

## The Nature of Pride

JESSICA L. TRACY  
RICHARD W. ROBINS

In so far as a man amounts to anything, stands for anything, is truly an individual, he has an ego about him to which his passions cluster, and to aggrandize which must be a principal aim within him.

—Cooley (1902, p. 216)

As the epigraph illustrates, feeling pride in oneself, or having one's "passions" "cluster about the ego," is a central part of human nature. Scheff (1988, p. 399) went so far as to claim, "We are virtually always in a state of pride or shame." Although this statement may be somewhat extreme, Scheff made a prescient observation: our everyday lives are frequently infused with a sense of mastery and achievement, or conversely, frustration and failure, and we react to these self-relevant events with often intense self-conscious emotions.

Yet, despite the importance of pride to everyday social life, this emotion has received relatively little research attention, particularly compared with fear, joy, and other so-called basic emotions. Like all self-conscious emotions, pride is generally viewed as a "secondary" emotion (Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger, & Weiss, 1989), and even compared with other self-conscious emotions pride is something of an underdog. A PsycINFO search found only 208 publications with the words "pride" or "proud" in their title, compared with 1,633 publications with the words "guilt" or "guilty," and 1,312 with the words "shame" or "ashamed." Similarly, in Tangney and Fischer's (1995) volume on self-conscious emotions, not a single chapter provided a review of the extant research or theory on pride, and only four of the 20 chapters discussed it.

However, a growing body of research may change all this: new theory and findings support the views of Cooley and Scheff, and suggest that pride is a psychologically important and evolutionarily adaptive emotion. The pleasurable subjective feelings that accompany a pride experience may reinforce the prosocial behaviors that typically elicit the emotion, such as achievement and caregiving (Hart & Matsuba, Chapter 7, this volume;

Herrald & Tomaka, 2002; Stipek, 1983; Weiner, 1985). Over the long term, these same feelings may contribute to the development of a genuine and deep-rooted sense of self-esteem. Pride is the emotion (along with shame) that gives self-esteem its affective kick (Brown & Marshall, 2001; Tracy & Robins, 2007b), and self-esteem in turn influences a wide range of intrapsychic and interpersonal processes. Meanwhile, the loss of pride, in the form of humiliation or ego threats, can provoke aggression and other antisocial behaviors (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998).

Since the publication of Tangney and Fischer's (1995) volume, a small body of research and theory on pride has emerged. Studies have begun to explore the structure, antecedents, expression, and function of this important emotion. In this chapter, we review these studies and highlight a central implication of their findings: that pride is likely to be an adaptive part of human nature. The chapter is divided into five sections. First, we describe a recent set of studies that explore the structure of pride and provide the first systematic empirical evidence for the long-standing claim that pride has two distinct facets. Second, we briefly review research on the development of pride (see also Lagattuta & Thompson, Chapter 6, this volume). Third, we describe a recent line of research testing whether pride has a recognizable nonverbal expression. Fourth, we discuss the extent to which pride and its expression may generalize across cultures (see also Edelstein & Shaver, Chapter 11, this volume; Fessler, Chapter 10, this volume; Goetz & Keltner, Chapter 9, this volume). Fifth, we describe a functionalist, or evolutionary, perspective on pride. Finally, we close by proposing several directions for future research. Our overarching goals for this chapter are to lay the foundation for continued programmatic research on pride and to convince our readers that there is a reason for pride's ubiquity in social life: it is part of what makes us human.

## A TALE OF TWO PRIDES

### **Theoretical and Historical Perspectives Pointing to Two Facets of Pride**

"Pride or arrogance . . . has been recognized since early times as a root cause of cruelty and evil" (Schimmel, 1997, p. 29). Both ancient Greek and biblical thought condemned what they referred to as "excessive pride" or "hubris" (Schimmel, 1997), and these prevalent early philosophical and religious views led Dante to refer to pride as the deadliest of the Seven Deadly Sins. Yet, in Western culture, "pride has been transformed from a vice into a virtue" (Schimmel, 1997, p. 37). Much like self-esteem, pride is generally perceived as something to be sought out, with its acquisition rewarded and encouraged in children and adults. This raises a perplexing question: Is pride good or bad?

Several researchers have addressed this apparent incongruity by arguing that pride is too broad a concept to be considered a single, unified emotion, and may be better viewed as two or more distinct emotions (Ekman, 2003; M. Lewis, 2000; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1989). Consistent with this perspective, pride has been theoretically linked to markedly divergent outcomes. On the one hand, pride in one's successes and relationships is assumed to promote future positive behaviors in the achievement domain and to contribute to further prosocial investments such as relationship maintenance and altruism. On the other hand, the "hubristic," "sinful," or "defensive" pride that is more associated with narcissism may contribute to aggression and hostility, interpersonal problems, relationship conflict, and a host of maladaptive behaviors (Bosson & Prewitt-Freilino, Chapter 22, this volume; Kernberg, 1975; M. Lewis, 2000; McGregor, Nail, Marigold, & Kang, 2005; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001).

We recently developed a theoretical model that addresses this paradox by distinguishing between two facets of pride: “authentic” and “hubristic” (Tracy & Robins, 2004a; see also Tracy & Robins, Chapter 1, this volume). Psychologists have long noted that pride occurs in response to internal attributions—that is, when the self is credited as the cause of the event (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988; M. Lewis, 2000; Roseman, 1991; Smith & Lazarus, 1993; Weiner, 1985). In our model, two facets of pride are distinguished by subsequent attributions. Specifically, authentic pride (“I’m proud of what I did”) may result from attributions to internal, unstable, controllable causes (“I won because I practiced”), whereas hubristic pride (“I’m proud of who I am”) may result from attributions to internal, stable, uncontrollable causes (“I won because I’m always great”). This distinction parallels the distinction frequently made between guilt and shame, where guilt involves a focus on negative aspects of one’s behavior—the “*thing* done or undone”—whereas shame involves a focus on negative aspects of one’s self—the *self* who did or did not do it (H. B. Lewis, 1971, p. 30; M. Lewis, 2000; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, Chapter 2, this volume; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). We labeled the first facet “authentic” to emphasize that it is based on actual accomplishments and is likely accompanied by genuine feelings of self-worth; in contrast, hubristic pride may be a genuine emotional experience that is fueled by a more inauthentic sense of self (i.e., distorted and self-aggrandized self-views).<sup>1</sup>

If pride is indeed characterized by these two distinct facets, then each facet should be associated with unique concepts, subjective feelings, and personality correlates, and the two facets should be elicited by distinct cognitive attributions. We conducted a series of studies to test these ideas (Tracy & Robins, 2007b).

### **The Semantic Structure of Pride**

In our first study, we examined people’s conceptualizations of pride. That is, what kinds of meaning do people infer from pride words and concepts? We asked research participants to rate the semantic similarity of pride-related words, which were derived from an open-ended study of the pride nonverbal expression (i.e., words were participant-generated labels for the pride expression; Tracy & Robins, 2004b). Analyses of participants’ ratings supported a two-cluster structure that converged with our theoretical distinction between authentic and hubristic pride. Specifically, words in the first cluster, such as “accomplished,” “triumphant,” and “confident,” described feelings about a controllable, typically effort-driven achievement. In contrast, words in the second cluster, such as “arrogant,” “cocky,” and “conceited,” connoted feelings associated with narcissistic self-aggrandizement. This study thus suggested that people conceptualize pride in terms of two distinct semantic categories, which correspond to authentic and hubristic pride.

### **Experiencing Pride**

We next examined whether the pride experience—the way that pride subjectively feels—is also characterized by two distinct facets. It is possible that, although people think of pride in terms of the two facets, only a single facet of feelings actually occur during a pride experience. For example, given that many hubristic pride words have a negative connotation, individuals may exclusively use authentic pride words to describe their own subjective feelings; hubristic pride words may exist in the lexicon only to describe pride felt by others. To test this possibility, we asked participants to write, in a narrative fashion, about a time when they had felt pride, and to rate the extent to which a set of pride-

related words (including words from both clusters) characterized their feelings. Factor analyses of their ratings suggested that a two-factor structure provided the best fit to the data.

Furthermore, the content of the words that loaded on each factor replicated the conceptual clusters found previously, such that an “authentic” pride factor emerged, with words like “achieving” and “confident” loading highly; and a hubristic pride factor emerged, with words like “arrogant” and “pompous” loading highly. We replicated these findings in five subsequent studies, two of which used the same method to assess momentary, state pride, and three of which assessed pride as a trait-like dispositional tendency (i.e., proneness to pride). Regardless of whether pride was measured as a trait or a state, we found two factors corresponding to authentic and hubristic pride. Moreover, these two factors were only weakly correlated (.22–.30 across studies), suggesting that they are relatively independent facets of pride.

We next tested whether the two factors could be accounted for by distinctions in evaluative valence (i.e., Do the authentic and hubristic pride factors simply reflect positively and negatively valenced words for a unitary pride emotion?), activation (i.e., Do the authentic and hubristic pride factors simply reflect high vs. low activity words for pride?), or a temporal distinction (i.e., Do the authentic and hubristic pride factors simply reflect state vs. trait words for pride?). We found that the factors replicated even when evaluative variance (i.e., ratings of pleasure and displeasure) and activation (i.e., ratings of activation and deactivation; Feldman-Barrett & Russell, 1998) were partialled out, suggesting that the two factors are not simply a statistical artifact of the tendency to distinguish between positive and negative valences or between activated and deactivated states. We also found that the two factors did not differ substantially in the degree to which the words defining each factor reflect stable traits versus transient states.

Based on these studies, we now believe that pride is best conceptualized in terms of two distinct facets, one reflecting authentic feelings surrounding achievement and mastery, and the other reflecting hubristic feelings of arrogance, grandiosity, and superiority. To facilitate future research, we developed brief, reliable measures of each facet (see Robins, Noftle, & Tracy, Chapter 24, this volume). These scales tend to be either weakly or not significantly correlated, suggesting that they assess relatively independent aspects of pride.

### **Correlates of Pride**

We next set out to test whether the two facets of pride have distinct personality correlates. If they do, then the two-facet perspective could resolve the long-standing question of whether pride is a psychologically healthy or a “sinful” emotion. Contradictory ideas about the consequences of pride may exist because one facet is associated with a positive personality profile and prosocial behaviors, whereas the other is associated with a more negative profile and antisocial behaviors.

As expected, we found that authentic pride is positively related to self-esteem, whereas hubristic pride is negatively related to self-esteem and positively related to narcissism. Interestingly, these correlations become even stronger when self-esteem and narcissism are partialled out of each other. We also found that authentic pride is negatively related, and hubristic pride positive related, to shame-proneness. This pattern is consistent with theories of narcissism as a defensive process in which explicit self-aggrandizement and hubris are used to protect the self from deep-seated feelings of shame and inadequacy (Kernberg, 1975; Kohut, 1977; Tracy & Robins, 2003a). Finally, we found that authentic

pride was positively correlated with the socially desirable and generally adaptive Big Five traits of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Emotional Stability, whereas hubristic pride was negatively correlated with Agreeableness and Conscientiousness—two traits that reflect a prosocial orientation, or what Digman (1997) referred to as “socialization.”

Together, these findings support the claim that authentic pride is the adaptive, prosocial, achievement-oriented facet of the emotion, which likely promotes the development of a deep-rooted and stable sense of self-esteem. In contrast, hubristic pride is uniquely related to narcissistic self-aggrandizement, and may, in part, be a defensive response to underlying feelings of shame. In addition, the correlations between hubristic pride and the Big Five suggest that hubristic pride is the less prosocial facet of pride. Importantly, for each of the Big Five traits except Openness, correlations with authentic and hubristic pride differed significantly, suggesting that individuals who tend to experience authentic pride have a markedly divergent personality profile from those who tend to experience hubristic pride.

### **Antecedents of Authentic and Hubristic Pride**

We next explored whether the two facets are elicited by distinct cognitive antecedents. Based on our theoretical model (Tracy & Robins, 2004a, and Chapter 1, this volume), attributing positive events to internal, unstable, controllable causes (e.g., effort) should lead to authentic pride, whereas attributing those same events to internal, stable, uncontrollable causes (e.g., ability) should lead to hubristic pride.

Across three studies, we found support for our theory that the two facets have distinct cognitive antecedents. First, based on content coding of narrative descriptions of pride experiences, we found that positive events with internal, unstable causes tended to promote authentic pride, whereas positive events caused by an individual’s stable ability, but not by any efforts made, and by “the self” (as opposed to unstable behaviors or actions), tended to promote hubristic pride. Second, we experimentally manipulated participants’ attributions for a hypothetical success, and found that they reported feeling greater authentic pride when success was attributed to internal, unstable, controllable causes (e.g., effort) than when success was attributed to internal, stable, uncontrollable causes (e.g., ability). Reports of hubristic pride showed the opposite pattern. Third, we examined participants’ dispositional attributional styles, and found that individuals who generally attribute outcomes to their own effort tend to experience authentic pride, whereas those who generally attribute outcomes to their own ability tend to experience hubristic pride.

Importantly, we also found that the two facets of pride are not distinguished by the *kinds* of events that elicit them. When we examined participants’ narratives about their pride experiences, we found no differences between the two facets in the degree to which the eliciting events involved success in academics, romantic relationships, family, athletics, or any other dimension, suggesting that people experience authentic and hubristic pride in response to all kinds of successes. Thus, it is not the event, but the way in which the event is *appraised*, that determines which facet is experienced.

As a whole, these studies provide empirical support for the claim that pride is not a unitary construct, and that, instead, there are distinct authentic and hubristic facets. In many ways, the relation between the two dimensions of pride seems similar to the relation between shame and guilt, the two major negative self-conscious emotions. Shame and guilt tend to be positively related yet have divergent and statistically independent cor-

relations with other relevant variables. As with shame and guilt, there are reliable and measurable individual differences in people's tendencies to experience each of the pride dimensions. Both pairs are also distinguished by the same causal attributions; shame and hubristic pride tend to be elicited by internal, stable, uncontrollable attributions, whereas guilt and authentic pride tend to be elicited by internal, unstable, controllable attributions (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tracy & Robins, 2006a). Finally, like shame and guilt, one facet of pride—hubristic—seems to have maladaptive correlates, whereas the other facet—authentic—seems to have adaptive correlates. One remaining question, which constitutes an important direction for future research, is whether the two facets are two forms of the same emotion or two distinct emotions.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIDE

Like all self-conscious emotions, pride emerges later in the course of development than basic emotions like fear and joy (Izard, 1971). Previous research suggests that most basic emotions emerge within the first 9 months of life (e.g., Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, & Stenberg, 1983), but that pride does not emerge until close to the end of a child's third year (Belsky & Domitrovich, 1997; Heckhausen, 1984; Lewis, Alessandri, & Sullivan, 1992; Stipek, 1995; Stipek, Recchia, & McClintic, 1992). These studies, which have examined toddlers' responses to success, have typically given young children a task they can accomplish and compared their behavioral and verbal responses after successful completion versus failure. For example, Stipek (1995) found that 2½- to 3-year-olds who successfully completed a puzzle tended to smile and look up (i.e., tilt their heads back, part of the pride nonverbal expression) more frequently than children who observed the experimenter complete the puzzle. The looking-up response was not observed in younger children, suggesting the later development of pride (Stipek et al., 1992). Lewis and colleagues (1992) and Belsky and Domitrovich (1997) observed 3-year-olds additionally display an erect posture (expanded chest, shoulders back), and make positive self-evaluative verbal statements after success; neither of these behaviors were seen in unsuccessful children of the same age, and all of these displays were more frequent when children succeeded on difficult, as compared with easy, tasks, suggesting that even young children feel pride only from a true accomplishment.

The capacity to understand pride emerges somewhat later than its experience. The form of understanding that seems to emerge first is the ability to recognize the pride nonverbal expression. At age 3, children cannot reliably distinguish the pride expression from expressions of happiness or surprise, but by age 4 pride recognition is significantly greater than chance and comparable to recognition of the more basic emotions (Tracy, Robins, & Lagattuta, 2005). In contrast to pride recognition, the ability to understand the situations and contexts in which pride is elicited seems to develop later. Harris, Olthuf, Terwogt, and Hardman (1987) reported that children under the age of 7 cannot spontaneously generate appropriate situations that would elicit pride. Thompson (1989) found that even 7-year-olds often attribute pride to individuals whose successful task completion is due to external (e.g., luck) rather than internal (e.g., effort) factors (see also Graham, 1988; Graham & Weiner, 1986). Similarly, Kornilaki and Chlouverakis (2004) found that 7-year-olds were unable to distinguish between the situations that elicit pride versus happiness. In several of these studies, it was also shown that by age 9 or 10 children can make the appropriate attributional distinctions, and become more likely to

grant pride only to individuals who are the cause of their own success (Kornilaki & Chlouverakis, 2004; Thompson, 1989).

This developmental trajectory is consistent with the theoretical perspective that certain cognitive capacities are prerequisites for the elicitation of any self-conscious emotion: self-awareness, the formation of stable self-representations, comparisons between one's own behavior and external standards, and internal attributions (Lagattuta & Thompson, Chapter 6, this volume; M. Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2004a). By the age of 3, children begin to acquire these abilities and display pride-like responses to success, but even at this age children cannot identify pride in others. The ability to recognize pride emerges at age 4, but this capacity is not accompanied by a full understanding of the situations and attributions that elicit pride and distinguish it from happiness. This complex understanding of pride is apparently not mastered until children have reached the age of 9 or 10.

### THE NONVERBAL EXPRESSION OF PRIDE

One of the major findings in the behavioral and social sciences is the discovery that a small set of “basic” emotions—anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, and surprise—have distinct, universally recognized, nonverbal expressions (Ekman, Sorenson, & Friesen, 1969; Ekman & Friesen, 1971; Izard, 1971). These findings emerged from studies demonstrating agreement on the emotions conveyed by each of these expressions across a wide range of nations and cultures, including highly isolated, preliterate tribal groups. Based on this research, many scientists came to accept Darwin's (1872) claim that emotions and their expressions evolved through natural selection. Within the emotion literature, the knowledge that certain emotions could be assessed through quantifiable, observable behaviors led to a strong research emphasis on those emotions known to have expressions, and to a corresponding lack of attention on more complex emotions thought to not have expressions—such as the self-conscious emotions.

However, Darwin (1872) also suggested that pride should have a recognizable display, writing: “Of all the . . . complex emotions, pride, perhaps, is the most plainly expressed” (p. 263). In fact, research on the development of pride supports this claim: preverbal toddlers show a specific set of nonverbal behaviors in response to success that are not seen when they fail (Lewis et al., 1992; Stipek, 1995). Furthermore, linguistically based folk models of pride tie behavioral elements to basic conceptions of the emotion, such as erect posture, chest out, head held high (Kovacs, 1986). Despite these varying sources of evidence, however, there was, until recently, no systematic test of whether pride is associated with a distinct, recognizable nonverbal expression.

Building on findings from the developmental literature, we tested whether the movements shown by successful toddlers might represent an early version of a pride expression. In a series of studies using forced-choice (i.e., asking participants to match expressions with specific emotion-word options) and open-ended (i.e., allowing participants to label expressions with any word they chose) response methods, we found that pride is associated with a distinct, recognizable, nonverbal expression (see Figure 15.1; Tracy & Robins, 2004b).

We began our research by instructing actors to pose expressions similar to those seen in young children after a success. We then manipulated potentially relevant components of these expressions (e.g., extent of head tilt, arm position) to determine the set of components that produced the highest level of agreement. Results demonstrated that the best



**FIGURE 15.1.** Prototypical pride expressions. Expression A is slightly better recognized than Expression B, but both are identified as pride. From Tracy and Robins (2004b). Copyright 2004 by Jessica L. Tracy. Reprinted by permission.

recognized, or, most prototypical, pride expression includes the body (i.e., expanded posture, head tilted slightly back, arms akimbo with hands on hips) as well as the face (i.e., small smile; Tracy & Robins, 2004b, 2007a). This expression is reliably recognized and distinguished from similar emotions (e.g., happiness) by adults from the United States and Italy, and, as was mentioned above, by children as young as 4 years old (Tracy & Robins, 2003b; Tracy et al., 2005). Pride recognition rates (typically around 80–90%) are comparable to recognition rates found for the basic emotions, and, like the basic emotions, pride can be recognized from a single snapshot image, both quickly and efficiently (Tracy & Robins, 2004b, 2004c).

One unique feature of the pride expression is that, unlike basic emotion expressions, it is not limited to facial musculature. The fact that pride recognition requires inclusion of at least the upper body (face-only pride expressions are equally likely to be identified as happiness) may be informative about the expression's unique evolutionary course. A non-verbal expression that involves the body as well as the face is more complex than face-only expressions, and this complexity may be more ideally suited to the complex message sent by pride. It is also possible that the bodily component makes the pride expression more easily regulated, which would be beneficial in a number of circumstances (Kemeny, Gruenewald, & Dickerson, 2004; Tracy & Robins, 2004a). Facial expressions are more difficult to regulate than body movements and posture because many of the facial muscle contractions involved are involuntary responses. Thus, although we may wish we could control the expression of all of our emotions, in our evolutionary history it was likely adaptive that our basic emotions be involuntarily expressed. The expression of pride, however, may be less directly linked to survival, and in some cases may be detrimental to fitness. As we explain below, in many cultures it is considered unacceptable to openly display pride, and such displays may lower a person's likeability (Eid & Diener, 2001;

Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2000; Paulhus, 1998; Zammuner, 1996). We may have evolved to show a pride expression that can be quickly suppressed when appropriate.

More broadly, the importance of the body in the pride expression is consistent with a growing number of studies suggesting that the body may be utilized in the recognition of all emotion expressions (e.g., Slaughter, Stone, & Reed, 2004). These studies have shown, for example, that similar neurological patterns occur during the perception of bodies and faces, whereas the recognition of ordinary objects recruits a different neurological process. Together, these findings suggest that it might be fruitful to focus more attention on the body in emotion research.

Much of the research on the pride expression, like the large majority of research on basic emotion expressions, has taken the form of judgment studies demonstrating that a posed version of the expression is highly recognizable (Tracy & Robins, 2004b, 2006b; Tracy et al., 2005). However, several studies have used encoding methods—assessing behaviors shown during actual pride experiences. These studies address the important question of whether the expression reliably identified by observers as pride is displayed when people feel proud. In addition to the developmental studies examining the spontaneous displays shown by toddlers after success, Weisfeld and Beresford (1982) found that high school students' performance on an exam was positively correlated with the increased erectness of their posture, suggesting that students who did well (and likely felt pride) expanded their posture more than those who did poorly. In another study, examining proprioceptive responses (i.e., how body movements influence perceptions and feelings) to success, Stepper and Strack (1993) found that individuals who were instructed to expand their posture while successfully completing a task reported greater pride than those who succeeded but did not make the corresponding postural movement.

In addition, in the only cross-cultural, naturalistic encoding study, Tracy and Matsumoto (2007) found that Olympic judo winners of medal (i.e., gold, silver, bronze) and nonmedal competitions tended to show aspects of the pride expression immediately after a match was completed. Winners typically displayed a head tilted back, expanded chest, torso pushed out, arms outstretched from the body, and hands in fists—all components of the recognizable pride expression—and these findings held across the wrestlers' gender and culture. Losers of these matches were much less likely to show pride. This research suggests that the well-replicated finding of accurate pride recognition is due to the fact that the pride expression *is* displayed during real-life pride evocative experiences.

## CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCH ON PRIDE

### A Universal Pride Expression

Perhaps the strongest evidence for the pride expression is the recent finding that it is recognized across highly diverse cultures that have little or no contact with each other (Tracy & Robins, 2006b). Researchers since Darwin (1872) have suspected that the pride expression may be universal. Ethnographic accounts support this view. For example, Fessler (1999) noted that a pride-like emotion discussed among the Malay people of Indonesia is thought to be associated with an erect posture, and Lindholm (1982) made a similar observation of the Swat Pukhtun of northern Pakistan. Until recently, however, these descriptive reports had not been empirically tested. In fact, a 2002 study, using meta-analyses to analyze the results of all judgment studies of emotion expressions conducted, found studies

examining recognition of 36 different possible emotional states—none of which included pride (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002).

However, in a recent study conducted in rural villages near Bobo Dioulasso, Burkina Faso, we examined whether preliterate individuals could accurately identify the pride expression (Tracy & Robins, 2006b). We chose to collect data in Burkina Faso because, as the third-least developed country in the world (United Nations Human Development Report, 2005), it is highly isolated from the rest of the world's shared cultures and media, making our Burkinabe participants unlikely to have learned the pride expression through exposure to Western media. The participants in our study live in mud huts in rural villages, have had no formal education, speak only their native African language, and cannot read or write. As a result, these individuals have virtually no exposure to Western media (e.g., television, film, magazines, newspapers), a fact evidenced by their inability to recognize photographs of George Bush, Tony Blair, Tom Cruise, or several other well-known Western figures. Similar to the Fore tribe in Papua New Guinea, who, in Ekman and colleagues' (1969, 1971) seminal studies were found to recognize the basic emotion expressions, our participants' lack of exposure to foreign cultures made them an ideal sample to test the universality of pride.

To assess emotion recognition in Burkina Faso, we photographed male and female Caucasian Americans and West Africans posing emotion expressions, and asked participants to choose from a list of emotion words (spoken aloud in their native language) the word that best matched the expression shown by each individual. Participants were also given the option to say "I don't know" and "other emotion." The mean pride recognition rate, 57%, was significantly greater than chance,  $p < .05$ , and comparable to the recognition rates found for the six basic emotions in this study ( $M = 50%$ ) and in previous studies of preliterate cultures (Ekman et al., 1969). The pride recognition rate did not differ for male versus female participants or targets. There was a small but significant tendency for American targets to be better recognized than African targets—but given that only four targets were used, this effect was likely due to the posing ability of these specific individuals.

These findings suggest that pride is reliably recognized and distinguished from related emotions, even by non-Western, culturally isolated, nonliterate individuals. Pride thus meets the primary criterion for universality that exists within the emotion literature (Ekman, 1992). It has previously been assumed that self-conscious emotions differ from basic emotions because they lack universally recognized expressions (Ekman, 1992), but our research challenges this assumption and suggests that even a highly social, cognitively complex, self-evaluative emotion like pride may be universal.

### **Cross-Cultural Views of Pride**

Despite universal recognition, it is nonetheless likely that there are cultural differences in the expression and experience of pride. Beyond its isolation, Burkina Faso is an ideal place to test the universality of pride because African countries tend to have highly collectivistic cultural values (Hofstede, 1984), which contrast sharply with the more individualistic values of most Western cultures (Wong & Tsai, Chapter 12, this volume). Perceptions of emotions and self processes relevant to pride (e.g., self-esteem) differ dramatically across these two types of cultures (Eid & Diener, 2001; Heine, 2004; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In particular, collectivistic cultures tend to promote the group over the individual, such that individuals are more prone to accept status differences rather than

try to change them and assert the self (Hoftstede, 2001; Rossier, Dahourou, & McCrae, 2005). Such values seem inconsistent with pride, an emotion geared toward enhancing and affirming the self. Thus, evidence for similarities in the recognition of pride across Burkina Faso and the United States suggests that, at least to some extent, the emotion transcends a fundamental cultural difference.

However, evidence for a cross-culturally recognized pride expression does not preclude the possibility that there are cultural differences in other aspects of pride, such as the situational elicitors, display rules, and societal value placed on the emotion. In fact, several studies have found that pride is viewed more negatively in collectivistic versus individualistic cultures. In a study comparing views of emotions in two individualistic (United States, Australia) versus two collectivistic (China, Taiwan) cultures, Eid and Diener (2001) found that pride was one of the few emotions valued differently across the cultural groups. In both collectivistic cultures, pride (along with contentment) was one of only two positive emotions not considered desirable, whereas among the two individualistic cultures pride was fairly highly valued. Similarly, Mosquera and colleagues (2000) compared the experience and expression of pride in Spain (a collectivistic, “honor-related valuing” culture) and the Netherlands (a more individualistic culture), and found that Dutch participants expressed more positive feelings in their descriptions of pride and were more likely to tell others about the pride-eliciting situation, as compared with Spanish participants. Finally, Scollon, Diener, Oishi, and Biswas-Diener (2004) assessed daily reports of pride and other emotions in five cultures (Asian American, European American, Hispanic American, Indian, and Japanese), and found the single largest cultural difference in reports of pride. Hispanic Americans reported feeling the most pride, and the three Asian cultures reported the least. Furthermore, cluster analyses showed that in India pride clustered with the negative emotions, but in Japan pride clustered with the positive emotions. These findings raise new complexities concerning the individualist/collectivistic distinction because Hispanic and Japanese cultures are both considered collectivistic. Nonetheless, all of these studies converge on the finding that the experience of pride is culturally variant.

The presence of two distinct facets of pride may make it particularly vulnerable to diverging cultural views. It is possible, for example, that in collectivistic cultures the predominant conceptualization of pride is tilted toward the hubristic facet. If this is the case, it could account for the more negative view of pride found in several collectivistic cultures. Alternatively, pride may be well accepted and valued in collectivistic cultures—as long as it is pride about one’s group instead of one’s individual self. In a study comparing pride in China and the United States, Chinese participants reported more positive views of pride that resulted from others’ accomplishments than from their own (Stipek, 1998). Recent research suggests that group pride can be authentic or hubristic, but it must be elicited by the activation of collective, rather than personal, self-representations (i.e., when the individual’s social group succeeds; Pickett, Gonsalkorale, Tracy, & Robins, 2006).

Furthermore, in addition to conceptualizations and subjective reports of pride, even the universally recognized pride expression may be influenced by culture. Research suggests that the in-group bias typically found in emotion recognition (i.e., higher levels of recognition when expressions are derived from the same culture as the research participants), which has emerged in our pride expression research, may be the result of “cultural dialects” in expressions (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002). According to this perspective, cultural influences produce small but noticeable changes in otherwise universal expressions, such that expressions are best recognized when individuals view them in the precise way

that they are displayed within their own culture. In other words, although Burkinabes can recognize the American version of the pride expression, there may be some other, slightly different, version that they would identify with greater accuracy. Of note, the in-group bias could also be explained by culturally divergent display rules for showing pride (Matsumoto, 2002). According to this perspective, if Burkinabe culture prohibits the experience or expression of pride, as some collectivistic cultures seem to do (Eid & Diener, 2002; Zammuner, 1996), then Burkinabe individuals would openly display the expression only infrequently. If viewing the pride expression is an uncommon experience in everyday social life, a lack of familiarity with it could promote the lower levels of recognition found in Burkina Faso. It is noteworthy, however, that in our Olympic judo competition study, cultural differences were not found in the tendency to display pride after success, suggesting that Asian, Latin American, European, and North American judo wrestlers were equally likely to display the expression in response to a victory (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2007).

In general, to the extent that pride is an adaptive emotion that functions to maintain and enhance social status, it is likely to be universal. Culture may influence the way it is displayed, regulated, and experienced, but not the core environmental contingencies that elicit it (i.e., its evolutionarily programmed cognitive antecedents) or the behavioral responses it generates (i.e., its adaptive outcomes).

### **PRIDE AS A FUNCTIONAL EMOTION**

In this section, we build on Darwin's (1872) claim about pride to present a functionalist account of the emotion. We first describe the potential adaptive value of the pride experience, and then turn to the likely adaptive benefits of its expression. We conclude by considering whether the two facets of pride might serve distinct functions.

#### **Adaptive Benefits of Experiencing Pride**

Emotions are likely to have evolved through natural selection to serve two primary functions: promoting the direct attainment of survival and reproductive goals, and promoting the attainment of social goals (e.g., getting along and getting ahead) which are more distally related to survival and reproduction. According to Kemper (1984), "when we examine the biological survival value of emotions, we see that [it] entails not merely the survival of organisms, but the preservation of patterns of social organization. Hence . . . emotions have not simply biological, but social survival value" (p. 373). As social creatures, social goals are essential for our survival, but their attainment represents a more intermediary step toward adaptive fitness than the direct attainment of survival goals. Whereas basic emotions clearly serve both survival and social functions, self-conscious emotions, like pride, seem to promote the attainment of specifically social goals (Keltner & Buswell, 1997; Tracy & Robins, 2004a).

Humans evolved to navigate within a social structure that has complex layers of multiple, overlapping, and sometimes nontransitive social hierarchies (e.g., the highest status hunters were not always the highest status warriors). These complex social contexts likely promoted the unique ability to hold complex self-representations and use self-awareness to coordinate and motivate behaviors essential to these social dynamics (Robins, Norem, & Cheek, 1999). Self-conscious emotions may have evolved to provide

information about one's current self-representations (i.e., self-evaluations), and to motivate the functional behaviors (e.g., achievement and caregiving) that allow individuals to maintain a positive self-concept and the respect and liking of others. Self-conscious emotions guide individual behavior by compelling us to do things that are socially valued and to avoid doing things that lead to social approbation (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). We strive to achieve, to be a "good person," or to treat others well because doing so makes us proud of ourselves. Put simply, society tells us what kind of person we should be; we internalize these beliefs in the form of actual and ideal self-representations; and pride motivates behavioral action toward the goals embodied in these self-representations. Thus, although we might know cognitively that we should help others in need, it takes the psychological force of the desire to feel pride to make us act in altruistic ways (Hart & Matsuba, Chapter 7, this volume). Similarly, we strive to achieve in school and work not only because we think that doing so will promote our status, but because the pride we experience when we succeed *feels* good. The reinforcement properties of pride are supported by a study showing that pride (at least as experienced by European Canadians) may facilitate memory for pride-eliciting events and make these events seem temporally more recent (Ross, Heine, Wilson, & Sugimori, 2005). In one of the few other studies examining the effects of pride, Herrald and Tomaka (2001) found that participants manipulated to experience pride showed higher task performance during and immediately following the pride experience.

Self-esteem may play an important role in this motivational process. Researchers have suggested that self-esteem functions as a social barometer, or "sociometer," to inform individuals of their social status and ensure that they behave in ways that will maintain their status and the acceptance of others, and avoid group rejection (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995). Given that pride (along with shame) is the emotion most strongly related to self-esteem (Brown & Marshall, 2001), it may be the affective motivator behind the maintenance and enhancement of self-esteem, and thus a key component of an individual's sociometer. Specifically, when individuals experience a success, they feel pride in response, and over time and with repetition, these feelings may promote positive feelings and thoughts about their global self, leading to the high self-esteem that informs individuals of their social value. This longitudinal process is somewhat speculative, however, and the precise nature of the relation between pride and self-esteem is an important direction for future research.

### **Adaptive Benefits of Expressing Pride**

In the previous section, we discussed how the experience of pride can motivate adaptive behaviors. Here we consider how the pride expression may serve a complementary adaptive function: alerting others that the proud individual merits increased group acceptance and social status. The cross-cultural generalizability of the pride expression is consistent with the possibility that it is an evolved response. Furthermore, similar displays (e.g., standing upright, pilo-erected fur, a "cocky" gait) have been observed in dominant non-human primates, suggesting that the expression may have evolved directly from earlier "protopride" displays in our evolutionary ancestors (de Waal, 1989; Maslow, 1936). In human research, studies have found that high-status individuals are assumed to feel more pride than lower status individuals working on the same task; if this link works bidirectionally, high status would likely be inferred from the pride expression (Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000).

Guilford and Dawkins (1991) have argued that the evolutionary “design” of social signals should reflect cues that perceivers will be best able to detect and interpret. According to the theory of ritualization, emotion signals begin as purely functional displays, and over time become simplified and exaggerated to the highly obvious expressions we see in everyday life (Eibl-Eisenfeldt, 1989). Thus, it may be fruitful to examine the components of a universal signal for insights into its possible original functions, bearing in mind that each component may be somewhat different than its original form.

One necessary component of the pride expression is expanded posture (Tracy & Robins, 2006b), which makes the individual showing pride look larger. Increased size conveys dominance, and might also attract attention. This would promote greater recognition from peers at the moment when such recognition is most desired: after an achievement. Another critical feature of the pride expression is the small smile. The fact that the smile is small helps observers distinguish pride from happiness, but the necessary presence of a smile in the expression (Tracy & Robins, 2004b) may reveal another function. Smiles convey friendship or alliance, and displaying a smile after an achievement sends the message “I’m dominant, but I’m still your friend; do not attack.” Without the smile, the pride display could promote hostility from others, as well as a desire to conspire against a person who has become too dominant.

### **Do the Two Facets Serve Distinct Functions?**

Our functionalist account of pride raises a perplexing question: Why does pride have a dark side? If pride evolved to promote status, why would a hubristic facet, which could foment coalitions against the proud individual, have evolved?

One possibility is that the two facets solve unique adaptive problems regarding the acquisition of status. For example, authentic pride might motivate behaviors geared toward the long-term attainment and maintenance of status, whereas hubristic pride might be a “shortcut” solution, providing status that is more immediate but fleeting. A related possibility, suggested by the correlations between the facets and the Big Five factors of personality, is that authentic pride promotes status through relationship-oriented, prosocial means (i.e., “getting along”), whereas hubristic pride promotes status by eliciting the admiration, if not the liking, of others (i.e., “getting ahead”). In fact, the personality correlates, as well as the correlations with self-esteem and narcissism, suggest that hubristic pride may be associated with psychopathy or Machiavellianism—two personality dispositions that may have short-term adaptive benefits despite causing long-term interpersonal problems (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). More generally, the likely outcomes of hubristic pride (e.g., boastfulness, competitiveness) may be adaptive in situations where it is advantageous to display one’s relative superiority to an adversary in order to intimidate an opponent. In contrast, authentic pride may be more tailored toward the formation and stabilization of longer term relationships and social bonds. Future studies are needed to disentangle the potentially unique functions of the two facets.

A broader question for future research in this area is whether pride is one emotion with two facets, as we have been assuming, or whether there are two distinct pride-related emotions. Our research to date suggests that, in terms of the way people conceptualize and experience pride, there are two facets so distinct as to have unique cognitive antecedents and entirely opposite personality correlates. However, in other research (Tracy & Robins, 2007b) we have found that both facets are reliably associated with the *same* nonverbal expression, suggesting that, from a behavioral perspective at least, there

is only one pride. Future studies addressing this complicated issue might test whether both facets exist across cultures, and whether the two facets are associated with distinct behavioral responses and interpersonal reactions—that is, whether each facet might, in fact, serve an independent function.

## CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this chapter, we have reviewed the small but growing literature on pride. Recent research and theory suggest that this emotion (1) has two conceptually and experientially distinct facets with distinct cognitive antecedents and personality correlates; (2) develops somewhat later than the more biologically basic emotions, but is experienced and recognized by the time children reach the age of 4 years; (3) has a cross-culturally recognizable nonverbal expression; and (4) evolved to promote dominance and status. Despite this emerging understanding of the nature and function of pride, much work remains to be done on this fundamental emotion.

We would like to highlight several directions for future research, inspired by linguist Noam Chomsky, neuroscientist David Marr, and ethologist Nico Tinbergen's proposed levels of analysis for understanding a faculty of the mind. These researchers have independently argued that a faculty of the mind needs to be understood in terms of: (1) "its real-time operation (how it works proximately, from moment to moment)"; (2) "how it is implemented in neural tissue"; (3) "how it develops in the individual"; (4) "its function (what it accomplishes in an ultimate, evolutionary sense)"; and (5) "how it evolved in the species" (Pinker, 2002, p. 70).

### Real-Time Operation

Regarding the first level of analysis, the "real-time operation" of pride, more research is needed on the pride expression to establish that the spontaneous display of pride corresponds to the recognizable posed display. Our study on Olympic judo wrestlers addressed this issue by demonstrating that elements of the recognizable expression are shown in response to a success experience (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2007), but future research should test whether individuals in these kinds of situations report feeling pride, make pride-eliciting cognitive attributions (i.e., internal), and show physiological responses that might be associated with the emotion (e.g., low cardiac and/or vascular activity; Herrald & Tomaka, 2001).

Also relevant to the real-time operation of pride is its connection to stable individual difference variables such as self-esteem and narcissism. Our research suggests that the two facets of pride show predicted correlations with these pride-related dispositions, but the process underlying the connection remains unclear. Is self-esteem simply the trait-like dispositional tendency to experience pride with great frequency across situations and over time? How does a pride experience boost one's self-esteem? And how might the dynamic interplay between (hubristic) pride and shame promote narcissism?

### Neural Level

To date, we know of no research on the neural bases of the experience, expression, or recognition of pride. Evidence for distinct prefrontal cortex activity in response to task-

contingent (i.e., pride-eliciting) versus noncontingent (i.e., happiness-eliciting) reward suggests that the pride experience, at least, may have a distinct neural signature (Davidson & van Reekum, 2005; see also Beer, Chapter 4, this volume), but considerably more work is required before we can begin to develop a neurobiological model of pride.

### Development

Developmental research on pride has provided insights into the age at which children first experience, recognize, and understand pride. However, we know little about the development of pride beyond childhood, and research is needed on later periods of life including adolescence, adulthood, and old age. One important direction is to explore the link between pride and self-esteem development. Studies suggest that self-esteem is at its highest during childhood but drops dramatically during adolescence and again in old age (Robins, Trzesniewski, Tracy, Gosling, & Potter, 2002); developmental changes in pride experiences (e.g., less frequent pride in adolescence and old age) may influence these normative changes.

### Function

Based on the research reviewed in this chapter, we have formulated hypotheses about pride's function. In our view, pride likely evolved to serve several distinct functions. The *experience* of pride reinforces prosocial and achievement-oriented behaviors and informs the individual that he or she has done something to increase his or her status and group acceptance. At the same time, the *expression* of pride may serve a third function: informing other group members that the individual deserves higher status and acceptance. All three functions seem ideally suited toward the overarching function of promoting social status, and suggest that humans may have evolved to communicate social messages about status, in part, through transitory emotions.

To test this functional account, we plan to examine the status implications of the pride expression (e.g., Does it convey dominance and promote higher status in those who show it?) and the pride experience (e.g., Is it associated with prosocial and achievement-oriented behaviors that might enhance the individual's status over the long term?) Additional cross-cultural studies are also needed to test whether the conceptual and experiential components of pride found in our research are universal. For example, do Burkinabes infer the same meaning from the pride expression as Westerners? Do they agree about the situations and contexts that elicit pride?

### Evolutionary Level

Finally, future studies should begin to tackle the last level of analysis: the evolutionary level. The functional level of analysis asks about the purpose of pride, but the evolutionary level asks a broader question: Given our evolutionary history, *how* did humans come to experience and express pride in the ways that we do? This level may be the most important for the functionalist view of pride because it addresses the critical "how" and "why" of pride's existence. Extant research provides few answers to these questions, but researchers might begin with the comparative literature and the growing evidence that humans, and possibly the great apes, are the only animals that experience pride (Hart & Karmel, 1996; Tracy & Robins, 2004a). Combined with the fact that pride and other

self-conscious emotions share a small set of features that distinguish them from other emotions and that seem relevant to some of the psychological characteristics unique to humans (e.g., self-awareness, self-representations, causal attributions; Tracy & Robins, 2004a), understanding the evolution of pride may provide important clues toward understanding humans' unique phylogenetic history. We hope that future researchers begin to address this issue, and, in doing so, reinvigorate the perspective on pride adopted over a century ago by psychologists such as Cooley, James, and others. Part of what it means to be human is to seek out the pride experience, and, perhaps, to show it to others.

### NOTE

1. In a previous paper, we labeled authentic pride with the somewhat narrower descriptor "achievement-oriented" (Tracy & Robins, 2004a).

### REFERENCES

- Belsky, J., & Domitrovich, C. (1997). Temperament and parenting antecedents of individual difference in three-year-old boys' pride and shame reactions. *Child Development, 68*, 456–466.
- Brown, J. D., & Marshall, M. A. (2001). Self-esteem and emotion: Some thoughts about feelings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 575–584.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 219–229.
- Campos, J. J., Barrett, K. C., Lamb, M. E., Goldsmith, H. H., & Stenberg, C. (1983). Socioemotional development. In M. M. Haith & J. J. Campos (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 2. Infancy and developmental psychobiology* (4th ed., pp. 783–915). New York: Wiley.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Scribner's.
- Darwin, C. (1872). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davidson, R., & van Reekum, C. M. (2005). Emotion is not one thing. *Psychological Inquiry, 16*, 16–18.
- de Waal, F. B. M. (1989). *Chimpanzee politics: Power and sex among apes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1246–1256.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1989). *Human ethology*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2001). Norms for experiencing emotions in different cultures: Inter- and intranational differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 869–885.
- Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 6*, 169–200.
- Ekman, P. (2003). *Emotions revealed*. New York: Times Books.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17*, 124–129.
- Ekman, P., Sorenson, E. R., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). Pan-cultural elements in facial displays of emotion. *Science, 164*, 86–88.
- Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 203–235.
- Ellsworth, P. C., & Smith, C. A. (1988). Shades of joy: Patterns of appraisal differentiating pleasant emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 2*, 301–331.

- Feldman-Barrett, L., & Russell, J. A. (1998). Independence and bipolarity in the structure of current affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 967–984.
- Fessler, D. M. T. (1999). Toward an understanding of the universality of second-order emotions. In A. L. Hinton (Ed.), *Biocultural approaches to the emotions: Publications of the Society for Psychological Anthropology* (pp. 75–116). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, S. (1988). Children's developing understanding of the motivational role of affect: An attributional analysis. *Cognitive Development*, 3, 71–88.
- Graham, S., & Weiner, B. (1986). From an attributional theory of emotion to developmental psychology: A round-trip ticket? *Social Cognition*, 4, 152–179.
- Guilford, T., & Dawkins, M. S. (1991). Receiver psychology and the evolution of animal signals. *Animal Behavior*, 42, 1–14.
- Harris, P. L., Olthof, T., Terwogt, M. M., & Hardman, C. E. (1987). Children's knowledge of the situations that provoke emotion. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 10, 319–343.
- Hart, D., & Karmel, M. P. (1996). Self-awareness and self-knowledge in humans, apes, and monkeys. In A. E. Russon, K. A. Bard, & S. T. Parker (Eds.), *Reaching into thought: The minds of the great apes* (pp. 325–347). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heckhausen, H. (1984). Emergent achievement behavior: Some early developments. In J. Nicholls (Ed.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: Vol. 3. The development of achievement motivation* (pp. 1–32). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Heine, S. J. (2004). Positive self-views: Understanding universals and variability across cultures. *Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology*, 21, 109–122.
- Herrald, M. M., & Tomaka, J. (2002). Patterns of emotion-specific appraisal, coping, and cardiovascular reactivity during an ongoing emotional episode. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 434–450.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). National cultures revisited. *Behavioral Science Research*, 18, 285–305.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequence: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Izard, C. E. (1971). *The face of emotion*. East Norwalk, CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. N. (1997). Embarrassment: Its distinct form and appeasement functions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122, 250–270.
- Kemeny, M. E., Gruenewald, T. L., & Dickerson, S. (2004). Shame as the emotional response to threat to the social self: Implications for behavior, physiology, and health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 153–160.
- Kemper, T. D. (1984). Power, status, and emotions: A sociological contribution to a psychophysiological domain. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 369–383). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Kornilaki, E. N., & Chlouverakis, G. (2004). The situational antecedents of pride and happiness: Developmental and domain differences. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22, 605–619.
- Kovacs, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach to the structure of concepts*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 518–530.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed., pp. 623–636). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. M., & Sullivan, M. W. (1992). Differences in shame and pride as a function of children's gender and task difficulty. *Child Development*, 63, 630–638.

- Lewis, M., Sullivan, M. W., Stanger, C., & Weiss, M. (1989). Self development and self-conscious emotions. *Child Development, 60*, 146–156.
- Lindholm, C. (1982). Swat Pukhtun family as a political training ground. *South Asia Occasional Papers and Theses, 8*, 51–60.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224–253.
- Maslow, A. H. (1936). The role of dominance in the social and sexual behavior of infra-human primates: I. Observations at Vilas Park Zoo. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 48*, 261–277.
- Matsumoto, D. (2002). Methodological requirements to test a possible in-group advantage in judging emotions across cultures: A comment on Elfenbein and Ambady (2002) and evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 128*, 236–242.
- McGregor, I., Nail, P. R., Marigold, D. C., & Kang, S. (2005). Defensive pride and consensus: Strength in imaginary numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 978–996.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177–196.
- Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2000). The role of honor-related values in the elicitation, experience, and communication of pride, shame, and anger: Spain and the Netherlands compared. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 833–844.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1197–1208.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556–563.
- Pickett, C., Gonsalkorale, K., Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006). *Two facets of collective pride*. Manuscript in preparation, University of California, Davis.
- Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Robins, R. W., Norem, J. K., & Cheek, J. M. (1999). Naturalizing the self. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 443–477). New York: Guilford Press.
- Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K., Tracy, J. L., Gosling, S., & Potter, J. (2002). Global self-esteem across the lifespan. *Psychology and Aging, 17*, 423–434.
- Roseman, I. J. (1991). Appraisal determinants of discrete emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 5*, 161–200.
- Ross, M., Heine, S. J., Wilson, A. E., & Sugimori, S. (2005). Cross-cultural discrepancies in self-appraisals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1175–1188.
- Rossier, J., Dahourou, D., & McCrae, R. R. (2005). Structural and mean-level analyses of the five-factor model and locus of control: Further evidence from Africa. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*, 227–246.
- Scheff, T. J. (1988). Shame and conformity: The deference-emotion system. *American Sociological Review, 53*, 395–406.
- Schimmel, S. (1997). *The seven deadly sins: Jewish, Christian, and classical reflections on human psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scollon, C. N., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2004). Emotions across cultures and methods. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 304–326.
- Slaughter, V., Stone, V. E., & Reed, C. (2004). Perception of faces and bodies: Similar or different? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*, 219–223.
- Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Appraisal components, core relational themes, and the emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 7*, 233–269.
- Stepper, S., & Strack, F. (1993). Proprioceptive determinants of emotional and nonemotional feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 211–220.
- Stipek, D. J. (1983). A developmental analysis of pride and shame. *Human Development, 26*, 42–54.
- Stipek, D. (1995). The development of pride and shame in toddlers. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer

- (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 237–252), New York: Guilford Press.
- Stipek, D. (1998). Differences between Americans and Chinese in the circumstances evoking pride, shame, and guilt. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(5), 616–629.
- Stipek, D., Recchia, S., & McClintic, S. (1992). Self-evaluation in young children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 57(1, Serial No. 226).
- Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., & Fischer, K. W. (Eds.). (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., & Gramzow, R. (1989). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Thompson, R. A. (1989). Causal attributions and children's emotional understanding. In C. Saarni & P. Harris (Eds.), *Children's understanding of emotion* (pp. 117–150). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiedens, L., Ellsworth, P. C., & Mesquita, B. (2000). Sentimental stereotypes: Emotional expectations for high- and low-status group members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 560–575.
- Tracy, J. L., & Matsumoto, D. (2007). *More than a thrill: Cross-cultural evidence for spontaneous displays of pride in response to victory at the Olympic Games*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006a). Appraisal antecedents of shame and guilt: Support for a theoretical model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1339–1351.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006b). *The nonverbal expression of pride: Evidence for cross-cultural recognition*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007a). *The prototypical pride expression: Development of a nonverbal behavior coding scheme*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007b). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 506–525.
- Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., & Lagattuta, K. H. (2005). Can children recognize the pride expression? *Emotion*, 5, 251–257.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004a). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103–125.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004b). Show your pride: Evidence for a discrete emotion expression. *Psychological Science*, 15, 194–197.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004c, January). *The automaticity of emotion recognition*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Austin, TX.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2003a). "Death of a (narcissistic) salesman": An integrative model of fragile self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 57–62.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2003b). Does pride have a recognizable expression? In P. Ekman, J. J. Campos, R. J. Davidson, & F. B. M. de Waal (Eds.), *Emotions inside out: 130 years after Darwin's "The expression of emotions in man and animals."* *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1000, 1–3.
- United Nations Human Development Report. (2005). Available online at [hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005/pdf/presskit/HDR05\\_PKE\\_HDI.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005/pdf/presskit/HDR05_PKE_HDI.pdf).
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548–573.
- Weisfeld, G. E., & Beresford, J. M. (1982). Erectness of posture as an indicator of dominance or success in humans. *Motivation and Emotion*, 6, 113–131.
- Zammuner, V. L. (1996). Felt emotions and verbally communicated emotions: The case of pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 233–245.