annelerin ve kızlarının toplam duygu kelimeleri, kullanılan özgün duygu kelimeleri ve utanç ile ilişkili kelimeleri yordamak için modeller oluşturulmuştur. Toplam duygu kelimeleri sonuç değişkeni için kurulan model istatistiki olarak anlamlı bir sonuç vermeyince keşifsel olarak incelenmek üzere bu duygu kelimeleri olumlu ve olumsuz duygu kelimeleri olarak ikiye ayrılmıştır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin utanç anıları konuşmaları sırasında kullandıkları olumlu duygu kelimesi kullanımını annelerinin bireyselleşme düzeyinin (partner etkisi) negatif yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Bu bulguyu tamamlayan bir şekilde kızların kendi bireyselleşme düzeyinin (aktör etkisi) aynı sohbette kullandıkları olumsuz duygu kelimelerini pozitif yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Konuştukları anı içeriğinin katılımcılar tarafından olumsuz olarak değerlendirildiği hatırlanırsa, bu iki bulgunun her iki aile üyesinin bireyselleşme puanlarının katılımcıların deneyimlerini olduğu gibi ifade etmesine katkıda bulunduğunu göstermektedir.

Üniversite öğrencilerinin anneleriyle yaptıkları bu anı konuşmalarında kullandıkları utanç ile ilişkili kelimelere ilişkin iki partner etkisi daha istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bulunmuştur: annelerin diğeri yönelimlilik şema alanı ile dışsallaştırılmış utanç düzeyleri kızlarının sohbet esnasında kullandıkları utanç ile ilişkili kelimeleri negatif yönde yordamıştır. Alan yazın bizlere kişilerin utançlarından utandıkları ve buna bağlı olarak da utanç kelimesini doğrudan kullanmalarının diğer kelimelere oranla daha düşük olduğunu göstermektedir (Macdonald, 1998; Retzinger, 1991). Diğeri yönelimlilik ve dışsallaştırılmış utanç değişkenlerinin ortak noktası, diğerinin kişiye

dair değerlendirmelerine ilişkin algılarındaki hassasiyet olarak değerlendirilebilir. Bu sonuçlar Goffman'ın (1959) değerlendirmeleriyle uyumlu olarak, sohbet esnasında üniversite öğrencilerinin, annelerinin bu hassasiyetlerini göz önünde bulundurmalarının bir yansıması olarak kızlarının utanç ile ilgili kelimeleri daha da azalttıkları açısından değerlendirilebilir.

### 5.4. Genel Tartışma

Bu çalışmaların amacı bireylerin utanç ile ilişkili deneyimlerini anlamaktır. Otobiyografik bellek araştırmaları alan yazını açısından görece yeni sayılabilecek utanç duygusuyla ilişkili anıların incelenmesine kadınlardan başlanması, birkaç anlaşılır gerekçe nedeniyle uygun bir başlangıç noktası olarak değerlendirilebilir. Kadınların, aile içinde *duygu tarihçileri* (Fivush ve ark., 2009) olarak isimlendirilmektedir. Bu da demek oluyor ki ister sosyalleştirme pratiklerinden, ister toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin teşviğinden olsun, kadınlar duygular konusunda erkeklere kıyasla daha aktif, düzenleyici ve aktarıcı bir rol üstlenmektedir. Aynı ailenin kadınlarıyla, özgül bir duygu olan utancın araştırılması başlangıç için uygun olarak değerlendirilmiştir.

Genel olarak duyguların, bireyleri bu deneyimleri başkalarıyla paylaşmaya yönelten bir işlev gördüğü kabul edilmektedir (Rimé, 2007). Rimé'ın (2007) *duyguların sosyal paylaşımı* kavramsallaştırması, duygusal yaşantıların çoğunlukla kişilerarası bağlamda anlamlandırıldığını ortaya koyarken, utanç duygusunun bu genel örüntüden ayrışabileceğine dikkat çekmektedir. Utanç; bireyin kendisini başkalarının gözünde kusurlu, yetersiz ya da nahoş biri olarak algılamasıyla ilişkili olup (Gilbert, 1998; Lewis, 1992; Nathanson, 1996), benlik değerlendirmesini ve sosyal aidiyet hissini doğrudan hedef alan bir duygu olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Gilbert ve McGuire, 1998; Keltner ve Harker, 1998). Bu yönüyle utanç, güven ilişkilerinde dahi dile getirilmekten kaçınılan; saklanma, geri çekilme ve içselleştirme eğilimiyle karakterize edilen bir duygusal deneyimdir (Gilbert, 1998; Nathanson, 1996). Alan yazında vurgulandığı üzere, kimlik gelişimi üzerinde derin ve kalıcı etkileri bulunan utanç, bireyin sosyal dünyadaki konumunu ve kendilik anlatılarını şekillendiren temel duygulardan biridir (Gilbert, 2003; Tangney ve Dearing, 2002).

Bu özellikleriyle utanç, bireyi paylaşımdan ziyade sessizlik ve yalnızlığa yöneltmekte; deneyimin söze dökülmemesi, duygunun düzenlenmesi ve anlamlandırılması süreçlerini karmaşıklaştırmaktadır. Alan yazın, utancın bireysel ve kişilerarası sonuçlarını kapsamlı biçimde ele almış olsa da, bu duyguyla bağlantılı deneyimlerin nasıl yaşandığı, nasıl hatırlandığı ve kişilerarası bağlamda nasıl şekillendiğine ilişkin önemli sorular hala yanıt beklemektedir.

Bu noktada, otobiyografik bellek alan yazınında önemli bir yere sahip olan Fivush'un (2004) dile getirme (*voice*) ve sessizliğin (*silence*) deneyimlerin öznel anlamını ve bellek temsillerini derinden etkilediğine yönelik vurgusu, utanç anılarının incelenmesi açısından güçlü bir kuramsal çerçeve sunmaktadır. Bu doktora tez çalışması kapsamında, otobiyografik bellek özellikleri bakımından yeterince anlaşılmamış olan utanç anıları; duyguların toplumsal olarak birlikte inşa edildiği temel bağlamlardan biri olan anne-kız ilişkisi odağında, birbiriyle ilişkili üç çalışma aracılığıyla ele alınmıştır.

Farklı bireysel özelliklere sahip kadınlarla yapılan bu kapsamlı çalışmalar, utanç anılarının özelliklerine dair hem alan yazına daha önce yapılmamış araştırmalarla katkılar sunmuş hem de bu alanda çalışılabilecek daha birçok çalışmaya ışık tutması sebebiyle çok önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Alan yazında önerilenden farklı bir biçimde (Pillemer ve ark., 2015) kişisel utanç anıları ve dolaylı utanç anıları arasında anlatılan anıların özellikleri açısından ortaya konan veya potansiyele işaret eden önemli farklılıklar, bu konunun utanç bağlamında daha fazla araştırma gerektirdiği ortaya koymaktadır. Kişilerin akıllarına gelen ve paylaşmayı seçtikleri anılar ile akıllarına gelen ve paylaşmayı seçmedikleri anılar ve belki de akıllarına dahi getiremedikleri anılarının kişilerin kimlik gelişimleri üzerindeki etkisi merak konusu olmayı sürdürmektedir.

Utanç ile ilişkili anılarla çalışırken karşılaşılacak en önemli nokta anlatılan anıların son derece heterojen olduğu gerçeğidir. Özellikle bu çalışmada olduğu gibi katılımcılardan sadece bir "utanç anılarını" anlatmaları istendiğinde kimi daha önce hiç kimseye anlatmadıkları kendileri için çok özel ve derin anıları araştırmacıyla paylaşırken kimi şimdi kendileri bile güldükleri, herkesin başına gelebilecek bazı

talihsizliklerden bahsetmiştir. Elimizdeki *utanç anılarının* doğası birbirinden bunca farklıyken bunların hepsini aynı kefeye koymak var olan ilişkileri görebilmek açısından büyük bir karıştırıcı özellik sergilemektedir.

Tüm olası kısıtlılıklara rağmen bu çalışmalar, ilgili alanda yapılabilecek nice çalışma için önemli yol gösterici nitelikler taşımaktadır.

## K. THESIS PERMISSION FORM/TEZ İZİN FORMU

**ENSTİTÜ/**INSTITUTE

**Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü**/Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü**/Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒

**Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü**/Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

**Enformatik Enstitüsü**/Graduate School of Informatics ☐

**Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü**/Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

**YAZARIN/**AUTHOR

**Soyadı/**Surname : Kozak
**Adı**/Name : Ekin Doğa
**Bölümü**/Department : Psikoloji/Psychology

**TEZİN ADI/**TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce**/English): SHAME MEMORIES ACROSS GENERATIONS: STUDIES ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND THEIR MOTHERS

**TEZİN TÜRÜ**/DEGREE**:** **Yüksek Lisans**/Master ☐ **Doktora**/PhD ☒

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır./**Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır./**Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır./**Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. **** ☐

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir./ A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

**Yazarın imzası**/Signature ..... **Tarih**/Date .....
*(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)*
*(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)*

*Tezin son sayfasıdır./This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.*