

An Understanding of Shame and Guilt: Psycho-Socio-Spiritual Meaning

Yong-Tae Kim

Torch Trinity Graduate School of Theology, Korea

Both shame and guilt are psychological emotions which reflect the social context, i.e. social norms. Shame is the emotion of “being” related to the negative evaluation of the total self. Guilt is the emotion of “doing” related to the negative evaluation on the behavior of the self. Both of these are the emotions that reflect the different aspects of a common psychological trait: perfection. The psychological trait of perfection originates from the spiritual quality, i.e. the image of God. Both shame and guilt are originated from the reflection of perfection. In this sense, shame and guilt are not only socio-psychological emotions but also spiritual emotions. Therefore, shame and guilt are the socio-psycho-spiritual emotions reflecting the psycho-spiritual trait of perfection which reflects the image of God.

Shame and guilt are not easily acknowledged in our consciousness, even though they are common emotions that humans often feel in their daily lives. There are a couple of reasons for this lack of acknowledgment. Firstly, they are deeply seated emotions in the intrapsychic world, which resides in the unconscious mind of people. They play important roles in human development and relationships. For example, they can block the flow of narcissistic energy that facilitates human development and arrest it. Other times, they can drive the same energy to flow in another area. A child then develops that area more excessively than other areas creating an imbalanced development.

Secondly, these emotions are often manifested in different ways; for example, in different emotions or psychosomatic symptoms. The feelings of anger, agitation, worry, and anxiety are rooted in the emotions of shame and guilt. Therefore, it is difficult for a person to experience shame and guilt directly. Headaches, indigestions, and backaches often produce emotions of shame and guilt in the cases of psychosomatic people.

Shame and guilt are often treated as one emotion and people fail to differentiate their meanings. It is evident that they have common meanings and functions in human development and relationships because

they are rooted in the same psychological trait. They are generated through the negative evaluation of the self. Thus, for example, when people fail to accomplish a certain level of achievement, they feel both shame and guilt. However, despite common features, they have different meanings: Shame comes out of the evaluation of one's self whereas guilt comes out of the evaluation of one's behavior.

Research shows that shame and guilt are socio-psychological emotions. Both of them are psychological because they are experienced in intrapsychic minds and manifested in psychological feelings or emotions. They are also sociological because they experience the effects in relation to others. Yet current research is incomplete because it fails to show the origins of where the psychological traits of shame and guilt come from.

This is a study of the emotions of shame and guilt that will firstly tackle the definitions of shame and guilt by discussing their meanings. Secondly, shame and guilt will be compared to each other within a framework of a single psychological trait. Thirdly, biblical and theological understandings about shame and guilt will be applied. Thus, the origins of shame and guilt will be highlighted throughout the study.

The Meanings of Shame and Guilt

Both shame and guilt are usually deeply seated emotions; people are hardly aware of them in their consciousness. Therefore, people do not understand the exact definitions of the emotions and confuse their meanings with other emotions such as anxiety, anger, fear, and possessing inferiority complexes. Shame and guilt are sometimes covered with extreme behaviors such as fearlessness, withdrawnness, and recklessness. Therefore, to avoid confusion, it is necessary to clarify the meanings of both shame and guilt.

Meaning of Shame: Being and Shame

Shame is the feeling of being "small, inadequate" (Wells & Jones, 2000, p. 19), having "self-contempt" (Adams & Robinson, 2001, p. 24), feeling "worthless" (Wiklander, Samuelsson & Asberg, 2003, p. 239), experiencing "powerlessness, personal failure" (Wilson, 2000, p. 229) and "inferiority" (Wright & Gudjonsson, 2007, p. 308). These feelings can be categorized into three different areas of self-worth, personal achievement, and self-attitude.

Firstly, the feeling of worthlessness, feeling small, and feeling inadequate are related to the concept of self worth that implies the usefulness of the self. The self is accepted not as it is but as whether it is useful or not. In this sense, the meaning of shame can be stated as "I am no

use at all," "I am a terrible being," and "I do not have any worth in this world." Secondly, the feeling of self-contempt is related to the concept of self-attitude. Shame has to do with a negative self-evaluation. The meaning of shame can be stated as "I do not like myself," "I know that no one likes me," and "even though I am nice to others, they do not like me." Thirdly, the feelings of powerlessness, personal failure, and inferiority are related to the concept of personal achievement. When people feel that they cannot achieve what they want, they evaluate themselves negatively. The feeling of inferiority is related to the comparison with others when they try to achieve something. They are very sensitive to what others want or achieve. In other words, if they cannot achieve what others want to ask or achieve less than what others achieve, then they feel shameful. Hence, shame can be stated as "I am weak," "I feel that I cannot do anything," "I have no power and energy," and "I am not better than anyone."

From the above discussion, the emotion of shame implies that it is related to the self, to evaluation, and to the standards of others. Firstly, there is much literature that suggest that shame arises from the evaluation of the self (Kim, 2010, p. 61; Wright & Gudjonson, 2007, p. 308; Thomas & Parker, 2004, p. 180; McNish, 2003, p. 6; Crystal, Parrot, Okazaki & Watanabe, 2001, p. 114; Leith & Baumerister, 1998, p. 3). The three different areas of shame, such as self worth, personal achievement, and self attitude always focus on the self. The feelings in relation to self worth manifest worth on the self. People who feel shame try to evaluate themselves in terms of their ideal standards. When they feel that they have not reached their standard, they focus on the self and feel shameful about themselves. Personal achievement is related to the self rather than achievement. Shame-prone people want to achieve mostly in order not to feel shame. Personal achievement is a means to protect themselves from the negative evaluation of others. Hence, the self is the primary concern for shame-prone people. Shame-prone people are very aware of themselves in relation to others. They think about how others think of them and what others think about them. In other words, shame is a self-conscious emotion in relation to others. For these reasons, it is very clear that shame is an ontological emotion reflecting the self, i.e. being.

Secondly, shame is characterized as an evaluative emotion (Kim, 2010, p. 61; Zou & Wang, 2009, p. 601; Reyles, 2007, p. 408). The self is always an object to be evaluated. Shame-prone people do not accept themselves as who they are. They live in the evaluative world where the natural world is filled with value judgments. They see themselves from others' standards that they have internalized previously. If they do not meet the standard, they evaluate themselves negatively. Even

though they achieve something, they are not satisfied with what they have achieved and maintain a critical attitude toward their achievement. They usually criticize themselves in terms of what they have achieved. In any case, shame-prone people have a negative attitude toward themselves. Therefore, the conclusion is that shame is an evaluative emotion.

Thirdly, shame is always related to the ideal standard. Wells and Jones (2000) says “shame involves failing to live up to an internalized ego ideal” (p. 20). They explain the ego ideal from the developmental perspective. When the self is formed from the family, a child internalizes the unrealistic expectations of parents and others. Children feel shameful and critical about themselves when they fail to live up to unrealistic expectations. Shame-prone people still retain the unrealistic standard in their inner minds as they become adults. Therefore, shame is an emotion of the ideal standard, and it can be defined as an ontological, evaluative, and standard emotion.

Meaning of Guilt: Acting and Guilt

Guilt is a feeling of “regret” (Wells & Jones, 2000, p. 19), a sense of responsibility from inside with “reparative action such as confession or apology” (Connor, 2001, p. 216), “remorse,” and “self blaming.” These feelings can be categorized into three different areas: behavior, evaluation, and standard. The feelings of remorse, regret, and reparative action come from wrongdoing in specific situations or relationships. Many different studies show that guilt originates from certain specific behaviors (Yang, Yang & Chiou, 2010, p. 607; Zou & Wang, 2009, p. 601; Thomas & Parker, 2004, p. 180; Wells & Jones, 2000, p. 20). People who made mistakes tend to evaluate their behavior negatively. Once they realize that they have behaved incorrectly, they feel guilty and tend to say reparative words such as “sorry” or “apologies.” In this sense, guilt is a self conscious emotion linked to specific behavior.

Secondly, the feeling of “self-blaming” is related to the concept of evaluation. When the self is blamed, people judge themselves negatively or attribute themselves as the cause of behaving wrongly. They already stand in line of what is right or wrong. They place themselves in the position of their own evaluator.

Thirdly, the feeling of “sense of responsibility from inside” is related to the concept of an inner standard. Conner (2001) says “a guilt culture, such as ours is thought to be, is one in which the self feels responsibility for itself, so that guilt is taken deeply into, or may even be thought of arising in the self.” (p. 216). This statement suggests that guilt originates from an internalized standard about certain behavior. The self is constantly aware of its behavior and tries to evaluate it by whether the

behavior is right or wrong. If a person's behavior does not meet the standard, the self evaluates the person negatively. As a result, the self feels guilty due to its behavior.

Guilt's emotional existence depends on a person's standard; it is a standard emotion like shame is. People can feel differently at different times when they display the same behavior if the internal standard is lowered or dismissed; a person feels less guilty or not guilty respectively if their standard changes or disappears. Therefore, it is very clear that guilt is an emotion of behavior, evaluation, and standard.

Commonalities and Differences between Shame and Guilt

Psychological Trait

Emotion is a psychological trait that exists in the human mind. The term "trait" means something that exists continuously. A psychological trait is a psychological state that exists continuously in the human mind. If a psychological state exists both in conscious and unconscious levels, then it is characterized as a psychological trait. But a psychological state that exists only in the conscious level is not to be considered as a psychological trait. Feelings as a psychological state usually exist only in the conscious level by awareness.

Emotion is a fundamental and dynamic force which motivates humans to do something (Kim, 2000, p. 327; Papero, 1990, p. 27). People survive because of them; they react according to their surrounding environment. For example, anger protects a person from a harsh environment. When people are threatened by others, they manifest anger to protect themselves and survive. This emotion is also seen in the early stages of human development. Similarly, shame and guilt also exist intrapsychically and play important roles in the very early stages of human development.

A psychological trait includes a certain psychological tendency. Anger as a psychological trait is closely related to the psychological tendency of aggression that exists in unconsciousness. Aggression is an innate tendency that resides in human DNA. All human beings have this psychological tendency without exception. Anger is an affective expression of aggression. People show anger when they feel danger or are threatened in an environment in order to survive. Like anger, both shame and guilt are related to one particular psychological tendency. In the previous section, we noticed that emotions are related to embraced ideal standards. From the developmental perspective, babies internalize unrealistic parental expectations into their minds. Babies require psychological tendencies to internalize expectations. Without them, babies

are not consonant with parental expectations. Psychologists call the consonant ability as a narcissistic tendency that leads to perfectionism. Therefore, shame and guilt are affective expressions of the narcissistic tendency, i.e. perfectionism.

The narcissistic tendency of perfection plays an important role in human development. Because of perfectionism, a baby is enabled to have a “symbiotic” (Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975) relationship with the primary caretaker. The baby can absorb the narcissistic energy from the primary caretaker. The baby can use this energy to develop a psychological structure that is related to an individual person, i.e. the individuation process (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975). Once the baby does not meet the primary caretaker’s expectations, the baby feels shame and guilt. The feelings of emotions cause babies to change their behavior to meet expectations. From the very early stages of development, emotions play important roles regardless of any emotional awareness.

Therefore, the psychological trait of perfection has two different aspects, shame and guilt. Perfection drives a person to be a perfect being and behave perfectly. This psychological phenomenon can be clearly understood from the developmental perspective. When children create a symbiotic relationship with the primary caretaker, they feel oneness with the caretaker and can initially imitate the behavior of the caretaker. Soon, the children realize that they cannot be perfect and act perfectly like their caretaker. In this case, children react in the areas of ontology and behavior. Ontologically, a child feels small and insignificant. Behaviorally, a child feels wrong and says “sorry.” Although they originate from the same psychological tendency of perfection, shame and guilt are different in aspects: shame belongs to the aspect of ontology, i.e., being; guilt belongs to the aspect of behaving, i.e., acting. Both of these emotions are generated from shortcomings. Shame exists when people focus on themselves. Guilt exists when people focus on their behavior.

Even though these two emotions represent different aspects of perfection, they are easily causable and complementary. From the causable perspective, the emotion of guilt easily creates the emotion of shame. For example, when thieves hesitantly admit that they steal, they feel guilty. The behavior of stealing relates to guilt, which leads to feeling shameful. Therefore, the guilt creates shame. The reverse is also true. The self-consciousness of thieves, i.e. shame, creates guilt when they behave wrongfully. This discussion leads to the next issue, “complementary.” Acting and being are always complementary. These two entities cannot exist without each other. Acting is the behavioral aspect of the self. Being is the ontological aspect of the self. The aspect of acting always reflects the inner state and the inner mind internalizes the outer behaviors intra-psychically. Therefore, the inside and outside cannot

exist separately. People confuse the two emotions because of their connectedness. Sometimes, guilt comes first and shame comes later. Other times, shame comes first and guilt comes later. Casey (1998) says "It is my premise that it is guilt which keeps shame hidden, burying it deep within the soul." (p. 224). He states that guilt covers shame failing to point out that shame can also cover guilt.

Social Emotions

There are many different scholars who assert that shame and guilt come from a group context, not only from the intrapsychic world. Connor (2001) says "shame is therefore associated with the maintaining of codes of conduct in the group" (p. 216). He argues that shame is related to the responsibility which is given by the community. People feel shameful when they fail to meet the norm or standard of the group. Shame is an emotion which fails "an internalized ego ideal" (Wells & Jones, 2000, p. 20). The ego ideal comes from internalizing unrealistic expectations of primary caretakers. Connor (2001) further discusses this point by saying, "A shame culture - the examples given are often an ancient Greek or Viking cultures, and contemporary Melanesian cultures - is said to be one in which feelings of responsibility are borne in upon the self from the outside in" (p. 216). While Wells & Jones outlines the psychosocial aspect of shame, Connor articulates the socio-cultural aspect of shame. The psychosocial aspect of shame implies that shame is not only psychological but also sociological, i.e. familial. This socio-cultural aspect of shame implies that the psychological phenomenon of shame comes from society and culture.

Guilt has both psychological and sociological aspects. Conner (2001) argues that guilt is related to the moral codes of society (p. 217). Guilt is an internalized emotion of social moral codes. When people violate internalized moral codes, then they feel guilty and try to apologize to others due to their wrong behavior. Guilt as a social emotion can be found through its function. Ranganathan & Todorov (2010) state that "guilt is said to have an adaptive effect on relationships because the remorse and regret experienced during guilt helps to motivate behaviors oriented toward reparative action" (p. 3). They believe that guilt has a social function to adjust themselves to people through the actions of apology. Yang, Yang & Chiou (2010) also have the same opinion of guilt's function by saying "The motivational inclination of individuals with guilty affect tends to generate a higher need for affiliation and therefore to motivate these people to engage in interpersonal interaction and perspective taking" (p. 607). It is very clear that guilt is a social emotion through the discussions of its origin and function.

There is a difference between shame and guilt despite their functions as social emotions. While shame pursues perfection through social convention, guilt pursues perfection through morality. In other words, they pursue perfection through different means. Conventional fitness to others' perspectives becomes the means of perfection in regard to shame. Shameful people do not want to show any flaws in the process of adjusting themselves to others. They want to be perfect in order to please others. If they cannot be as such, they become shameful and blame themselves. The means of perfection of guilt is the actualization of moral ideals which are internalized and then demonstrated in one's interaction with others. Guilty people want to behave perfectly in order to be exemplary from other people's points of view.

A Psychological Approach to the Bible: Spiritual Interpretation of Shame and Guilt

Shame and guilt are not only socio-psychological emotions but also spiritual emotions. In this section, the spiritual root of the emotions will be addressed. Both emotions are considered not only in the natural human world but also in relation to God.

Shame in the Creation Story

Shame is the first human emotion discussed in the Bible in Genesis 2:25, "The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame" (Bible verses will be quoted from the New International Version). The question arises from the use of the negative emotion in the creation story: "no shame." From the context of Genesis 2:18-25, it is very clear that Adam and Eve were the perfect couple. God created Eve, Adam's wife, from his rib. God was the wonderful creator and the perfect match-maker. Adam loved Eve wonderfully and fantastically. Yet Genesis 2:25 was *not* written as follows "The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt ecstasy," which could easily have been the case. Rather, the verse says "no shame" instead of "ecstasy."

Genesis 2:25 delivers a message about who people are. In the previous section, shame is an ontological emotion where a person believes, "I am small (or nothing)." If this meaning is applied to Genesis 2:25, the phrase of "no shame" can be interpreted as "not being small." About the phrase of "not being small," there is a question of whether Adam and Eve perceived themselves if they were ontologically not to be small. In order to answer this question, another question should be answered. The question is how the word "small" can be understood. The word "small" is a comparative term. From the context of the creation story, it is not possible that Adam compares himself with Eve or vice versa. There

is a possibility that the object of comparison between Adam and Eve is God. The word shame is generated from the comparison between God and human beings. It is very clear that humans are small beings in comparison with God. Even though Adam and Eve perceived themselves as “not being small,” they are small beings ontologically in relation to God.

This message is well addressed in Genesis 3:7, “Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves.” After the fall, Adam and Eve knew the meaning of being naked. Although Genesis 3:7 does not mention explicitly the emotion of shame, it is very clear that they felt shame. Thomas & Parker (2004) mention this point as follows, “After eating of the forbidden fruit, they have an awareness of their nakedness. This awareness causes them to hide. This implication is clear: they are experiencing a new emotion, that of being ashamed” (p. 177). Genesis 3:7 can be interpreted as follows: when Adam and Eve realized they were naked, they felt shame and covered themselves with fig leaves. They were in the realm of comparison when they realized that they were naked; they were small in front of God who is big.

The main difference between Genesis 2:25 and Genesis 3:7 in terms of shame is the ability to know nakedness. In Genesis 3:7, Adam and Eve were able to exercise the ability of evaluation by eating the fruit of good and evil. They possessed the power of comparative evaluation which enabled them to know who had more power, who was big and who was small. They immediately knew that God was more powerful than they were. That is the reason why they felt shame and covered themselves with the fig leaves. When they compared themselves to God, they realized that they were small and were nothing.

Guilt in the Story of Fall

Although guilt is not explicitly mentioned in Genesis 2 and 3, it is very clear that Adam and Eve felt guilt after eating the forbidden fruit. Genesis 3:8 says, “Then the man and his wife heard the sound of the Lord God as he was walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and they hid from the Lord God among the trees of the garden.” The following verse drives the same point of hiding. Genesis 3:10 says, “He answered, ‘I heard you in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked, so I hid.’” The sound and the voice of God triggered Adam’s feeling of guilt which led to his behavior of covering and hiding after their fall.

The emotion of guilt is related to the behavior of attribution. Genesis 3:12 says, “The man said, ‘The woman you put here with me – she gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it.’” In this verse, Adam explained why he ate the fruit by attributing it to God and his wife.

Adam could not accept the responsibility of breaking God's rule. His fear was generated by the emotion of guilt. He knew that someone had to take responsibility of the wrongful behavior but he did not want to take the blame. This is the reason why he attributed the cause of his behavior to God and his wife.

The Abilities of Perfection and Evaluation Before the Fall

The first man Adam had two different abilities to become perfect and to evaluate himself and others (hereafter perfection and evaluation). The source of the abilities can be categorized into two different areas of predispositional potential and internalization through relationships. The predispositional potential is related to genetic development. From the biological perspective, genes determine a person's physical attributes; a person's physique is predetermined. In contrast, a psychological trait is not predetermined but predispositional. Although babies have certain psychological traits, their development varies as seen from the babies' interaction with their environment. In this sense, the psychological trait has not been fully determined but predisposed. The psychological trait will manifest differently according to the relationship with the environment. The abilities of perfection and evaluation will potentially include a predisposition to want perfection and to evaluate against a perfect standard. This is the reason why the abilities of perfection and evaluation are called psychological potentials.

A formation of a certain psychological trait comes from two different sources: parental genes and the interaction with one's environment. Predispositional potentials are usually qualities inherited from birth through the parental genes; a baby comes to the world with certain possible abilities to develop. The formation of a psychological trait, however, comes from the interaction between potentials and the environment. Parents are the most important primary environmental force to influence the formation of a certain psychological trait. When babies interact with their parents after the birth, they internalize parental images into their minds. The interaction between the potential and internalized parental images produces a particular psychological trait.

In the same way, Adam's perfection can be explained through the image of God and his relationship with God. The image of God is the primary source of Adam's ability to think and possess moral qualities (Erickson, 2001, pp. 520-523). Genesis 1:27 says, "God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." Adam was created as a rational being to pursue morality. He was able to decide rationally what he desired. His decision was always correct and idealistic in the eyes of God. He declared his perfect

relationship with Eve in Genesis 2:23 when he said, “This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called ‘woman,’ for she was taken out of man.”

The relationship with God is another source of Adam’s ability to rationalize and pursue the moral ideal. In the Garden of Eden, God was very pleased after creating Adam and Eve. This implies that Adam and Eve had the perfect relationship with God. The perfect love of God was able to actualize the potentials of Adam and Eve to the fullest level. On Adam’s part, he internalized the perfect character of God through his relationship with God.

The potential and internalization of Adam’s abilities can be best explained by discussing the relationship between a mother and child. When a baby is born with predispositional potentials, the love of the mother plays an important role developing potentials to their fullest dimensions. The baby absorbs narcissistic energy from the mother through his symbiotic relationship which is a psychological concept to describe the relationship of the baby with the mother. The narcissistic energy realizes the baby’s potentials and actualizes them in the real world. Through the actualization of the potentials, the baby is able to acquire the actual ability to live in the real world. The symbiotic relationship between the baby and the mother has common characteristics with the peak experience between God and man. The human in the peak experience has perfect union with God like mother and child. The perfect union with God is possible because of the potentials of human and God’s spirit.

Adam’s ability of being rational to pursue moral ideals can be translated into the ability of perfection and evaluation. Firstly, it is important to note that the ability of perfection from a rational being belongs to the ontological aspect of being human. After the creation, Adam was able to pursue perfection through the relationship with God and God’s image. Without the ability to pursue perfection, Adam was not able to pursue God because God is the perfect being. Adam’s inherent lack of perfection (after the fall) does not hinder his pursuit of perfection because Adam’s knowledge and desire of perfection comes from his relationship with God and his image, not from himself. In other words, God’s love and spirit enables Adam to seek perfection.

Secondly, it is equally important to note that ability of evaluation from a rational being belongs to the cognitive aspect of being human. Adam knew what kinds of behavior and relationships were desirable according to God and for his own sake. He knew how to please God through the ability to pursue the moral ideal. God commissioned Adam to take care of the world. Genesis 1:28 states, “God blessed them and said to them, ‘Be fruitful and increase in number, fill the earth and

subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground.” Adam obeyed God faithfully and immediately. Adam’s ability of evaluation was shown in Genesis 2:19: “Now the Lord God had formed out of the ground all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air. He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever they called each living creature, that was its name.” Adam’s moral ideal was the perfect obedience to God by naming the creatures which God created.

The Abilities of Perfection and Evaluation After the Fall

After the fall, Adam and Eve’s relationship with God changed. Erickson (2001) explains that the essential nature of sin is as follows: sensuality, selfishness, and displacement of God (pp. 596-598). The three views of sin imply that Adam’s focus had been changed. When he was in the Garden of Eden, his focus was on God as a spiritual person. After he had sinned, he could not let God be God and focused on himself. Erickson (2001) clearly points out the change in Adam by saying, “Dethronement of God from his rightful place as the Lord of one’s life requires enthroning something else, and this is understood to be the enthronement of oneself” (p. 597).

Sin has two different aspects concerning what is “bad and wrong” (Erickson, 2001, p. 623). The bad aspect of sin means that the self is bad, i.e. “impure, repulsive, hated by God” (Erickson, 2001, p. 623). The “bad” self is not perfect or whole. The aspect of “bad” self can be explained through Adam’s abilities of perfection and evaluation. Adam used them to be perfect and realized that it was impossible. He felt shame and covered himself with fig leaves. With the ability to evaluate his circumstances and himself, he realized that he could not be the same person before God. He realized that he was very small, imperfect, impure, miserable, and partial when he compared himself to God. He felt strongly shameful about himself and covered himself with fig leaves.

To sin is to violate a given law. Adam violated God’s commandment not to eat the forbidden fruit. He had gone astray from the standard of God and he deserved to be punished by God. This is the reason why he felt fear when he heard the sound and voice of God in the Garden of Eden because fear comes from the emotion of guilt.

Although the abilities of perfection and evaluation have been affected by sin, the tendency to be perfect and the ability to evaluate still remain in Adam’s nature. Erickson (2001) says, “The image of God has not been lost as a result of sin or specifically the fall” (p.532). Even though the tendency to be perfect and to evaluate remained, Adam ruined his relationship with God. For his focus had changed; he was

once spiritual but now he focuses on the natural. Any discussion on spiritual qualities is now discussed under an anthropocentric context instead of a godly one. When he thought about perfection, he no longer saw perfection from the perspective of having a relationship with God but rather he sought fulfillment through his relationships with other people with himself as the center. Erickson (2001) addresses this point well by saying "Since sin makes increasingly self-centered and self-seeking, there will inevitably be conflict with others" (p. 635).

Conclusion

Shame and guilt are psycho-socio-spiritual emotions which are deeply seated emotions in the human mind. When counselors provide services to people with shame and guilt, they have to open up their eyes deeply, widely, and highly. Clients will have feelings of anger, fear, anxiety, irritation, and embarrassment; thus, it is crucial to know that shame and guilt reside beneath these emotions. In addition, emotions of shame and guilt are related to the psychological trait of perfection and evaluation. It is vital that counselors understand the abilities of perfection and evaluation in terms of shame and guilt. In addition, they should be mindful that the root of the emotions of shame and guilt is spiritual. The two emotions are deeply related to a person's relationship with God. The restoration of the relationship with God is key for treatment.

Counselors are encouraged to move beyond the point of merely discovering a client's identities and moral ideals. Counseling should delve into the issues of shame and guilt in terms of the client's tendency toward perfection. Thus, an evaluation on these terms should also be sought in a client's context and treated accordingly.

References

- Adams, K. M., & Robinson, D. W. (2001). Shame reduction, affect regulation, and sexual boundary development: Essential building blocks of sexual addiction treatment. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 8, 23-44.
- Connor, S. (2001). The shame of being a man. *Textual Practice*, 15 (2), 211-230.
- Crystal, D. S., Parrott, G., Okazaki, Y., & Watanabe, H. (2001). Examining relations between shame and personality among university students in the United States and Japan: A developmental perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25 (2), 113-123.
- Erickson, M. J., (2001). *Christian theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

- Leith, K.P., & Baumeister, R.F. (1998). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality*, 66 (1), 1-37.
- Kim, Y. T. (2010). An understanding and solution of shame as psychosocial trait (사회심리적 특성으로서 수치심의 이해와 해결). *The Korea Journal of Counseling* (상담학연구), 11 (1), 59-73.
- Kim, Y. T. (2000). Family Therapy Theories: Concepts and Methods (가족치료이론: 개념과 방법). Seoul: Hakjisa (학지사).
- Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant: Symbiosis and Individuation*. New York: BasicBooks.
- McNish, J. L. (2003). Shame's revelatory and transformative potential, and its use and misuse by the church's pastoral ministry. *American Journal of Pastoral Counseling*, 6 (2), 3-22.
- Papero, D. V. (1990). *Bowen Family Systems Theory*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ranganathan, A. R., & Todorov, N. (2010). Personality and self-forgiveness: The role of shame, guilt, empathy and conciliatory behavior. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29 (1), 1-22.
- Reyles, D. Z. (2007). The ability to go about without shame: A proposal for intentionally comparable indicators of shame and humiliation. *Oxford Development Studies*, 35 (4), 405-430.
- Thomas, R., & Parker, S. (2004). Toward a theological understanding of shame. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 23 (2), 176-182.
- Wells, M., & Jones, R. (2000). Childhood parentification and shame proneness: A preliminary study. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 28, 19-27.
- Wiklander, M., Samuelsson, M., & Asberg, M. (2003). Shame reactions after suicide attempt. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Science*, 17, 293-300.
- Wilson, M. (2000). Creativity and shame reduction in sex addiction treatment. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 7, 229-248.
- Wright, K., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2007). The development of a scale for meaning offence-related feelings of shame and guilt. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 18 (3), 307-316.
- Yang, M., Yang, C., & Chiou, W. (2010). When guilt leads to other orientation and shame leads to egocentric self-focus: Effects of differential priming of negative affects on perspective taking. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38 (5), 605-614.

Zou, Z., & Wang, D. (2009). Guilt verses shame: Distinguishing the two emotions from a Chinese perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37 (5), 601-604.