

BACKGROUNDS

- 1.- We have conducted a 100 sample survey in La Paz, Cochabamba and Santa Cruz (urban populations, and main cities in Bolivia) .
- 2.- Diego sent me three different versions of a same Q:
 1. A 11 questions Q to probe, that I added some more
 2. A group of questions of empowerment which also went in the first probe (not commented in this occasion) and
 3. A third version with a reduced list of adjectives on one main question (internal experience of humiliation) and one battery of phrases for perception of community thoughts on the shame-poor question that we have also not been able to probe.
- 3.- We had also economical and time restrictions to do an extensive sample. So you have to look data with care and open mind.
- 4.- We are looking to test in three different languages in June and in five different countries in July.

MEANINGS

1.- Shame

- Shame is in between the definition gave in Diego´s paper (global- painful experience in which the self is negatively evaluated....accompanied by the sense of powerlessness): “fear of something” “feeling bad of themselves” (51.8% of answers), and that more properly of humiliation (feeling of being lessened in dignity): embarrassed, ridiculed, humiliated, and similar (46.3%).

2.- Humiliation

- Humiliation is much closer to its definition and better with three of the adjectives tested of internal experience of humiliation.

3.- Corelation

- Shame is highly correlated with humiliation (0,740) and it descends when you control it by city (0,651).

MEANINGS

Conclusion: We are under two phenomena's: 1) people are not distinguishing quite well the difference between both meanings and as we go to different places we are getting different interpretations. If we do the survey in several countries we will surely have several meanings that will attempt to comparativeness. Translations (cultural differences) will worse the problem.

SHAME PRONENESS

- 1. It's precisely the difficult of terminology that leads to indirect approaches.**
- 2. We have a list of adjectives that proxies to the definition of shame.**
- 3. The more frequent felled are**
 1. Feelings of blushing
 2. Feeling "childish"
 3. Feeling helpless, paralyzed
 4. Feeling humiliated
- 4. But this are not precisely the most named as synonymous of shame**
 1. Feeling ridiculous
 2. Feeling humiliated
 3. Self-consciousness
 4. Embarrassment
- 5. Nor the best predictors of shame (Regression analysis with Beta indicator as measure of impact)**
 1. Self-consciousness
 2. Feelings of blushing
 3. Feeling ridiculous
 4. Feeling humiliated
 5. Feeling laughable

SHAME PRONENESS

- **Conclusion 1:** as we have concept problems is better a reduced list of principal components (factor analysis)
 - Feeling ridiculous
 - Feeling humiliated First Component
 - Feeling laughable
 - Self-consciousness
 - Feelings of blushing Second Component
 - Feeling stupi
- **Conclusion 2:** With this reduced list (as a base) we went in our reliability indicator (Cronbach's Alpha) from 0,770 to 0.751. We need to do a hard qualitative research to improve this indicator
- **Conclusion 3:** There is no correlation between shame proneness and social economical level (see below)
- **Conclusion 4:** We need to try new approaches (adjectives)
- **Conclusion 5:** As shame is of hard apprehension by adjectives we suggest to try with situational phrases, we think they can work better in order to improve our reliability indicator.

FEELING SHAME OF POVERTY

- 1. We tested four phrases relative with respondents to be ashamed if they were poor**
- 2. We do not have problems of meanings, phrasing or accomplishing objectives.**
- 3. But most people do not agree with**
 - I would be ashamed if I was poor (52%)
 - I will be ashamed if someone in my family was poor (61%)
 - People leaving in poverty should be ashamed of themselves (74%)
- 4. And they agree that most people who are not poor make people who are poor feel bad (61%)**
- 5. If we obtain a composed weighted variable of social economical level (income, goods or assets, access to services, education, and employment), what can be categorized as poor people believe less that poverty is to be ashamed.**

FEELING SHAME OF POVERTY

Conclusion 1: We have to redefine poverty or we have to change our indicators or both (Cronbach's Alpha 0,444).

Conclusion 2: There is no significant difference between poor and no poor people (poor media score= 1,9527, no poor media score 2,03465 in scale 1 to 5) both groups believe that its not to be ashamed of poverty.

Conclusion 3: We do not find correlation between this four questions and social economical level.

Conclusion 4: Indirect questioning might work better or get better results

EXTERNAL EXPERIENCE OF HUMILIATION

1.- There are four different indicators proposed

- People feel that are treated with respect.
- People feel that they treated unfairly.
- People feel that they were discriminated.
- People feel that they were humiliated.

2.- Same as previously we do not have problems of understanding the phrase or their objective.

3.- We find a better correlation (than previous indicator) with poverty but we still are not in safe area.

4.- There is a better relation (than with poverty) with race, cultural or ethnic aspects. (I disagree that in Bolivia there is a direct relation between poverty and race. Bolivia has 23% of indigenous contrary to biased data offer by the 2001 Census)
See www.Lapopsurveys.com

EXTERNAL EXPERIENCE OF HUMILIATION

Conclusion 1: We have problems of scales. In general we need to uniform scales.

Conclusion 2: Negative phrasing are working better, it would be a good thing to probe the first phrase changed.

Conclusion 3: It's a wise move to measure humiliation from experience. Its wiser to set a time of measurement.

EXTERNAL EXPERIENCE OF HUMILIATION: Whether economic or ethnics restrain access

1. Same as previously we do not have problems of understanding the phrase or their objective.
2. We find a better correlation with SE Level with economic questions than with ethnic, race or culture questions.
3. We obtain good reliability indicators (0,855 and 0,822).

Conclusion 1: If our effort is to reduce questions, after a factor analysis we can say that this is not the case. So just keep it as they are.

INTERNAL EXPERIENCE OF HUMILIATION: LEVEL OF ACCUMULATED HUMILIATION

1. We already pointed out the difficulties of meaning.
2. We have been able only to test the first list of adjectives that proxies to the definition of humiliation.
3. The more frequent experienced are
 1. Bullied
 2. Referred in derogatory terms
 3. Teased
 4. Scorned
4. An they are more or less the most named as synonymous of humiliation
 1. Ridiculed
 2. Teased
 3. Bullied
 4. Scorned
 5. Discounted

INTERNAL EXPERIENCE OF HUMILIATION: LEVEL OF ACCUMULATED HUMILIATION

5. Which are more or less the best predictors of humiliation
(Regression analysis with Beta indicator as measure of impact)
 5. Referred in derogatory terms
 6. Teased
 7. Bullied
 8. Ridiculed
 9. Cruelly Criticized
 10. Embarrassed
 11. Harrased

INTERNAL EXPERIENCE OF HUMILIATION: LEVEL OF ACCUMULATED HUMILIATION

- **Conclusion 1: reduced list of principal components (factor analysis)**
 - Scorned
 - Cruelly Criticized
 - Referred in derogatory terms
 - Ridiculed
 - Discounted
 - Excluded
 - Bullied

This is similar to the adjectives selected in the third version of the question, that came from psychologists. So we can have a good start with this list

- **Conclusion 2: With this reduced list we went in our reliability indicator (Cronbach's Alpha) from 0,930 to 0.893 which is also good**
- **Conclusion 3: We are working with a good indicator**