SHAME, EMBARRASSMENT AND GUILT:
CORPUS EVIDENCE FOR THE CROSS-CULTURAL
STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL EMOTIONS

KAROLINA KRAWCZAK
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań
karolina@wa.amu.edu.pl

ABSTRACT

This article is a cross-cultural and cross-linguistic comparison of three interrelated emotional categories of shame, embarrassment and guilt in two different cultural settings of individualistic societies, as represented here by Britain and America, and a collectivist society, such as Poland. The conceptual field of SHAME is operationalized through its three near-synonymous adjectival exponents, ashamed/zawstydzony, embarrassed/zażenowany, and guilty/winny. Drawing on relevant research in social and cognitive psychology as well as linguistics, the present study applies advanced quantitative corpus-based methodology to reconstruct the cultural and conceptual profiles of the three emotions.
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1. Introduction

The present study investigates the cross-cultural and inter-subjective structuring of negative social emotions, also referred to as self-conscious, self-regulatory or self-evaluative (Barret 2005; Beer and Keltner 2004; de Hooge et al. 2011; Taylor 1985; Zinck 2008; Lewis 1995, 2008, 2011), in British English, American English and Polish. More specifically, we focus on situa-
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tions where the subject considers him- or herself an object of potentially negative evaluation by others in the context of his/her actions, inherent properties or the overall unfolding situation. The most overarching among such emotions is shame. The lexical category “shame” is here investigated alongside “embarrassment” and “guilt”. The analysis is based on the adjectival exponents of these three indexes of the concept SHAME.


Despite these conceptual differences across the various instantiations of negative self-evaluative emotions, they all clearly lie at the intersection of subjective experience of one’s own self and inter-subjective sensitivity to the social reality and the self’s presence therein. They presuppose “self-awareness” and “self-representation” as well as the ability to contemplate and evaluate the self (Wierzbicka 1999a: 109; cf. de Hooge et al. 2011: 198; Gilbert 2003: 1207; Lewis 2008: 743) on the basis of internalized assump-
tions as to what is socially acceptable (Barret 2005: 956). This intersubjective awareness makes us refrain from actions and behaviors that may engender social disapproval (e.g. de Hooge et al. 2011: 197) and initiate “self-threatening” emotions (Ferguson 2005: 378). The underlying human tendency to avoid negative evaluation from others and possible ostracism is only natural and may well be regarded as universal. Given this, social emotions may also appear to be universal, in the sense that at least some of their “cognitive components” (Wierzbicka 1999b: 46) are likely to be cross-culturally common. Undoubtedly, their most general common denominator is the subject’s innermost wish to be socially successful.

However, the yardstick against which to judge the acceptability of one’s actions and internal properties is context-dependent, which makes self-conscious emotions culturally bound (Lewis 2008, 2011; Kitayama et al. 1995). This self-regulatory mechanism is fostered through the subject’s socio-cultural maturation (Lewis 2008: 746). As Kaufman (1996: xii) notes, “[c]ultures utilize shame as a means of furthering social control, as an important socializing tool”, while at the same time “pattern[ing] shame quite distinctively”. Likewise, Sznycer et al. (2012: 353f.) indicate that even though the emotion of shame – an “adaptive” strategy “implemented” to avoid “social devaluation” – is present “in all known human cultures”, there are important cross-cultural differences “in shame proneness”, linked to the immediate “social ecology” of the experimenter(s). It is, therefore, important that we avoid “absolutizing” the concept as “a universal human emotion” on the basis of its meaning in a given language, such as English (Wierzbicka 1999a: 111).

Accordingly, in this study, rather than universalizing the self-conscious emotions subsumed under SHAME, the objective is to establish the culture-specific intersubjective structuring of the concept. One of the important cultural divergences between the communities under analysis, which is here hypothesized to affect the conceptualization and patterning of self-evaluative emotions, concerns the discourses of individualism and collectivism (Hofstede 1980; Triandis 1989, 1995, 2001; Oyserman et al. 2002, 2008). Prior experimental research has demonstrated that individualism is more typical of the West, here represented by the Anglo-Saxon world, while collectivism is relatively more dominant in eastern cultures, such as Poland (e.g. Hofstede 1980; Triandis 1989; Oyserman and Lee 2008).

Individualism rests on the independence of the subject relative to others, high “relational mobility” and weaker interpersonal bonds (Sznycer et al. 2012: 354). Another proposed characteristic of individualism is that social
conduct is conditioned by the individual’s internalized system of values, rather than externally imposed norms (Triandis 1989: 510; Markus and Kitayama 1991: 226; Triandis 2001: 909; Oyserman et al. 2002: 4). Guided by “mechanisms of internal control” (Triandis et al. 1988: 326; Edelstein and Shaver 2007: 202), individualistic cultures are generally seen as more guilt-oriented. In such communities, the subject feels bad after a misdeed, irrespective of whether it has been revealed or not. The most likely source of self-evaluative emotions in the individualist context is the violation of “a law or a moral principle” (Markus and Kitayama 1991: 237).

Collectivism, on the other hand, is associated with “interdependence” (Markus and Kitayama 1991: 227), social non-mobility and stronger interpersonal bonds (Sznycer et al. 2012: 354). In collectivist communities, behavior is normatively and situationally conditioned (Triandis 1989: 509; 2001: 920; Triandis and Suh 2002: 145; Triandis and Gelfand 2012: 506). Given the prevalent role of external “mechanisms of social control” (Triandis et al. 1988: 326), collectivist societies are perceived as more shame-oriented, with the subject caring more about others’ judgment, and, thus, feeling bad about revealed misdeeds (Edelstein and Shaver 2007: 202). In such interdependent cultures, a very common cause of shame-like emotions is “hurting others psychologically” (Markus and Kitayama 1991: 237), which may put undesirable pressure on interpersonal relations. Naturally, individualism and collectivism are not clearly demarcated categories with a well-defined set of referents, but rather conceptual continua with contextually determined more and less prototypical representatives. The situation is further complicated by other socio-cultural complexities differentiating the communities under analysis.

Comparing the cultures of Poland, Britain and America is, therefore, a demanding task, even if restricted to the context of self-conscious emotions. Despite the nation’s history of geopolitical partitions, the Polish society today is rather homogeneous, unified by language policy under the former Communist regime and a single predominant religion. Compared with the United Kingdom or the United States, the Polish community can be characterized as relatively more hierarchical and family-based. Both the British and

2 It is noteworthy that in folk categorization the emotion of guilt is more typically associated with Catholicism. However, in the context of the constructs discussed here, this religion is linked to collectivist societies and the emotion of shame.

3 The distinction between shame cultures and guilt cultures originates from the work of Benedict (1946).
American societies, on the other hand, are intrinsically heterogeneous, yet despite this heteroglossia, they both possess a largely Protestant work ethic as a prominent discourse. As opposed to America, however, Britain is relatively more liberal and its social structure is class-based. America, in turn, has been shaped by its historically-antecedent puritanism and its discourse of the frontier and the pioneering spirit. This is perhaps why it has been experimentally shown to be the most individualistic culture to date (Oyserman et al. 2002: 4).

2. Hypotheses and method

On the basis of the above observations as well as the author’s prior studies (e.g. Krawczak 2011, 2014), two sets of hypotheses can be put forward, one regarding the conceptual profile of the three lexical categories, the other concerning their socio-cultural models. With respect to the psychologically informed hypotheses, it is expected that there will emerge a semantic cline from “embarrassment” through “shame” to “guilt” along the parameters of experimental duration and the gravity of the cause. Such a semantic cline, associated with the use of the respective lexemes, would constitute indirect evidence of a parallel conceptual cline. The identification of this continuum will support three specific hypotheses with regard to the moral, durative and private nature of “guilt”, the social, momentary and public character of “embarrassment” and the least distinct, intermediary profile of “shame”.

Relative to this overall conceptual structure, a number of statistically significant differences are predicted between the communities. It is expected that in the collectivist culture of Poland, characterized by a relatively higher degree of interdependence and lower interpersonal mobility, the causes of self-conscious emotions are more likely to be related to social norms and conventions, whose violation poses threats to positive intersubjective relations. By the same token, it is hypothesized that in such communities, the experiencer is more liable to feel bad about his or her misdeeds and vices if they are intersubjectively witnessed. Finally, it is predicted that in the collectivist society of Poland, owing to its comparatively higher level of interdependence, SHAME emotions are likely to be experienced because of what other people do or what they are like, especially if they are close to the experiencer. In individualistic communities, on the other hand, where autonomy and internally imposed standards are prioritized, neither the presence of an audience nor the behavior or character traits of other people are expected to
have any significant effect on the conceptualization of negative self-evaluative emotions. A related hypothesis is that in the Anglo-Saxon communities, the sources of SHAME will be of a more serious character and will be linked to internally defined moral standards.

Having presented the hypotheses to be tested in the present study, we can now discuss the methodology that is adopted here. It can be broadly described as usage-based (Langacker 1987, 1988; Bybee 1985; Geeraerts et al. 1994; Croft 2000; Tomasello 2000; Tummer et al. 2005). Such an approach assumes that units that reoccur frequently across many individual usage events become reinforced (Langacker 1987, 1999; Hopper 1987; Givón 1995; Bybee 2006). Following Langacker (1987: 494, 1988, 2000: 1ff., 2008: 241), who coined the term usage-based in his seminal 1987 volume, we can state that a symbolic unit emerges for the individual from interaction through the process of entrenchment or reinforcement of semantic and/or phonological features recurrent in many usage events. This process of reinforcement decontextualizes, schematizes and generalizes the input to reveal salient common features. There are a number of important methodological consequences of this theoretical framework (after Geeraerts 2010):

(a) Conceptualization, i.e. contextually emergent meaning, is central to language;
(b) Language is inherently dynamic and heterogeneous;
(c) Language is described probabilistically in terms of “statistical tendencies”, rather than rules.

Another crucial methodological consequence of the usage-based model of language “is that psycholinguistic units [...] are identified through observation of their” frequent occurrence “across usage events” (Tomasello 2000: 62). In other words, it is possible to reveal the conceptual structure behind language by analyzing its contextualized recurrent use, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Given these methodological tenets, the present study employs observational data extracted from corpora and submits them to detailed qualitative annotation, followed by statistical modeling. This specific usage-based approach is referred to as multifactorial usage-feature and profile analysis, as developed by Dirven et al. (1982), Geeraerts et al. (1994, 1999), Gries

4 Entrenchment is also known as “routinization”, “automatization”, or “habit formation” (Langacker 1999: 93).
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It has been successfully applied in a wide spectrum of studies, including, among others, Gries (2006), Gries and Stefanowitsch (2006), Glynn (2009, 2010a, 2010b), Janda and Solovyev (2009), Divjak (2010), Glynn and Fischer (2010), Hilpert (2013), Glynn and Robinson (2014), Krawczak (2014), to mention but a few. It assumes that contextualized language structure provides an insight into conceptual organization, which, in turn, is a key to socio-cultural profiling of reality. The study presented here, which is part of a wider project undertaken by the author, is the first application of this state-of-the-art methodology to the analysis of social emotion concepts. It further develops the work of Krawczak (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014). It is also complementary to the GRID method adopted in social psychological studies, as collected in Fontaine et al. (2013), or the work of Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Wilson (2014), which combines GRID methodology with collocational investigation.

3. Data, aims and analysis

The data amount to approximately 700 examples. Equal numbers of the adjectives realizing the three lexical categories in the three linguistic communities (ashamed, embarrassed, and guilty for British English and American English and zawstydzony ‘ashamed’, zażenowany ‘embarrassed’, and winny ‘guilty’ for Polish) were extracted randomly from the fiction components of the British National Corpus (BNC), the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), and the National Corpus of the Polish Language (NKJP). The contextualized occurrences of the lexemes, each coming from a different author/book, were subjected to meticulous manual annotation for a range of semantic and pragmatic variables. We will here focus only on a number of semantic-pragmatic factors that are relevant to the present study objectives, which are twofold. Firstly, the aim is to establish the frequency-based semasiological structure of and onomasiological relations between the lexemes in their respective linguistic environments. Secondly, the study will identify the cross-cultural differences in profiling the three lexical categories of SHAME, based on the use of their adjectival instantiations. Both these objectives will also allow us to test our psychologically and socio-culturally informed hypotheses. It must be accentuated that the results, thus yielded, will be representative of the communities under investigation only to the extent that the sources of the data employed here can be said to be representative of the respective cultures. It should also be noted that the study identifies frequency-
based patterns of language use, treating all occurrences of the object of study equally, and thus possibly overlooking potential (experiential) salience effects.

Let us now discuss the variables that figure prominently in the structuring of the data and which are, therefore, critical to the socio-cultural and conceptual profiles of the lexemes. These variables also form the basis of operationalizing the hypotheses formulated above. For ease of presentation, the factors are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Annotation schema.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-semantic factors</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotion cause</td>
<td>Bodily, Dubious Social Status, Failure to self, Failure to others, Financial, Inadequacy, Insecurity, Norm Violation Decency, Norm Violation Emotional Reaction, Norm Violation Politeness, Social Status Loss: Mistreatment, Social Status Loss: Unprestigious Status, Unfairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause intentionality</td>
<td>Intentional, Unintentional, Non-intentional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause temporal scope</td>
<td>General, Present, Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause type</td>
<td>Internal, External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion type</td>
<td>Individual, Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Social, Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Present, Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first and most important variable in the study is the cause that gives rise to the emotion. The specific causes recognized here and enumerated in Table 1 have been informed by prior linguistic and psychological research into the field of social emotions (e.g., Kövecses 1986: 44, 1990: 93f.; Tissari 2006: 150; Fabiszak and Hebda 2007: 29f.; Krawczak 2011, 2014; Tangney and Tracy 2012). They can be illustrated by the following linguistic examples.

(1) They knew why Vice always played shirts in pickup hoops – because he was ashamed of the scars that the belt had left on his back. (US, bodily cause)

(2) Bridget's look of utter gratitude made Venus feel so guilty for being here under false pretenses that she felt a need to leave immediately
and come back when her motives were pure and her head wasn't full of crazy plots. (US, Dubious Social Status)

(3) But now, dismissed by his father, he felt ashamed of his own lack of legitimate work, and he mistrusted his own father, even though there was nothing his father had done that was clearly illegal. (US, Failure to self)

(4) Sarah had been too ill to defend herself, and besides, in a way Elizabeth Bradford had been telling the truth. She was to blame. The shock of finding out about her child had been responsible for her husband's fatal apoplexy, and she would feel guilty for the rest of her life. (UK, Failure to others)

(5) ‘Sometimes he would be given some second-hand clothes, which he would take ashamedly and triumphantly bring them to his mom so she could alter and adjust them.’

(6) ‘The plate broke and the stew sauce splattered the shoes and stockings of a woman. Deeply ashamed, he started wiping the shoes clean with a cloth.’

(7) Sally sat with her hands folded in her lap, squinting down to make sure her blouse was done up properly and embarrassed to meet Edward’s eyes. (UK, Insecurity)

(8) ‘Marek, without taking his eyes off her, was getting undressed. And have you thought… – Ashamed, Marta wasn’t sure how to ask him about it. – Yes, I have. – Marek pulled out a packet of condoms from underneath the mattress.’
She rebuked herself, feeling deeply ashamed, for having given way earlier to despair and self-pity. (UK, Norm Violation: Emotional Reaction)

She could use a bit of makeup, the secretary thought and then blinked, embarrassed at having stared at the repairwoman so blatantly. (US, Norm Violation: Politeness)

Biorę ją za rękę i... rozlega się straszliwy krzyk [...], nie wiem, co się dzieje, dopiero po chwili widzę nad sobą czerwoną z gniewu twarz leutnanta policji, który wymachuje rękami i czymś grozi. Uchodzę usiłując zachować możliwie jak najwięcej godności. [...] Wychodzę wściekły, zawstydzony, z czułością myślę o Suzanne. (Social Status Loss: Mistreatment)

‘I’m taking her hand in my hands and ... there comes the sound of an excruciating scream [...], I don’t know what’s happening, only after a moment do I notice the angry face of a police officer who is waving his hands and threatening me with something. I’m leaving, trying to keep as much dignity as possible. [...] I’m leaving angry, ashamed, thinking of Suzanne with affection.’

After my plate has been cleared and my coffee refill refilled, I know it’s time to go. I dread walking near them, ashamed of my loneliness. But I gather my things and saunter toward the cashier, deceptively oblivious of Oliver and his friends. (US, Social Status Loss: Unprestigious)

To straszne, że ludzie w Afryce umierają z głodu, ale co ja mogę dla nich zrobić? – Przecież nie możemy wciąż czuć się winni! (Unfairness)

‘It’s horrible that people in Africa are starving to death, but what can I do for them? We cannot possibly feel guilty all the time!’

Bodily causes, as exemplified in sentence (1), concern such aspects of our physicality as looks, clothing, physical disabilities or diseases. The next cause, labeled Dubious Social Status (2), covers situations, where the subject’s social conduct or character traits are morally questionable. This source of SHAME emotions can be easily differentiated from other seemingly similar
causes, such as unprestigious status or indecent behavior, on the basis of its being intrinsically wrong, irrespective of whether it has been made public or not. Therefore, the ‘culprit’ should feel bad about what he or she has done, regardless of whether the action is revealed or not. The next type of cause, referred to as Failure, concerns failing oneself (3) or failing others (4) in personal, social or professional respects. Financial sources of self-conscious emotions (5) have to do with poverty and financial insolvency. Inadequacies (6), whether in the form of social awkwardness, mental ineptitude, or physical clumsiness, can be yet another stimulus of shame emotions. Insecurities (7), the next condition identified as a potential source of self-evaluative emotions, has mainly to do with circumstances where the experiencer feels publicly exposed, thus being the center of positive or negative attention from his or her social surroundings. Next, there are three causes linked to the violation of some social norms, which may concern indecency (8), socially inappropriate emotional reaction (9) or impoliteness (10). Behaviors subsumed under these categories are frowned upon socially, but they do not have any moral undertones. The next two causes also form one general category marking the loss of social status. They have to do with instances of verbal, physical or psychological abuse as well as social or emotional rejection by a group or a person (<Mistreatment>), as illustrated by (11), and being in some social respect inferior to one’s milieu (<Unprestigious>), as exemplified by (12). The final source of shame emotions identified in the study has to do with perceived unfairness of a given state of affairs (13). It happens when the experiencer feels that he or she is in a socially or economically privileged situation, which is either undeserved or inappropriate in the global social context.

With regard to the cause of the emotion, four more distinctions have been introduced, concerning its intentionality, experiential duration, type, and status. Intentionality, subsuming three possible levels, relates to whether the source of a given shame emotion is an instance of deliberate behavior, unpremeditated action, or, perhaps, it is not amenable to description in terms of purposefulness (14–16). The second category, covering the temporal boundedness of the cause, subdivides into past stimuli, present causes coextensive with the shame experience, and atemporal or general causes which extend beyond the situation engendering the self-evaluative emotion (17–19). The next variable, concerning the type of the cause, identifies it as either internal to the experiencer, being related to his/her own behavior or inherent properties, or external, that is, coming from the outside world (20–21). Next, we draw a dual distinction with respect to the type of the emotion, which can be either individual (14), i.e., focusing on the self, or shared (22), i.e., engen-
dered by shameful behaviors or characteristics of other people. The status of the cause, which can be either social (23) or moral (24), deals with whether whatever has brought about the emotion is inherently wrong, irrespective of whether other people know about it or not, in which case it is a moral cause; or whether it is only a cause for concern if actually discovered by somebody, thus being of a purely social character. The final functional parameter that relates to our hypotheses and which has turned out significant when predicting the use of the three near-synonymous adjectives across the three linguistic communities is the presence or absence of an audience (25–26). All the above variables are exemplified below.

(14) They are both meat eaters, she more guilty about this than he is. She has tried vegetarianism several times since their teens. He has never tried it, knowing he would give up within a week. (US, Intentional, Individual)

(15) Suddenly, I was ashamed at how I'd allowed the room to grow so disordered. It told the truth about me: that I'd burnt out. (US, Unintentional)

(16) W lustrze nie odbijały się wewnętrzne korytarze i własna twarz wydawała się Joannie pusta i bez wyrazu. Zawstydzona, że jest tym, kim jest, chciała schować się w którymś z korytarzy. (Nonintentional)

‘The interior corridors were not reflected in the mirror, and her own face seemed empty and expressionless to Joanna. Ashamed that she was who she was, she wanted to hide in one of the corridors.’

(17) I am a moral person. I am not ashamed of being moral. (UK, General)

(18) Danielle pulls away and wipes her cheeks, embarrassed by her tears. (US, Present)

(19) Not to mention, she did feel somewhat guilty – not much, but somewhat guilty – about once having an affair herself and then having a child by her lover. (US, Past)

---

5 This type of social emotions is referred to in the literature as “vicarious” (e.g. Lickel et al. 2005).
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(20) Tylko Witek siedział zafrasowany, zawstydzony, że zwątpił i niepewny, jak udźwignie nowe ojcowskie obowiązki. (Internal)
‘Only Witek was sitting worried, ashamed that he had doubted, and unsure of how he would manage with the new paternal duties.’

‘Finally, there came a couple of young Indians accompanied by a friend as a chaperone. They all got onto the boat. She was ugly and awfully hairy. Ashamed by Max’s presence, she was staring at the bottom of the boat.’

(22) Po jakimś czasie jednak dostrzega istotne luki w tych notatkach, zdjęciach, opisach stanów chorobowych, wnioskach – i poczuła się jakby zawstydzona, że mąż, człowiek tak pracowity i rozumny, nie ustrzegł się od pewnego bałaganu (Emotion Type: Shared)
‘After some time, however, she noticed some important gaps in the notes, photos, descriptions of the morbidities, conclusions – and she started to feel kind of ashamed that her husband, a man of such industriousness and judiciousness, did not avoid some disorder.’

(23) Pat also went to see Gildas and Ludens, both of whom were feeling guilty because they had not offered to “put him up”. (UK, Status: Social)

(24) The poor middle-aged guy had a heart attack during a bonk with his teenage neighbour while his wife was out shopping. The girl ran off and left him. He died, and now she feels guilty. (UK, Status: Moral)

(25) they were embarrassed by the female camera crew (UK, Audience)

(26) Only the walls heard this delirious talk, but I was suddenly seized by a guilty fear (UK, No audience)

The factors delineated and illustrated above were employed for the meticulous manual annotation of all the examples in the dataset. This qualitative
analysis of the extended context of each single occurrence of a lexeme is a very laborious process, which constitutes the most important phase in any multifactorial usage-feature analysis, as it forms the basis upon which to identify the conceptual and socio-cultural profiles of the categories under analysis. Once the data annotation had been completed, the results were submitted to multivariate statistical modeling. Two types of quantitative methods were employed at this stage: (1) exploratory in the form of correspondence analysis (Glynn 2014) and (2) confirmatory in the form of logistic regression (Arppe 2008; Speelman 2014). Section 4 introduces the methods and reports the results obtained in the multivariate statistical analyses.

4. Results

This section presents the findings of the cross-cultural study into the field of the lexical categories designating social emotions in two steps. We will first look at two correspondence analysis plots (4.1), visualizing the associations of usage features for the near-synonymous adjectives, relative to their respective cultural settings. More specifically, we will employ two types of correspondence analysis, binary correspondence analysis (4.1.1) for the interaction of lexeme relative to language and the cause of the emotion and multiple correspondence analysis (4.1.2) for the interaction of lexeme relative to language and a range of functional variables. This will yield culturally sensitive conceptual usage profiles of the near-synonymous adjectives realizing SHAME. Following that, we will establish the reliability and descriptive accuracy of the usage profiles thus revealed by means of polytomous logistic regression analysis (4.2).

4.1. Exploring SHAME: In search of usage patterns

Correspondence analysis is “a multivariate exploratory space reduction technique for categorical data analysis” (Glynn 2014: 443). It is employed here to reveal patterns of language use typical of the three lexemes relative to their linguistic and socio-cultural context of use. The method identifies and visualizes “frequency-based associations” (Glynn 2014: 443) of usage features that are related to each lexeme. This is represented in “the form of configuration biplots, or maps, which depict degrees of correlation and variation through the relative proximity of data points” (Glynn 2014: 443f.). In this section, we
consider two types of correspondence analysis, namely, binary and multiple, of which the latter type makes possible the identification of more complex interactions between many factors. The former type of correspondence analysis, on the other hand, has the advantage of providing “the percentage of explained” variation in the data for the two axes. In addition, it is easier to interpret in terms of how the individual data points contribute to “the structuring of the data” (Glynn 2014: 448). We start with this type of correspondence analysis.

4.1.1. Conceptual continuum in SHAME across cultures: Etiological factors

Figure 1 presents a binary correspondence analysis accounting for the behavior of the three lexical exponents of SHAME relative to their linguistic setting and the cause of the emotion. This graphical representation accounts for over 75% of the variation in the data in the first two dimensions, which is indicated by the percentages along the x- (60.57%) and y- (15.48%) axes. The plot reveals a number of interesting associations.

Firstly, in line with the relevant hypothesis in Section 2, there emerges a semantic continuum from the lexical category “guilt” through “shame” to
“embarrassment”, structured by the decreasing gravity of the causes. Another general observation that can be made with respect to the overall distribution of the data points is that the lexical concept of “embarrassment” emerges as the most coherent across the three linguistic communities, forming a single relatively stable profile. The two other lexical categories are much more diversified vis-à-vis their cultural context, which is particularly visible in the case of “shame”. The occurrences of the respective exponents of the lexical category of “shame” are spread across three separate quadrants of the map, each corresponding to a different linguistic setting, which is indicative of their cross-culturally distinct conceptual tendencies. The usage of Polish zawstydzony ‘ashamed’ is approximating that of zażenowany ‘embarrassed’, which may indicate that in a collectivist culture, such as Poland, the semantic profiles of “shame” and “embarrassment” are merging. The point of their convergence is defined by a set of causes, all of which are social and directly interactive in character, thus being more typically associable with the behavior of “embarrassment”, which requires an audience. This corresponds to our hypothesis that in such communities the presence of a judging witness is instrumental to the experience of negative self-evaluative emotions. Interestingly, in the individualistic societies of America and Britain, the use of ashamed emerges as oscillating between the interactive sources of the emotions, more peculiar to “embarrassment”, and the more morally-underpinned causes, such as failing oneself or dubious status, shared with “guilt”. This finding is congruent with the claim made in Section 2 with respect to the cline of the three lexical concepts, in which “shame” was expected to take a medial position. The lexical category indexed by guilty in British and American English and winny in Polish is less varied cross-linguistically than that designated by UK and US ashamed and Polish zawstydzony. However, interestingly enough, the contrast that surfaces obtains between the cluster of the Polish and British occurrences of the instantiations of the category, on the one hand, and their American English equivalent, on the other. That said, let us now consider the biplot from a fine-grained perspective.

We will start with the right-hand bottom quadrant, where “embarrassment”, largely irrespective of the linguistic environment of its occurrence, forms a single cluster, relating this emotional lexical category to a range of social causes. As already indicated, the Polish uses of ashamed are part of this cluster. Within this macro setting, there are two sub-groupings. First, there is a distinct correspondence between the Anglo-Saxon uses of embarrassed and the violation of the social norm of politeness as well as insecurity, as illustrated in (10) and (7). These causes are not particularly grievous in na-
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ture and relate directly to the here-and-now of the interactive situation, which is in line with our hypothesis. This usage context is less saliently linked to the Polish occurrences of *zażenowany* ‘embarrassed’ and *zawstydzony* ‘ashamed’, both of which are linked to the loss of social status due to mistreatment, the breach of the social norm of decency, and, less closely, to inadequacies or the loss of social status for economic reasons. The first two features are also within the usage scope of the British and American occurrences of *embarrassed*, but to a much lesser degree. Overall, these Polish associations are more diverse in their character than those corresponding to the British and American uses of *embarrassed*. Being publically mistreated or indecent may have far direr social and personal consequences. Likewise, financial problems or inadequacies may also transpire to be lastingly detrimental to one’s social image and public well-being. All these sources of social emotions may, in the end, hinder or damage the experiencer’s interpersonal relations, which in the context of collectivist cultures such as Poland is assumed to be an unacceptable social risk. These specific uses are exemplified in sentences (5), (6), (8), and (11). This emergent tendency of the Polish adjectival exponents of “shame” and “embarrassment” toward the same usage characteristics may be taken to be indicative of the blurring of their intercategorial boundaries in this linguistic setting, pertaining to collectivist cultures. This, in turn, may suggest that in this particular linguistic and socio-cultural context, the lexical category “shame” is assimilating or merging semantically with the more subordinate category of “embarrassment”. This is an intriguing finding that may be motivated by the hypothesized characteristic of collectivists to experience negative self-evaluative emotions when the stimulus arousing such feelings is made public.

As we move up to the right-hand upper quadrant, we can see a clustering of causes associated with the lexical concept of “shame”. It is, as already noted, less stable across the three linguistic settings. Central to this cluster is the American usage of *ashamed*, which is closely linked to unprestigious social status (12), bodily causes (1), and failing oneself (3). It is less readily related to financial causes and inadequacies, both of which tend toward the Polish cluster, situated on the periphery of the usage profiles for the lexical exponents of “embarrassment” and “shame”. Similarly to the differential behavior of Polish “shame”, as realized by *zawstydzony* ‘ashamed’, in British English, *ashamed* also appears to tend away from the overall semantic profile “shame”, as anchored in its American instantiation, toward that of “guilt”. Its data point is positioned between the occurrences of *ashamed* and *guilty* in American English, with the features of emotionally inappropriate
reactions (9) and failing oneself (3) shared between the three, i.e. UK ashamed, US ashamed, and US guilty.

Finally, in the left-hand part of the plot, there is a clustering of causes associated with “guilt”. Relative to the three linguistic communities, this conceptual grouping is less compact than that of “embarrassment”, but not as loose or spread-out as that of “shame”. It is mainly the American uses of guilty, located in the left-hand upper quadrant, that behave differently, being drawn toward features shared with British occurrences of ashamed, i.e. dubious social status, as illustrated by (2), and the violation of social norms of emotional reaction, exemplified by (9). The former cause constitutes a very close association, the latter is more immediately related to the profile of “shame”, being close to the vertical axis of the plot. In the left-hand bottom quadrant, there are the British and Polish realizations of “guilt”, linked to two causes, i.e., failing others, which is shared equally between the two (examples 4 and 27) and unfairness, which is closer to Polish, as evidenced by sentence (13).

(27) Czułem się winny wobec zdychającego psa.
  ‘I felt guilty because of the dying dog.’

This finding shows that the collectivist context of Poland, which centers on interdependence and harmony with others, and the individualistic context of Britain, revolving around autonomy and relative relational mobility, both witness guilt as a result of disappointing others, a strongly relational factor. In the former setting, this may be motivated by the fear of straining one’s relationships with those involved and thus risking the desired codependence; in the latter case, where interpersonal interdependence is low, it might have to do with simultaneously failing one’s own internal ideals. It is also noteworthy that both these causes are likely to be publically observable, which is interesting given the postulated private character of guilt.

4.1.2. Conceptual continuum in SHAME across cultures: Functional factors

We now turn to a more complex configuration of usage characteristics of the adjectival instantiations of self-conscious emotions in the three cultural settings. Figure 2 is a multiple correspondence analysis plot visualizing the associations of the three adjectives relative to language and a number of functional usage features, namely, the temporal frame of the cause, intentionality
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Principal inertias (eigenvalues):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dim</th>
<th>value</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cum%</th>
<th>scree plot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.058489</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>********************</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.006388</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.005885</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000910</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000246</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4e-05</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1e-06</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical output, providing the adjusted inertia scores that are considered realistic representations of the explained variance, was produced using an adjusted Burt Matrix in Greenacre’s (2006) package {ca}, in R. The biplot of the MCA in Figure 2 was produced using a standard Burt matrix in FactoMineR.

Figure 2. SHAME relative to the socio-linguistic and functional context of use.
As evidenced by the percentages given in the penultimate column, in the first two dimensions of the plot, we account for nearly 70% of the variation in the data, most of which is explained in the first dimension. This means that the data are mainly structured along the $x$-axis, which is also evident in Figure 2. The score of 70% is satisfactory given that the interactions visualized in the map are of a highly multifactorial character. Naturally, the higher the multidimensionality of the analysis, the more difficult it becomes to account for the variation in the data in the two visualized dimensions. Let us now discuss the findings yielded in the plot in Figure 2.

We will start with three general comments. Firstly, the same semantic cline in SHAME from “guilt” through “shame” to “embarrassment”, which emerged in Figure 1 along etiological factors, also surfaces here, structured by functional variables. It yields further support for the hypothesis in line with which such a cline was expected. The second observation concerns the contribution size of the particular data points to the overall structuring of the data. There are four factors that play a major role in structuring the behavior of the three lexical categories, regardless of the linguistic situation. Two of those variables, namely, the presence of an audience and the cause type establish a clear continuum along the $x$-axis from externally caused self-conscious emotions requiring an audience – i.e. “embarrassment” in all three communities and collectivist “shame” – to those occurrences experienceable in solitude and initiated by stimuli inherent in the subject – i.e. “guilt” in both the Anglo-Saxon and Polish contexts and individualist “shame”. Two other sizable factors, i.e. intentionality and the temporal scope of the emotion, form a cline along the $y$-axis from intentional sources of the emotion that are simultaneous with the experience or posterior to it, as is the case with “embarrassment” and “guilt”, to non-intentional and atemporal causes, typifying the individualist profile of the lexical category “shame”. The feature designating unintentional sources of the emotions <Cause: Unintentional> is located very close to the center of the plot with a very small contribution size, which means that it is not distinctive in its behavior, being equally associated with all the categories. A generally weaker point of contribution to the overall distribution is the factor designating the type of the emotion. We are, however, leaving this variable in the analysis, as it relates to one of our hypotheses, whereby it is expected that collectivist cultures are more likely to experience negative social emotions as a result of other people’s actions. The

---

7 The relative contribution of the individual data points to the structuring of the data in the overall distribution is represented by the size of each point.
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last coarse-grained observation is that the usage profiles for “guilt” and “embarrassment” are here much more unified across the linguistic contexts than in Figure 1. The usage profile of “shame”, on the other hand, remains diversified vis-à-vis the linguistic setting, with the Anglo-Saxon occurrences of ashamed being closer together, and the Polish uses of zawstydzony ‘ashamed’ tending toward those of zażenowany ‘embarrassed’, as witnessed in Figure 1. Let us zoom in on the individual usage profiles.

In the upper half of the visualization, there is a cluster of features associated with the lexical category “shame”. This cluster reveals some divergent tendencies in the individualist and collectivist contexts. We can see that ashamed in British and American English is linked to atemporal causes (17) and to situations that defy description in terms of intentionality, as in (28).

(28) The worry which most perturbed Winnie was one of which she was deeply ashamed. She had found, since her return to the house, that she was horribly nervous of being alone in it at night. (UK, Non-intentional)

These two data points <Cause: NonIntent> and <Cause Time: General> are located on the other side of the plot with respect to UK and US “shame”, clearly tending away from the other lexical concepts, and thus representing distinct associations. In addition, in American English, the adjectival exponent of “shame” is also likely to be used to describe the emotion experienced without any audience and as a result of internal causes, as indicated by how this data point tends toward the features <NoAudience> and <Cause Type: Internal>. These correspondences, however, are relatively remote, given their location in the plot, which is indicative of their orientation toward “guilt”.

In the left-hand upper quadrant of the plot, we have the Polish sub-profile of “shame”, linked closely to the shared type of the emotion <Emotion Type: Shared> (22) and causes coming from the external world <Cause Type: External> (21) and having a social character <Status: Social> (21). It is clear that this sub-cluster tends away from the Anglo-Saxon semantic profile of “shame” and toward the usage features of embarrassed in British and American English and the Polish equivalent, a characteristic already observed in Figure 1. This tendency of zawstydzony ‘ashamed’ toward the usage profile of zażenowany ‘embarrassed’ is, in itself, indicative of the recontextualization of the emotion in the collectivist community of Poland. It is clearly acquiring more social undertones and losing its moral grounding,
which adds supporting evidence to our hypothesis that in interdependent societies the profiles of self-conscious emotions are likely to lean toward a configuration of usage features embedded in the interactive situation. Likewise, the correspondence between this adjectival exponent of the category and the shared type of the emotion supports our hypothesis that in collectivist contexts of high interdependence, it is more likely that the subject will experience negative self-conscious emotions as a result of other people’s actions and vices, notably those of his or her family and friends. Similarly, the association between Polish *zawstydzony* ‘ashamed’ and the social and external status of the cause corroborates our hypothesis that in a collectivist society, such as Poland, self-evaluative emotions are more distinctly linked to sources that are observable and, therefore, interactively available for judgment. In addition, the Polish “shame” cluster is also structured by the feature <Audience>, which falls more distinctly within the semantic profile of “embarrassment”, but it is located right at the x-axis, thus being within the conceptual orbit of both clusters. Overall, as has been demonstrated in Figure 1, the semantic profile of “shame” in Polish is becoming more and more grounded in the immediate context, thus being closer to “embarrassment”.

Turning now to the semantic profile of the lexical category “embarrassment”, in the left-hand bottom quadrant, we can see that its structure is defined by the presence of witnesses <Audience> (25) and the present temporal frame of the cause <Cause Time: Present> (18). The latter usage feature, which was hypothesized to be the most prototypically representative of “embarrassment”, is central to the cluster, thus supporting the hypothesis that this lexical category is inextricably linked to the here-and-now of the interactive situation. This is further corroborated by the correspondence obtaining between “embarrassment” and the presence of an audience. Relatively close to this configuration of features are two other usage characteristics, namely, the social status of the cause <Status: Social> and its external source <Cause Type: External>, as illustrated by sentences (7), (10) or (25). These properties, being located in the left-hand upper quadrant, are more typical of the usage tendencies of *zażenowany* ‘embarrassed’, but, as already established above, the semantic profiles of Polish *zażenowany* ‘embarrassed’ and *zawstydzony* ‘ashamed’ overlap in some contexts of use. This is consonant with what we have seen in Figure 1, where, relative to the causes of self-evaluative emotions, the usage profiles of the two lexemes in Polish coincided to an even greater degree. There is one more usage feature that is associated with the “embarrassment” cluster, though in a more remote manner, namely, inten-
tional causes of the emotion <Cause: Intentional>. It is located at the y-axis between the conceptual profiles of “embarrassment” and “guilt”, thus being a property shared in use by the two lexical categories.

When we now look at the right-hand bottom quadrant of the plot in Figure 2, we can see a number of other characteristics typical of the usage profile of “guilt”. A central position is occupied by the anterior frame of the cause <Cause Time: Past> (19), which means that, relative to “shame” and “embarrassment”, the lexemes designating “guilt” are more likely to be used to describe emotions initiated in the past. Another feature associated with the cluster for “guilt” is the moral status of the cause of the emotion <Status: Moral> (24), a feature particularly close to the Anglo-Saxon configuration of “guilt”. This usage characteristic supports the hypothesis that relative to the two other emotions, “guilt” is more likely to be engendered by more grievous and morally underpinned causes. The other correspondences visualized in the plot link “guilt” to the individual type of the emotion <Emotion Type: Individual> (14), internal causes <Cause Type: Internal> (14), and to the absence of witnesses <NoAudience> (26). Given that they are distributed along the x-axis, they may be said to be simultaneously attracted to the individualist profile of the lexical category “shame”. Let us now turn to the confirmatory method of polytomous logistic regression to verify the findings obtained through the exploratory analyses.

4.2. Verifying the conceptual continuum in SHAME

Polytomous logistic regression analysis serves to determine the descriptive accuracy and predictive power of the usage profiles obtained above. This method implements the “one-vs.-rest technique” consisting in juxtaposing each level of the response variable, which is here the lexical concept relative to language, with all the other levels put together (Arppe 2008: 120). For example, if the classes of the category whose behavior is being explained are a, b, c, d, e, then the polytomous logistic regression model would contrast a against b|c|d|e, b against a|c|d|e, c against a|b|d|e, d against a|b|c|e, and e against a|b|c|d. This method has been shown to be particularly appealing “in the study of lexical choice with multiple alternative outcomes” (Arppe 2008: 257), such as the different ways of expressing a given concept (e.g. SHAME). As noted by Arppe (2008: 257), it has a number of important advantages
over other existing methods. Firstly, its results are “naturally interpretable” in that the log-odds given to the “explanatory features” can be used as a basis of evaluating and comparing their “relative importance” with respect to all the outcome levels. Secondly, it accounts for “the joint occurrence of multiple contextual features”, which also co-occur in natural language use, calculating “the expected probability of occurrence of an outcome in such a context” (Arppe 2008: 257). Finally, the estimated probabilities are yielded for each level of the explained variable, which means that it is not necessary to select a “prototypical baseline category” (Arppe 2008: 257). That said, we can now look at what the polytomous logistic regression model presented in Table 2 can tell us about the three lexical categories in the three linguistic environments.

This model explains the usage of the three adjectival instantiations of SHAME relative to their three linguistic settings, as listed in the first row of Table 2. The socio-cognitive context that serves as the basis of explanation is determined by the variables specified in column 1 of Table 2. These factors, given their role in the model, are referred to variably as explanatory factors, controlled factors, independent factors, predictors, or regressors. The following nine columns in Table 2 provide the log-odds, also referred to as coefficients or estimates (Arppe 2008: 120), for each level of the explained variable in relation to each level of the explanatory variables. These scores are significant only when unparenthesized and are indicative of association (positive values) or disassociation (negative values). The overall performance of the model is evaluated on the basis of the pseudo $R^2$ scores as well as the C statistic, given at the bottom of Table 2. The McFadden and Nagelkerke $R^2$ measures considerably exceed what are regarded as satisfactory values of 0.2 and 0.3 respectively (Lattin et al. 2003: 486; and McFadden 1978: 307), thus indicating a strong model. The C statistic measure is lower than what the rule of thumb suggests as an indicator of a strongly predictive model, i.e. 0.8 (Baayen 2008: 204). However, given that it is a multinomial logistic regression analysis with a high level of complexity, the model’s goodness-of-fit is satisfactory.

We can now look at the results in detail. For ease of presentation, let us provide the significant results that this polytomous logistic regression model yields in a more easily legible tabular form. Table 3 specifies the significant multifactorial usage context of associations and disassociations for the three lexical categories in the three communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language + Concept</th>
<th>Cause Type + Cause Time + Intentionality + Audience</th>
<th>Log-odds Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL: EMBR</td>
<td>UK: EMBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL: GUILT</td>
<td>US: GUILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL: SHAME</td>
<td>US: SHAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>−1.758 (−0.914)</td>
<td>−3.979 (−0.700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience: Present</td>
<td>1.334 (1.334)</td>
<td>1.411 (1.411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Dubious Status</td>
<td>−3.174 (−1.832)</td>
<td>−3.315 (−1.654)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Failure to others</td>
<td>1.213 (0.967)</td>
<td>1.654 (−0.323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Inadequacy</td>
<td>−1.842 (−2.633)</td>
<td>−1.783 (−1.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Status Loss Financial</td>
<td>1.612 (1.008)</td>
<td>1.801 (1.278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Social Norm Decency</td>
<td>−1.173 (0.686)</td>
<td>1.891 (1.248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Failure to self</td>
<td>−0.520 (0.214)</td>
<td>−3.297 (−1.509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Social Norm Emotional</td>
<td>−0.854 (0.499)</td>
<td>−3.818 (−1.677)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Status Loss Mistreatment</td>
<td>−1.326 (0.646)</td>
<td>2.363 (1.278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Social Norm Politeness</td>
<td>−1.075 (0.796)</td>
<td>2.615 (1.486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Insecurity</td>
<td>−1.846 (−2.123)</td>
<td>2.415 (1.648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Status Loss Unprestigious</td>
<td>−0.026 (−1.359)</td>
<td>−0.330 (−1.796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Unfairness</td>
<td>−1.846 (−1.654)</td>
<td>−2.415 (−1.486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause Time: Past</td>
<td>−1.521 (−0.854)</td>
<td>−0.520 (−0.264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause Time: Present</td>
<td>−0.696 (−0.221)</td>
<td>0.854 (0.478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause Type: Internal</td>
<td>−0.65 (−0.854)</td>
<td>0.619 (0.350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality: Intentional</td>
<td>−1.12 (−0.181)</td>
<td>−0.520 (−0.221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality: Non-Intentional</td>
<td>−0.605 (−0.906)</td>
<td>−1.25 (−0.520)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Statistics: Null deviance: 2951 on 6048 degrees of freedom Residual (model) deviance: 2181 on 5877 degrees of freedom McFadden $R^2$: 0.26 Nagelkerke $R^2$: 0.69
Table 3. Summary of the results of the polytomous logistic regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical category</th>
<th>Polish: Collectivist</th>
<th>British: Individualist</th>
<th>American: Individualist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“embarrassment”</td>
<td>Mistreatment –</td>
<td>Audience +</td>
<td>Audience +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to others –</td>
<td>NonIntentional –</td>
<td>Present time +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unprestigious –</td>
<td>Internal –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dubious Status –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decency –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politeness –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audience +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “guilt”          | Failure to others +  | Audience –             | Audience –             |
|                 | Unfairness +         | Unfairness +           | Internal +             |
|                 |                      |                        | Intentional +          |

| “shame”          | Mistreatment +       | Present Time –         | Failure to others –    |
|                 | Decency +            | Politeness –           | Present Time –         |
|                 | Audience +           | NonIntentional –       |                        |
|                 | NonIntentional +     | Audience +             |                        |
|                 | Present time +       | Intentional –          |                        |
|                 | Intentional –        | Internal –             |                        |

With respect to the first lexical category, “embarrassment”, there is one clear common denominator for its usage context in both the collectivist context of Poland and the individualistic setting of Britain and America. It is the presence of an audience, which points to the interactive nature of “embarrassment”. This association supports the results of the correspondence analyses and is consistent with the psychological profiles of the emotion (see Section 1). Let us now consider the other distinctive predictors of ‘embarrassment’ in the collectivist and individualist contexts. In Polish, the other features with significant estimates are all disassociated in use from the lexeme zażenowany ‘embarrassed’. These negative predictors are mostly specific causes of self-evaluative emotions, ranging from more serious ones, such as dubious social status, mistreatment, unprestigious status, or failing others, to more ephemeral ones that have to do with breaking social conventions of politeness and decency. The disassociation from the more grievous causes was expected and is consonant with the hypothesized profile of the emotion. The negative predictors of impoliteness and indecency, on the other hand, are both linked to
the interactive situation and might, thus, be expected to be related to this emotion. Why this is not the case remains unclear. The final explanatory feature associated with “embarrassment” in Polish is its non-internal causation, which is congruous with the hypothesis that this emotion is prototypically initiated by external factors inherent in the intersubjective context.

This disassociation from internal causes is also typical of British English uses of embarrassed, which are additionally also significantly unrelated in use to nonintentional causes. This usage characteristic is compatible with the hypothesized interactive profile of “embarrassment”, which is expected to be linked to either intentional or unintentional behaviors. A parallel picture emerges for the American English model of “embarrassment”, which is characterized by its relation to the here-and-now <Present Time> of the situation engendering the emotion. This emergent model of “embarrassment” in American English makes it a prototypical profile of the emotion vis-à-vis the assumptions drawn on the basis of prior psychological and linguistic studies. Not only does it require an audience, but it is also used when considering causes that are concurrent with the emergence of the emotional experience itself.

Let us now turn to the second lexical category of “guilt”, whose usage profile is the least elaborate across the collectivist and individualist communities. Its simplicity may be indicative of what we have already seen in the correspondence analyses, namely, the relative internal coherence of the socio-cognitive profile of this category. In Polish, winny ‘guilty’ is associated with failing others as well as unfairness of fate, which confirms the results in Figure 1. The former cause clearly focuses on other people, possibly close to the experiencer, whose negative judgment might jeopardize their mutual relations. This, as pointed out in Section 1, is an unthinkable risk in collectivist communities, which rely heavily on interdependence. Unfairness, which is also significantly associated with the use of guilty in British English, centers more on how the experiencer feels bad because of social inequality. This is a source of social emotions more typically expected in the context of individualistic communities, where an independent internal code of norms and values is strong and more likely to operate as a private control system, regardless of external rules and potential witnesses. Another characteristic of how guilty is used in the British setting, is its disassociation from situations where the behavior causing the emotional response is witnessed by others. This finding corroborates the private character of “guilt”, which does not necessitate any audience. It is enough for the experiencer him- or herself to know that something bad has happened in the aftermath of his or her actions. This disassoci-
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ation from the presence of any audience is also typical of the American context. Such a profile of “guilt” in the Anglo-Saxon world is consistent with the hypothesis that in the individualist world, which is claimed to be more guilt-oriented, the subject’s negative self-evaluative emotions arise even when nobody knows about his or her misdeeds or vices. The American model of “guilt” is additionally characterized by the internal and intentional nature of the cause of the emotion, which adds further supportive evidence to the results obtained in Figure 2.

Finally, the socio-conceptual profiles of “shame” revealed in the model are more detailed, particularly in Polish. Before zooming in on the specific cultural environments of use, let us point out two interesting lines of convergence and divergence across the languages. The presence of an audience is a significant feature typical of both Polish and, to a lesser degree, British occurrences of the adjectives instantiating “shame”, without featuring in the usage profile of ashamed in American English. While in the case of Polish this correspondence is consonant with the overall interactively involved model of “shame”, emerging in the present study, it is not entirely clear why there should obtain a parallel association in British English. Admittedly, in the latter case, the correlation is much weaker in its importance (0.77 for UK vs. 1.21 for Polish). However, in light of the proposed cultural model of the emotion in individualist societies, focalizing around private experience and internal judgment, the factor of audience was not expected to be a predictor of any significance. The other noteworthy general observation concerns the present temporal frame of the cause. This feature distinguishes between the use of ashamed in the individualistic cultures of Britain and America as opposed to the collectivist community of Poland, being a negative association in the former context, and a positive association in the latter. This finding corroborates the emergent interactive model of “shame” in Polish, which approximates semantically that of “embarrassment”, as revealed in the two correspondence analyses. It also confirms the hypothesis that in collectivist cultures, such as Poland, the emotion of shame arises in the context of “revealed” misdeeds, which requires an audience. In individualist societies, on the other hand, where negative self-evaluative emotions are likely to be experienced in solitude, the cause of the emotion need not be simultaneous with the experience, which is liable to go beyond the engendering event itself.

Let us now look more closely at the individual profiles of “shame” emerging here for the three communities. In the collectivist context, zaws-tydzony ‘ashamed’ is related to causes of the emotion that originate in the ex-
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The perceiver’s own actions or inherent properties <Cause Type: Internal>. The specific causes of the emotion in this collectivist setting provide additional evidence pointing toward its interactive character. They have to do with indecent behaviors or mistreatment, both of which presuppose witnesses and are thus intrinsically social stimuli. The sources of “shame” in Polish are additionally characterized by lacking the element of intentionality <NonIntentional>. In such cases, the experiencer is helpless and has no control over the state of affairs, which can be particularly painful in a public situation.

Now, when we turn to the individualist communities, we can see that the emerging cultural models of “shame” are less conceptually complex, notably in the case of American English, where the usage profile of ashamed is the least elaborate of the three communities. On top of the already discussed common usage features, it only has one more significant characteristic, which is its disassociation from the cause designating failure to others. This may be taken to be in line with the independent and interpersonally mobile spirit of individualist communities, where the interests and needs of the individual are highly valued and those of others are peripheralized. In British English, in turn, ashamed is additionally significantly unrelated to violating norms of politeness and non-intentional causes. The latter usage feature sets it apart from the Polish counterpart. It suggests that in British English, speakers do not speak of ‘shame’ when dealing with states of affairs that render the experiencer completely powerless and exposed, with the whole self affected, as in example (16).

Overall, the results in this section confirm the conceptual continuum identified in the exploratory analyses, proceeding from “guilt” through “shame” to “embarrassment”. The lexical category “guilt” emerges as the most private shade of SHAME, related to more serious causes and experienceable in solitude. It is followed in the semantic continuum by “shame”, whose cross-linguistic profile is rather varied. Its adjectival exponents in American and British English are clearly disassociated from the here-and-now, while the Polish occurrences tend toward a more situation-dependent usage, where they designate self-evaluative emotions experienced as a result of the current circumstances causing the response. This finding ties in with the construal of interdependent cultures as more susceptible to SHAME emotions in non-moral contexts. Finally, the lexical category of “embarrassment” clearly denominates the most ephemeral “face” of SHAME, to use Kaufman’s (1996: 24) phrasing, whose emergence in all three communities requires the presence of witnesses.
5. Conclusion

The present article has developed corpus-based quantitative methodology for the study of self-conscious emotions in a cross-linguistic perspective. Drawing on the insights of anthropological and psychological research in the field of social emotions as well as the findings of prior linguistic studies, we have formulated a range of hypotheses and built a relevant annotation schema of usage features. Through meticulous qualitative analysis of corpus examples, followed by multivariate statistical modeling, the study has established the conceptual and cultural profiles of the three lexical categories designating SHAME. These usage profiles have emerged from frequency-based associations of social and functional characteristics of use typical of the respective adjectival exponents of SHAME. The findings are representative of the three communities only to the extent that the sources of the data, i.e., the fictional components of BNC, COCA and NKJP, can be said to be representative of the cultures.

The exploratory and confirmatory analyses have revealed a cline from “embarrassment” through “shame” to “guilt” along the parameters of gravity of the causing factors and the experiential duration of the emotion. These correspondences are consistent with our hypotheses regarding the psychological profiles of the lexical concepts. It has also been demonstrated that the usage model of zawstydzony ‘ashamed’ in the collectivist community of Poland tends toward that of zażenowany ‘embarrassed’, being linked to the interactive situation, its participants, and social conventions. This finding supports the hypothesis positing the interdependent, other-oriented character of collectivists as well as the claim that in such societies, the subject is more likely to feel bad about revealed misdeeds. In the Anglo-Saxon world, on the other hand, the usage profile of ashamed emerges as closer to that of guilty, being related to more serious, atemporal moral issues. This is consonant with the image of the individualist cultures as independent and guided by internally defined standards, rather than externally imposed norms and expectations. Given these results, we can conclude that the culturally sensitive profiles emerging for the three lexical categories designating SHAME across the three linguistic contexts correspond to our psychologically informed observations and confirm our hypotheses.
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