Guilt: One Story Behind Psychological and Sexual Health Luci A. Martin, M. S. & Mark Vosvick, Ph.D. University of North Texas

Introduction

Freud described guilt as the result of a humanity that lives in a civilization that does not allow us to act impulsively toward our desires and fantasies (Kahn, 2002).

Guilt has been examined over the years for its role in psychological and sexual health from many perspectives (Faiver, O'Brien, & Ingersoll, 2000). Kahn (2002) argued that without guilt, people might act freely, pursuing pleasures without negative emotions.

Such ungoverned pleasure seeking behaviors could result in legal action, isolation, or disease.

> Not all researchers agree on guilt's role in psychological and sexual health (Ellis, 1960; Mowrer, 1960).

> It is important to examine guilt complexly, the role of guilt in psychological health as well as the role of guilt in behaviors that could result in negative or harmful consequences.

Our study examines the specific relationship three types of guilt have with markers of psychological and sexual health to provide an empirical basis to help understand the complex role guilt plays in college students' lives.

Hypotheses

H1: Sex-related guilt, guilty conscious and hostile guilt will b negatively related to psychological health

H2: Sex-related guilt will be positively associated with marker sexual health

H3: Hostile guilt and guilty conscious will be negatively related measures of sexual health

Method

Participants completed a computerized battery of self-report measures including demographic, sexual and psychological information.

> A diverse non-clinical sample (N = 662, 70% female, 60% European-American, 20% African-American, 9% Latinos, 11% "Other") was drawn from a college student population at a large Southern university.

Criteria for inclusion required that all participants were enrolled as undergraduate students and 18 years of age or older.

> The average age was 21 years (SD = 3.66, Range 18-54).

> This sample predominantly selfreported as heterosexual (94%).

Sixty-nine percent of the sample reported that they were single/dating.

Sexual health consisted of yes/no questions, with the exception of number of partners and condom embarrassment.

Sexual Activity

Have condoms available and ready for use Sex after using alcohol or drugs History of STD Sex with partner known for less than a day Ever purchased condoms? Total number of partners 2-5

Since our measures of psychological health and sexual health included both categorical and continuous data as outcome measures, we conducted both multiple linear regressions and binary logistic regressions to test our models. Each model controlled for gender and ethnicity.

oe rs o	f
ed to	
n=5	62)
<u>′ES</u>	<u>NO</u>
3%	37%
8%	32%
5%	85%
0%	70%
′4%	26%
<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
1	25%

41%

34%

Measures	Sample Question
Revised Mosher Guilt Inventory (Mosher, 1968)	1. "Masturbation is wrong and will ruin you."
1. Sex Guilt	2. "After an outburst of anger, I am sorry and say so."
 Hostile Guilt Guilty Conscious 	3. "I punish myself when I do wrong and don't get caught."
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)	"I take a positive attitude toward myself."
Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983)	"How often have you felt nervous and 'stressed'?"
Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977)	"I felt sad."

Condom Embarrassment

Scale (Vail Smith, Durham

& Howard, 1992)

"I am embarrassed or would be embarrassed about burying a condom from a drug store near campus.'

Results

Correlation Matrix								
	Sex Guilt	Hostile Guilt	Guilty Conscious					
Gender	-	0.20**	0.11**					
African American	0.27**	-0.12**	-					
European-American	-0.28**	-	-					
"Other" Ethnicity	0.12**	-	-					
Ever had sex?	-0.31**	-	-					
Number of partners	-0.12**	-	-					
Sex with person known < day	-0.12**	-0.12**	-					
Sex after drugs/alcohol	-0.24**	NS	-0.10*					
Ever purchased condoms	-0.22**	-0.13**	-0.13**					
Have condoms available	-0.18**	-0.12**	-0.11*					
History of STD	-	-	-					
Condom embarrassment	0.36**	0.19**	0.25**					
Self-Esteem	-	-0.14**	-0.45**					
Stress		0.10**	0.36**					
Depression	-	-	0.34**					

Simultaneous Multiple	Psychological Health							
Regression	Self-Esteem		Stre	SS	Depression			
Analyses	t	ß	t	ß	t	ß		
Gender	2.10*	0.07	1.23	0.05	-0.62	-0.02		
African American	2.67**	0.10	3.21**	0.13	2.75**	0.11		
Latino(a)	2.38*	0.08	-0.91	-0.03	-0.45	-0.02		
Other Ethnicity	-0.40	-0.01	0.97	0.04	0.40	0.02		
Sex-Guilt	2.74**	0.11	-4.41**	-0.18	-5.00**	-0.21		
Hostile Guilt	0.89	0.04	-0.50	-0.02	-0.06	-0.00		
Guilt Conscious	-12.97**	-0.51	10.48**	0.43	10.10**	* 0.42		
* p < .05; ** p < .01	F (7, 653) Adjusted) = 18.61** d R ² = 0.16) = 16.67** ed R ² = 0.14		

Center for Psychosocial Health

Mean (SD)	Range	α
111.67 (39.37)	0 - 300	
136.92 (26.28)	0 - 252	0.93
65.86 (11.64)	0 – 132	
31.45 (5.10)	10 – 40	0.76
25.78 (6.83)	0 - 56	0.82
15.43 (10.31)	0 - 60	0.90
17.74 (8.86)	8 – 40	0.91

Sexual Health											
Logistic Regression Analyses											
		<u>Partner known < day</u>			<u>Sex after drugs/alcohol</u>			<u>Hx of an STD</u>			
		В	WALD	Exp(B)	В	WALD	Exp(B)	В	WALD	Exp(B)	
Gender		-0.34	2.75	0.72	0.34	2.64	1.40	0.89	8.40**	2.44	
African A		0.36	0.87	1.44	-1.20	10.43**	0.30	0.66	2.01	1.92	
Latino(a)		-0.22	0.21	0.80	-0.11	0.05	0.90	-0.51	0.72	0.60	
European-Americ	can	0.15	0.18	1.16	0.09	0.06	1.09	-0.51	1.35	0.60	
Sex Guilt		-0.01	6.44*	0.99	-0.01	7.72**	0.99	-0.01	4.90*	0.99	
Hostile Guilt		-0.01	3.55	0.99	0.01	1.64	1.01	0.00	0.64	1.00	
Guilt Conscious		0.01	0.38	1.00	-0.02	2.70	0.98	-0.00	0.09	1.00	
		χ² = 18	.59*, <i>df</i> = 7	, n = 562	$\chi^2 = 70$	0.42**, <i>df</i> =	= 7, n = 562	$\chi^2 = 23$	3.49**, <i>df</i> =	= 7, n = 562	2
	Eve	ar nurch	hased co	ndome	Con	dome av	ailahle			Cond	0 m
	Ever purchased condoms			Condoms available B WALD Exp(B)			Condom				
Gender		B 1.83	WALD 35.33**	Exp(B) 0.16	-0.62	9.10**	0.54		En	nbarra	ssment
African A		0.23	0.31	0.79	0.44	1.51	1.56			t	ß
Latino(a)		0.41	0.66	0.66	0.06	0.02	1.06	Gend	ler	4.71**	0.17
EuroAmerican		0.26	0.45	0.77	0.07	0.02	1.07	Afr/		-4.61**	
Sex Guilt		0.01	18.27**	0.99	-0.01	15.54**	0.99				
Hostile Guilt		0.00	0.46	1.00	-0.01	1.57	1.00	Latin	o(a)	-2.40*	-0.09
Guilt Conscious		0.01	0.29	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	"Oth	er"	0.15	0.01
			, <i>df</i> = 7, n				7, n = 562	Sex-	Guilt	8.83	0.36
* n < 05: ** n < 01								Host	ile Guilt	0.61	

* p < .05; ** p < .01

F (7, 654) = 25.00** Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Adjusted R² = 0.20

> In conclusion, it appears that higher sex-related guilt and lower guilty conscience have the strongest relationship with psychological well-being. > Our findings that the relationship between guilty conscious and psychological health are consistent with previous research (Faiver et al., 2004; Abramson et al., 1977).

Sex-related guilt has a less clear relationship with sexual health, with positive relationships with both risky and less risky behaviors and attitudes. Hostile guilt did not appear to play a significant role in either psychological or sexual health.

Low sex-guilt has been linked to higher contraceptive and safe sex practices in women (Mosher & Vonderheide, 1985), but few studies have examined the constructs of hostile and sex guilt in relation to health, therefore it is difficult to compare our findings.

> Given the limited research available, it is important for researchers to continue to address the complex relationship between various forms of guilt and health.

> Our study is limited by retrospective, self-report data and consists of primarily female students, limiting generalization. We used a cross-sectional, correlational design, which does not allow us to infer causality. > Given the consequences of risky sexual behaviors and psychological illness, it is crucial that we understand which types of guilt are useful and which put individuals at risk, in order to design the best educational and psychotherapeutic interventions.

> Future studies need to examine the influence of such interventions on college student's sexual and psychological health. Please see handout for references and acknowledgement.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

Discussion