



Cross-cultural evidence for the two-facet structure of pride



Yan Shi^{a,b,c}, Joanne M. Chung^d, Joey T. Cheng^e, Jessica L. Tracy^f, Richard W. Robins^d, Xiao Chen^{a,b}, Yong Zheng^{a,b,*}

^a Key Laboratory of Cognition and Personality (MOE), Southwest University, Chongqing, China

^b Faculty of Psychological Science, Southwest University, Chongqing, China

^c Center for Mental Health Services, The Ninth People's Hospital of Chongqing, Chongqing, China

^d Department of Psychology, University of California, Davis, USA

^e Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine, USA

^f Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Available online 9 February 2015

Keywords:

Authentic pride

Hubristic pride

Causal attributions

Self-conscious emotions

Cultural psychology

ABSTRACT

Across six studies conducted in Mainland China and South Korea, the present research extended prior findings showing that pride is comprised of two distinct conceptual and experiential facets in the U.S.: a pro-social, achievement-oriented “authentic pride”, and an arrogant, self-aggrandizing “hubristic pride”. This same two-facet structure emerged in Chinese participants’ semantic conceptualizations of pride (Study 1), Chinese and Koreans’ dispositional tendencies to experience pride (Studies 2, 3a, and 3b), Chinese and Koreans’ momentary pride experiences (Studies 3a, 3b, and 5), and Americans’ pride experiences using descriptors derived indigenously in Korea (Study 4). Together, these studies provide the first evidence that the two-facet structure of pride generalizes to cultures with highly divergent views of pride and self-enhancement processes from North America.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Pride is a fundamental human emotion. In addition to playing a critical role in many domains of social and psychological functioning, a growing body of research suggests that pride may be a human universal. Studies have demonstrated that pride has a distinct, recognizable nonverbal expression that is reliably identified by children and adults from several different cultural groups, including geographically and culturally isolated traditional small-scale societies in Burkina Faso and Fiji (Tracy & Robins, 2004a, 2008; Tracy, Robins, & Lagattuta, 2005; Tracy, Shariff, Zhao, & Henrich, 2013). Furthermore, the pride expression is spontaneously displayed by individuals from a wide range of cultures in response to the pride-eliciting situation of success, and by congenitally blind individuals who could not have learned to display pride through visual modeling (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008). Together, these findings suggest that the pride expression meets the criteria typically considered to indicate universality (see Norenzayan &

Heine, 2005), and thus that pride may be part of humans’ evolved emotional repertoire.

However, few studies have examined whether conceptualizations of pride, or the subjective experience of pride, generalizes across cultures. As a result, it is possible that humans universally display and recognize the nonverbal expression of pride, but different cultural groups have different conceptualizations of the meaning associated with this expression, and may experience different subjective feelings of pride. In other words, we do not know whether the psychological structure of pride previously found in the U.S. reflects a universal structure of pride.

In prior research conducted in the U.S., a series of eight studies demonstrated that pride is comprised of two distinct and largely independent facets (Tracy & Robins, 2007). This research measured lay-people’s conceptions of the semantic similarity among of pride-related words, to uncover a consensual conceptual structure of pride, as well as the feelings individuals tend to report when experiencing pride. Across all these studies, results revealed two distinct facets of pride, which are conceptually consistent with theoretical notions of the emotion (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1989; Tracy & Robins, 2004b). Specifically, the first facet, labeled “authentic pride”, is reliably associated with feelings of confidence, self-worth, productivity, and achievement. The second facet, labeled “hubristic pride”, is reliably associated with arrogance, egotism, and conceit. Further supporting this

* Corresponding author at: School of Psychology, Southwest University, Chongqing 400715, China.

E-mail addresses: girlseetheworld@qq.com (Y. Shi), jmhchung@ucdavis.edu (J.M. Chung), joey.cheng@uci.edu (J.T. Cheng), jltracy@psych.ubc.ca (J.L. Tracy), rwrubins@ucdavis.edu (R.W. Robins), 644907092@qq.com (X. Chen), zhengy@swu.edu.cn (Y. Zheng).

distinction, the tendency to experience each pride facet is associated with theoretically predicted, divergent personality profiles, cognitive elicitors, and behavioral outcomes (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012; Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010; Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2004b, 2007).

Drawing on this body of evidence, researchers have argued that the two pride facets may be distinct adaptations, each having evolved to serve a different, though related, adaptive function (e.g., Cheng et al., 2010; Shariff, Tracy, & Cheng, 2010; Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010; but see also Clark, 2010; Williams & DeSteno, 2010). Specifically, although both facets are likely to function to promote an individual's social status and group inclusion (Shariff & Tracy, 2009; Tiedens, 2000; Williams & DeSteno, 2009), the two facets of pride may promote different means of attaining social status. In this account, hubristic pride is a functional affective mechanism that facilitates individuals' attainment of Dominance, a form of social status that is derived through force and intimidation. By experiencing hubristic pride, individuals may acquire the motivation and mental preparedness to exert force and intimidate subordinates, and be motivated to engage in hubristic-pride associated behavioral tendencies of aggression and hostility. In contrast, authentic pride may facilitate the attainment of prestige, a form of status that is based on deserved respect for one's skills and expertise. By experiencing authentic pride and its associated feelings of confidence, accomplishment, and productivity, individuals may acquire the motivation to persevere and work hard, and the mental preparedness to achieve the socially valued goals that will garner others' respect and admiration (Cheng et al., 2010; Tracy et al., 2010). This theoretical account has received empirical support from studies demonstrating that individuals who tend to experience hubristic tend to attain greater dominance, assessed via both self- and peer-reports, whereas individuals who tend to experience authentic pride tend to attain greater prestige, again assessed through self- and peer-reports (Cheng et al., 2010). By promoting the pursuit of these two forms of social rank—both of which have been shown to predict greater influence and control over others (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013)—the two pride facets may each function to increase social status and, ultimately, fitness.

This account suggests not only that pride, at a broad level, is an evolved part of human nature, but also that the two facets of pride may have evolved separately, to serve somewhat distinct status-oriented functions. However, all of the studies supporting the two-facet account thus far were conducted with North American participants, who are often not representative of the vast majority of the world's populations (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). As a result, we cannot presently draw any conclusions about whether the two-facet structure of pride is likely to be universal, rather than an artifact of North American, or Western culture. Moreover, because self-evaluations are critical to the elicitation of all self-conscious emotions, including pride (Buss, 2001; Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2004b), the experience of pride is particularly likely to vary across cultures that hold different construals of the self, because different self-construals may facilitate different self-evaluative processes (Mesquita & Karasawa, 2004). A large body of research (e.g., Heine, 2003; Heine & Hamamura, 2007; Heine, Kitayama, & Hamamura, 2007; Yamagishi et al., 2012) suggests that individuals from largely collectivistic Asian cultures, who tend to hold interdependent, rather than independent, self-construals, are generally less likely to self-enhance than those from individualistic Western cultures, where more independent self-construals predominate. More recent work examining the boundary conditions of this cultural difference indicates that East Asian self-effacement is primarily driven by concerns about face, harmony, and punishment (Lee, Leung, & Kim, 2014; Tam et al., 2012).

Given that pride is both a typical emotional response to self-enhancement and a motivator of self-enhancement (Tracy, Cheng, Martens, & Robins, 2011), it is possible, and even likely, that pride is experienced somewhat differently in cultures where self-enhancement is discouraged and self-criticism encouraged. However, it should be noted that although pride is thought to be most prevalent and intensely felt in cultures that hold heightened self-enhancing tendencies, pride is an emotion that, in all likelihood, also operates independently of self-enhancement motives. As a result, we would expect that even individuals who hold self-effacing cultural values experience pride, especially pride that is well-calibrated to their achievements.

Indeed, notable differences have been observed in the handful of cross-cultural studies that have examined individuals' conceptualizations and experiences of pride. Several studies have found that individuals from Western cultures tend to hold more positive attitudes toward pride compared to individuals from Eastern cultures, who generally view pride negatively (Kim-Prieto, Fujita, & Diener, 2012), unless it is experienced in response to the success of others rather than oneself (Eid & Diener, 2001; Sommers, 1984; Stipek, 1998). Mirroring these cultural differences in attitudes toward pride, other studies have shown that, not only do Asians report experiences of pride less frequently than Westerners (Scollon, Diener, Oishi, & Biswas-Diener, 2004), but when they are reported, they are often in the context of others' achievements rather than one's own (i.e., a group members' success; Neumann, Steinhäuser, & Roeder, 2009) and include both pleasant and unpleasant subjective components (Scollon, Diener, Oishi, & Biswas-Diener, 2005). It should be noted however, that cultural proscriptions against the experience and display of pride as documented in these studies might minimize the reporting of pride experiences even if it is felt (Smith, 2004). As a result, the finding that pride is experienced less frequently among East Asians should be interpreted with caution. Nonetheless, these findings offer tentative support for the characterization of pride as a socially disengaging and devalued emotion in Asian cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Despite these cultural differences, however, it remains possible that pride experiences—and the two-facet structure of pride—has cross-cultural generality, as a result of the fitness-enhancing effects of both facets, by virtue of their distinct functional effects on status-promotion. An alternative possibility, however, is that the general conceptualization of pride is universal, but the hypercognized distinction between authentic and hubristic pride is a learned product of a Western cultural tradition that emphasizes showing and enhancing one's pride (and status). As a first step to teasing apart these competing hypotheses, we tested whether the two-facet structure of pride replicates in cultural contexts that do not share the Western cultural emphasis on status-seeking and self-enhancement. Specifically, the present research examined the psychological structure of pride in two non-Western cultural contexts that are highly collectivistic and emphasize interdependent self-construals: Mainland China and South Korea (Hofstede, 2001; Oyserman, Coon, & Kimmelmeier, 2002). This work takes an important first step toward answering the question of whether the two-facet structure of pride is likely to be a human universal.

2. Overview of research

Six studies were conducted to provide the first systematic analysis of the psychological structure of pride in two East-Asian countries—Mainland China (Studies 1, 2, and 5) and South Korea (Studies 3a, 3b, and 4). Across these studies, we used a combination of emic and etic approaches—two long-standing methodological traditions that respectively emphasize the importance of

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/951264>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/951264>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)