A study of the relationship between different forms of pride, empathy and tolerance

Annick Bouma

S4677021

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

PSB3E-BT15: Bachelor

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ernestine Gordijn

Second evaluator: Lisette de Jonge-Hoekstra

In collaboration with: Thomas Covers, Marriott Gemmink, Thom Oterdoom, Lieke Verbree, and Samantha Werkman

Octobre 05, 2023

Abstract

In a globalized and diverse world, fostering tolerance is an important concept for the promotion of harmonious coexistence. The present study examines whether different forms of pride (hubristic pride and authentic pride) and empathy predict tolerance towards others who do not share our views. Hubristic pride, characterized by arrogance, is hypothesized to decrease tolerance, whereas authentic pride, rooted in genuine self-worth, is expected to increase it. Empathy is hypothesized to be a potential mediator between pride and tolerance. To examine these relationships, we conducted a correlational study ($n = 253$). In order to address measurement challenges, this study assessed different forms of pride by asking participants how they felt after describing a successful experience. In addition we coded their descriptions in terms of expressed hubristic pride and authentic pride to get a more objective indication of pride. Following critique on the hubristic pride scale that was proposed by Tracy and Robins (2007), this study added the new hubristic pride scale to investigate if it could be a better measure of hubristic pride. Hubristic pride has a small negative relation with both empathy and tolerance. Authentic pride shows divergent results, challenging established notions. Expressed new hubristic pride emerges as a more accurate measure than hubristic pride, that mediates the relationship between pride and tolerance. The study contributes theoretical implications by highlighting the multifaceted nature of pride and the importance of nuanced measures. Overall, this study lays the groundwork for the development of evidence-based interventions aimed at promoting a more inclusive and tolerant society by investigating to what extent tolerance has a relationship with pride.

A study of the relationship between different forms of pride, empathy and tolerance

In a world that is characterized by increasing diversity and interconnectedness, the concept of tolerance has emerged as an important psychological construct for creating harmony amidst differences. Tolerance, defined by UNESCO (1995) as the ability to accept and respect differences in beliefs, values, opinions, and behaviors of others, contributes to this harmony in many ways (Butrus & Witenberg, 2013). For example, being tolerant allows individuals to maintain their own views while also recognising that others may have different opinions. Therefore, individuals who are more tolerant are also able to participate in more open-minded conversations (Adelman et al., 2021). Moreover, tolerance is closely associated with pro-social behavior, equality, respect and acceptance (Dusche, 2002). In our quest for harmonious societies, it is imperative to explore the factors that can promote tolerance.

The main purpose of the present study was to examine factors that might predict tolerance. Previous research has found that people who are more humble tend to focus more on other people and therefore show more tolerance towards others who have a different point of view (Byun, 2023). The current research aimed to build on this by asking whether a lack of humility would have the opposite effect. A lack of humility might be reflected by pride. Therefore, this research focused on pride and its relation with empathy and tolerance instead. However, pride is discussed as a multifaceted construct and may not work as a measure of lack of humility alone. The relationship between pride and tolerance may depend on the type of pride one is interested in. According to Tracy and Robins (2007), we can distinguish hubristic pride from authentic pride. Tracy and Robins (2007) found that hubristic pride is associated with arrogance, egotism, and a sense of superiority, whereas authentic pride is characterized by a sense of achievement and humility. Hubristic pride is therefore more likely to measure a lack of

humility, whereas authentic pride is more likely to resemble humility. If this is the case, authentic pride would have a similar relation with tolerance as humility did in Byun's (2023) study, and hubristic pride might have the opposite relation. Connecting these prior research findings, we aim to investigate whether authentic pride and hubristic pride predict tolerance, and whether this relationship is mediated by empathy.

What is tolerance?

Tolerance is a fundamental virtue that is essential for nurturing inclusive societies. UNESCO (1996) describes it as an "act of humanity" that requires individuals to embrace diversity. This notion is echoed in scholarly works that highlight the role of tolerance in promoting social cohesion and pro-social behavior (Butrus & Wittenberg, 2013; Dusche, 2002).

Various academic works have described different types of tolerance. Cultural tolerance refers to recognising and respecting the uniqueness of different cultural identities (Butrus & Wittenberg, 2013; UNESCO, 1996). Religious tolerance involves the acceptance of different religious beliefs and practices (Vogt, 1997; Adelman et al., 2022). Political tolerance involves the acceptance of varying political ideologies and opinions (Dusche, 2002; Mondak & Sanders, 2003). Social tolerance focuses on accepting and respecting different lifestyles and identities. Finally, interpersonal tolerance focuses on accepting and respecting differences in perspectives, values and behaviors. In this research, we will focus on exploring tolerance in terms of respect for differing opinions when it comes to politics, religion and lifestyle.

The world is becoming increasingly multicultural as a result of globalization and this means that different perspectives come together more often. Tolerance seems to enable social cohesion and a harmonious coexistence between people of different backgrounds and is therefore

an important concept. In order to promote harmonious societies in a multicultural world, it is important to explore what makes people tolerant.

What makes people tolerant? The role of empathy

In order to increase our understanding of tolerance and what makes people tolerant, it is important to examine the factors that influence tolerance. One of the factors that has been found to have a significant relationship with tolerance is empathy (Hoffman, 2000; Butrus & Witenberg, 2013). Empathy can be defined as an emotional response triggered by perceiving or understanding the emotional state of another person (Feshbach, 1978). It involves understanding and sharing other people's emotions and is associated with prosocial behavior (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). The literature distinguishes between two types of empathy: cognitive empathy and affective empathy. Cognitive empathy describes the ability to understand the emotions of others and involves the ability to put oneself in another person's shoes in terms of their feelings and mental state. Affective empathy, refers to the feeling of experiencing others' emotions, involving basic mechanisms such as emotional contagion, identification of emotions, and shared emotional distress (Auyeung & Alden, 2016; Murphy et al., 2018).

Research by Davis (1983) suggests that empathic individuals' sensitivity to the thoughts and feelings of others allows them to better appreciate differences in perspective and experience, thus facilitating greater understanding and acceptance of others. Acceptance of others is something we find again in the definition of tolerance. Monroe and Martinez-Marti (2008) highlight the important role of empathy in promoting tolerance within societies. They argue that by developing empathy, people gain the ability to challenge preconceived notions and actively work towards understanding and acceptance of others. In addition, Batson et al (2002) proposed

that empathy serves as a basis for reducing prejudice. They suggest that highly empathetic individuals are predisposed to promote tolerance and reduce prejudice. Indeed, individuals who show increased levels of empathic concern are more likely to engage in behaviors that are critical for reducing prejudice and promoting tolerance (Monroe & Martinez-Marti, 2008). These findings suggest an important role for empathy in promoting tolerance. This raises the question of what makes a person more empathetic and therefore more tolerant.

What makes people empathic and tolerant? The role of pride

What makes people empathetic and tolerant? Research by Byun (2023) contributes to this question by exploring the relationship between humility, empathy and tolerance. Humble individuals tend to show more empathy towards others (Worthington, 1998), and as mentioned before, previous research has found empathy to be a motivator for tolerance (Hoffman, 2000; Butrus & Witenberg, 2013). Linking these findings, Byun (2023) examined the relationship between humility, empathy and tolerance and found that higher levels of humility were associated with higher levels of empathy and tolerance. The results also indicate that empathy is a significant mediator in the relationship between humility and tolerance. If higher levels of humility are associated with higher levels of empathy and tolerance, will a lack of humility be associated with lower levels of empathy and tolerance? The present study attempted to answer this question by using pride as a construct to represent a lack of humility.

But what exactly is pride? Pride is a complex construct and its definition has been controversial in the research field. On the one hand, pride is often associated with a positive feeling that inspires people to succeed. On the other hand, pride is also associated with arrogance and selfishness (Kusano & Kemmelmeier, 2022). Several researchers have provided both

theoretical and empirical support for the distinction between two forms of pride: authentic pride and hubristic pride (Tangney & Wagner, 1995; Tracy, Cheng, Robins, & Trzesniewski, 2009; Tracy & Robins, 2007a, 2007b). Authentic pride results from attributing success to internal, unstable and controllable causes ("I did well because I worked hard"), whereas hubristic pride results from attributing success to internal, stable and uncontrollable causes ("I did well because I'm great"). This study examines the relationship between pride (authentic pride and hubristic pride) and tolerance, with empathy as a mediating factor.

Authentic pride is characterized by genuine feelings of self-worth, resulting in secure self-esteem and authenticity (Tracy et al., 2009). Secure self-esteem increases feelings of similarity to others (Neff, 2003), which in turn increases empathy and altruistic behavior (Batson & Powell, 2003; Davis, 1983; Joireman et al., 2002). Secure self-esteem also reduces self-centeredness, allowing one to be more responsive to the needs of others (Eisenberg et al., 1998; Garber, et al., 1997). Although pride as a construct is quite self-centered and could therefore lead to less openness to the ideas of others, the characteristics of authentic pride could potentially lead to more openness to others. Thus, it would seem that authentic pride would increase empathy and, consequently, tolerance.

Hubristic pride, on the other hand, is often associated with insecure self-worth, resulting in defensive self-esteem and narcissism (Tracy et al., 2009). Research has shown that insecure self-worth can promote excessive self-focus (Crocker & Park, 2004) and lead to hostility, aggression and disregard for the rights and feelings of others (Batson & Powell, 2003). The feelings of superiority associated with hubristic pride have been shown to reduce one's ability to feel similar to weaker others (Oveis, Horberg, & Keltner, 2010). The ability to feel similar to others is an important predictor of empathy (Batson & Shaw, 1991; Cialdini, Brown, Lewis,

Luce, & Neuberg, 1997). Thus, in the case of hubristic pride, in contrast to authentic pride, it would seem that it would reduce empathy and thereby reduce the effect of empathy on tolerance.

Ashton-James and Tracy (2012) followed the same line of reasoning and found that hubristic pride led to a decrease in empathy, which led to an increase in prejudice. Prejudice is defined by Fiske (1998) as a negatively biased evaluation of individuals belonging to groups that are perceived to be inferior on some dimension (e.g., racial, religious, socioeconomic, political, sexual, or physical). They also found that authentic pride increased empathy and therefore contributed to a decrease in prejudice. The question remains as to what this means for tolerance. Previous research has not yet described the relationship between different forms of pride with empathy and tolerance, that is, to what extent feeling proud is related to feeling empathy with and being tolerant towards others who do not share your views. The present study aims to fill this gap by examining this relationship.

Present study

The present study aims to examine the role of different forms of pride (authentic pride versus hubristic pride) as predictors of tolerance, mediated by empathy. Inspired by Byun's (2023) research, who found a relationship between humility and tolerance that was mediated by empathy, this research seeks to provide further understanding of the role of pride and empathy in predicting tolerance. We hypothesized that authentic pride will be associated with more empathy and will therefore have a positive relation with tolerance. Hubristic pride, on the other hand, is hypothesized to be associated with less empathy and will therefore have a negative relation with tolerance.

To test these hypotheses, this study used a questionnaire that included measures of authentic pride, hubristic pride, empathy, and tolerance. The hubristic pride scale that Tracy and Robins (2007) developed has been criticized to not measure hubristic pride accurately because it generally produces low response values and variability (Dickens & Murphy, 2023; Murphy & Dickens, 2023; Holbrook, 2014). The present study therefore added a new hubristic pride scale with less negatively worded questions next to the hubristic pride scale from Tracy and Robins (2007) in an attempt to measure hubristic pride in a more accurate way. Additionally, this study made use of self-report measures as well as coded measures of pride to challenge the notion of social desirability bias in the questionnaires. The hypotheses of our study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who experience more authentic pride feel more empathy towards those who do not share their views.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who experience more hubristic pride feel less empathy towards those who do not share their views.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who experience more authentic pride are more tolerant towards those who do not share their views.

Hypothesis 4: Individuals who experience more hubristic pride are less tolerant towards those who do not share their views.

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between authentic pride and tolerance, is mediated by empathy.

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between hubristic pride and tolerance, is mediated by empathy.

Method

Participants and Design

The participants were recruited through Prolific. The sample consisted of non-religious adults from the UK. Participants received £1.20. We used a Monte Carlo power analysis for indirect effects to estimate the minimum number of participants necessary to test hypotheses 5 and 6 based on a power of .80%. For the power, we set a small to medium correlation of .23 between pride and tolerance, and .23 between pride and empathy. The correlation we set (r =.397) for empathy and tolerance was based on previous findings by Byun (2023). This resulted in an estimate of at least 148 participants for a simple mediation with one predictor. Given that we tested our model with two predictors we aimed to recruit at least 220 participants. To account for possible exclusions and drop-outs we aimed to sample at least 250 participants. However, more people participated which resulted in a final sample of 293 participants[1]. As per the pre-registration protocol (https://aspredicted.org/7R8_YR3) for this study, participants who met the following criteria were excluded from the research: participants who: answered less than 50% of the dependent measures (40 participants), completed the survey in less than 120 seconds (30 of the 40 already eliminated participants), showed flat responses (none), failed at least two out of three attention checks (none), and participants who omitted an answer to the open-ended question about the experience of pride or provided no description of pride (none). After the exclusion of these participants, our final sample consisted of 253 participants (143 females, 110 males), reaching sufficient power to test our hypotheses.

The age range of the participants varied from 21 to 74 (M =42.84, SD =13.40). The predominant age cohort within the participant pool was between 30 and 39 years, representing

27.7% of the sample. Subsequently, the 40-49 age group represented 23.3%, followed by the 20-29 (18.6%), 50-59 (15.8%), 60-69 (11.9%) and 70-80 (2.8%) age groups.

The main focus of the study was to examine the relationship between two types of pride (hubristic and authentic) and tolerance. Additionally, the role of empathy as a mediator was investigated. In this study, pride was included as an independent variable, tolerance as the dependent variable, and empathy as a mediating variable. On the basis of criteria, outlined by the EC-BSS at the University of Groningen, the study was exempt from full ethical review.

Procedure

Participants of this study were recruited through the online platform Prolific, which enables fast and high quality data collection, while offering ethical financial compensation to participants. First, after accessing the online Qualtrics survey, the participants were asked to give their informed consent to participate. After this, participants were asked to fill out demographic information: age and gender. Next, the participants had to answer an open-ended question about a time they experienced the feeling of pride. After this, they were asked to answer questions with Likert-scales regarding their reported experience during this proud moment. Next, we measured empathy and tolerance as the dependent measures. After this, participants were thanked and debriefed.

Measurements

Pride (hubristic/authentic)

The relived experience measure by means of an open question is an adaptation from the research done by Ashton-James and Tracy (2011). The function of this question was to investigate whether described state feelings of pride are also distinguishable into hubristic and authentic pride and how these described experiences relate to the tolerance and empathy

measures. To make sure the participants were not primed to either respond in a hubristic or authentic manner, the question included hubristic as well as authentic examples and was stated as follows: "Next, please recall a recent event in which you were successful, making you feel very proud. This experience of pride could be due to the effort you have invested prior to success, or due to how you are as a person (i.e., your natural talent or abilities), or perhaps a combination of both" (see Appendix A).

After answering the open-ended question, participants were asked to react to statements relating to their described experiences on a 7-point-Likert scale (1= absolutely disagree, 7= absolutely agree) to measure their feelings of pride. The items were based on a reduced version (Witkower et al, 2022) of the original hubristic and authentic pride scale items (Tracy & Robins, 2007). The Witkower scale consists of eight items, four authentic pride items and four hubristic pride items.

Authentic pride was assessed using the items: "I felt productive", "I felt like I am achieving", "I felt accomplished" and "I felt confident". The internal consistency for this scale was .773, which is acceptable. Hubristic pride was assessed using the items: "I felt smug", "I felt arrogant", "I felt stuck-up" and "I felt egotistical". The α for this scale was .791, which shows acceptable internal consistency.

We also added six newly formed hubristic pride items. This scale was added because the hubristic pride scale generally produced low response values and variability (Murphy & Dickens, 2023). Adding a new hubristic scale that includes less negatively worded items could possibly give more insight into this problem. The new hubristic pride was assessed using items such as "I felt like I was more important than others" and "I felt like I was the only person who mattered"[2]. Note that based on the factor analysis (see Table A) we deleted two items of this scale as they did

not load on the hubristic pride factor. The α for the newly added hubristic pride scale was .779, which is acceptable. The statements were randomly placed in the questionnaire matrix. Additionally, four items measuring humility (e.g. "I felt humble") were added to balance the questionnaire, but they are not relevant to our hypotheses. All items can be found in Appendix B.

In addition to the self- report measures, we also coded the experiences of pride that the participants described. The first two objective measures are based on the items for hubristic pride and authentic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007) which we called *coded authentic pride* and *coded hubristic pride.* Hereafter we computed the variable *new coded hubristic pride* based on the six items of the newly formed hubristic pride scale. Each story was rated by two researchers to be able to measure interrater reliability. Interrater reliability was calculated for each measure. If the interrater reliability was sufficient, ratings were weighed and averaged. The average for each measure was taken into analysis as a rating for the participant. Although *coded authentic pride* and *coded new hubristic pride* had a sufficient interrater reliability (κ =.678; κ =.853), *coded hubristic pride* did not. Rarely any participant described a pride-experience with adjectives used in the *hubristic pride scale*. Therefore, there was low variance in the coded values regarding the *hubristic pride scale.* As a result, *coded hubristic pride* was excluded from the analyses.

Regarding the coding of the *authentic pride scale,* the descriptions of the participants were rated based on the adjectives used for every item of the abbreviated *authentic pride scale* (Witkower et al., 2022). We rated whether descriptions of feeling 'productive', 'achieved', 'accomplished', and 'confident' were recognisable in the story of the participant. Regarding the coding of the *hubristic pride scale*, we sought for similarities between how participants described their success and the items of the *hubristic pride scale* that described feeling 'smug', 'egotistical', 'arrogant' and 'stuck-up'. Lastly, for the *new hubristic pride scale* we checked for

the participants' description of feeling 'more important than others', 'like the only person who mattered', 'content with myself' and 'like the center of attention'.

Additionally, we added four measures based on the description of self attributions of pride by Tracy and Robins (2007). These scales are based on the statement that all forms of pride are associated with internal attributions, which could be explained by the notion of Tracy and Robins (2004; 2007) that pride is a self-centered emotion. According to their research, authentic pride is more likely to be the result of internal, unstable, specific and controllable causes, like effort. On the other hand, hubristic pride is more likely to be the result of internal, stable, global and uncontrollable causes, like ability (Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007).

The final four measures included: Effort (1= very low degree of described effort, 5= very high degree of described effort), Ability (1= very low degree of described ability, 5= very high degree of described ability), and Uncontrollable vs Controllable (1= very low degree of control over one's own success, 5= very high degree of control over one's own success). The fourth measure involved the attribution of success: 1= high degree of attribution to the self, 5= very high degree of attribution to something else. Interrater reliability (κ) for the coded variable "Effort" was .820, which shows a good internal consistency. The κ for the coded variable "Ability" was .777, and the κ for the coded variable "Internal versus external attribution" was .704. These alfas show an acceptable internal consistency. The κ for the coded variable "Uncontrollable versus controllable" was .646, which shows a moderate internal consistency.

Empathy and tolerance

We first assessed the attitudes of the participants by asking for their opinions on statements regarding various social issues. This was done to explore whether our stories were counterattitudinal for our participant pool. The statements presented were: "I am in favor of the

death penalty" (*M* =2.30, *SD* =1.34), "People should be allowed to refuse life-saving medical treatments of people under their care (e.g., their children) based on religious or personal beliefs" (*M* =2.11, *SD* =1.31) and "A woman's primary role is to care for her family and home" (*M* =1.56, *SD* =.84). These low averages indicate that the stories were counter-attitudinal. Hereafter, to measure empathy and tolerance, participants were shown three stories. These stories were deliberately made to be counter-attitudinal, containing norms and values that do not align with the general attitudes of the participants. This way it can be tested whether, despite these differences, participants can still empathize with and tolerate the characters in the stories. Each of the stories (Byun, 2023) described a unique situation: a man supporting the death penalty toward the murderer of his daughter, a man refusing medical treatment for his daughter based on religious beliefs and a woman believing the primary role of women is to take care of her family by being a housewife.

The items measuring *tolerance* (*M* =4.96, *SD* =.85, *α* = 0.772) were: "I respect *name of the character*'s beliefs and opinions.", "I like to spend time with *name of the character*, even if *name of the character* thinks differently about important issues than me." And "*name of character* should have the right to live and think how he/she wishes.". The items measuring *empathy* (*M* =4.65, *SD* =.78, *α* = 0.719) were: "I can easily place myself in the shoes of *name of the character*", "I could not care less for *name of the character*", "I find it difficult in this case to take the perspective of *name of the character*", and "I empathize with *name of the character*.". The participants rated these statements on a 7-point-Likert scale (1= absolutely disagree, 7= absolutely agree).

Results

Preliminary analyses

To test whether there are distinct dimensions underlying the tendency to experience pride, we conducted a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation on participants' ratings of the self-reported feelings. Four factors have an eigenvalue above one. These factors accounted for 62,8% of variance. Table A (see Appendix B) presents the output found in the first factor analysis done with all the original items. In the rotated component matrix shown in Table A (see Appendix B) both old and new hubristic pride items are represented by component one, except for "content with myself", which loaded on the second component and "little effort was needed because I was simply up for the task", which loaded on the fourth component (no other items loaded on this component). These two items were therefore excluded from the *new hubristic scale*. The third component represented three items measuring humility. For this study we focused on hubristic pride and authentic pride and not on humility, therefore we did not further include these three items in our analysis. We conducted a factor analysis with the remaining items (see Table 1).

Table 1.

Rotated component matrix of the pride items (adjusted set of items)

	Hubristic pride	Authentic pride
Egotistical	**.818**	.052
More important than others	***.812***	-.010
Superior	***.793***	.143
Stuck-up	**.763**	-.084

Arrogant	**.763**	-.120
Smug	**.666**	.134
Only person who mattered	**.663**	.120
Centre of attention	**.558**	.275
Accomplished	.073	**.838**
Like I am achieving	.094	**.826**
Productive	.064	**.751**
Confident	.102	**.645**

Note. Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation. Scores in italic refer to the newHubristic items.

The rotated component matrix as shown in Table 1 represents the distinction between hubristic pride and authentic pride, just as in the research done by Tracy and Robins (2007). The new hubristic items that we added loaded on the same component as the old hubristic items and therefore seem to measure the same concept (i.e., hubristic pride). To examine its unique role we differentiated between two hubristic pride scales (*hubristic pride* (HP) and *new hubristic pride* (HPnew)). Means for both scales were calculated (HP: $M =2.22$, $SD =1.07$; HPnew: $M =2.60$, $SD =1.28$). Hereafter a t-test analysis was performed to see whether this difference was significant. The difference in mean was significant ($t(252) =6.762$, $p <.001$).

Next, we examined correlations between all self-reported and all coded variables (see Table 2).

Table 2. *Correlations between self-reported and coded variables*

	AP	HP	HPnew	cAP	cHPnew	empathy	tolerance
AP	1	.098	.200**	.043	.054	.019	.147*
HP	.098	1	.713**	.019	.257**	-.102	-.104
HPnew	.200**	.713**	1	.043	.257**	-.018	-.045
cAP	.043	.019	.043	1	-.301**	.009	.090
cHPnew	.054	.257**	.257**	-.301**	1	.124	.097
empathy	.019	-.102	-.018	.009	.124	1	.483**
tolerance	.147*	-.104	-.045	.090	.097	.483**	1
cAbility	.136*	.215**	.279**	-.009	.334**	-.062	.006
cIntern	.087	-.107	-.106	-.144*	-.264**	-.031	.004
cEffort	.120	-.062	-.001	.598**	-.397**	-.055	-.129*
cControl	.096	.103	0.86	.382**	-.043	-.135*	-.129*

Note. cHP was excluded from this table since the scale showed no variance.
AP represents the authentic pride scale, HP the hubristic pride scale and HPnew the new hubristic pride scale. Additionally, the letter 'c' stands for the coded measures.
Note. 'positive versus negative emotions described' and 'negative versus no negative starting point' were excluded from this table since we will not be discussing this in the results.
**. $p < .001$
*. $p < .05$

Firstly looking at the self-reported variables, the results show significant small positive correlations between authentic pride ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 0.81$) and both new hubristic pride ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.28$) and tolerance ($M = 4.96$, $SD = 0.85$). The results also show that authentic pride is not significantly correlated to empathy ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 0.78$). Additionally, we found a large significant positive correlation between new hubristic pride and hubristic pride ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 1.07$). Furthermore, hubristic pride showed a trend for a negative relation with empathy. The new hubristic pride scale did not correlate with empathy. The results also show that hubristic pride

was not significantly correlated to tolerance, but there was a negative trend in the relation between hubristic pride and tolerance. Furthermore, new hubristic pride was not significantly correlated to tolerance. Moreover, the results show a moderate positive significant correlation between empathy and tolerance. Taken together, authentic pride is positively correlated with new hubristic pride and tolerance. Hubristic pride and new hubristic pride also show a large significant correlation. Hubristic and new hubristic pride show no significant correlations with empathy and tolerance, but they do show a negative trend.

Secondly, looking at the coded variables, the results show a small to moderate significant negative correlation between coded authentic pride ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.67$) and coded new hubristic pride ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 0.88$). Coded authentic pride was not significantly correlated to both tolerance and empathy. Additionally, we found a small significant positive correlation between coded new hubristic pride and hubristic pride. Furthermore, coded new hubristic pride did not significantly correlate to empathy as well as tolerance. In summary, both coded authentic pride and coded new hubristic pride showed no significant correlation with empathy and tolerance. In addition, coded authentic pride showed a significant negative correlation with coded new hubristic pride. There was also a small but statistically significant positive correlation between coded new hubristic pride and hubristic pride.

When comparing the self-reported variables with the coded variables, the results show a small to moderate significant correlation between new hubristic pride and coded new hubristic pride. No significant correlation was found between authentic pride and coded authentic pride. Coded hubristic pride ($M = 1.02$, $SD = 0.11$) was excluded from the correlation table since this variable showed almost no response values and variability, thus it was not able to measure hubristic pride.

Lastly, we wanted to test whether the characteristics ascribed to hubristic pride (high ability, high internal attributions, lesser degree of control) and authentic pride (high effort, high internal attributions, greater degree of control) correlated with the pride constructs we attempted to measure. The results show a significant positive correlation for the relationship between the three types of self reported pride and coded ability ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.96$), but not with coded internal ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 0.79$), coded effort ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.92$) or coded control ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.76$). Additionally, authentic pride correlated positively with coded effort, however this was only a trend. New hubristic pride and hubristic pride did not positively correlate with effort. To summarize, authentic pride showed a trend towards higher levels of effort and all types of pride were found to be associated with higher levels of ability.

Testing the hypotheses

We conducted a linear regression analysis to examine whether both forms of pride are predictors for both empathy and tolerance. If a form of pride was a significant predictor of both empathy and tolerance, a mediation analysis was performed to see whether empathy was a mediator for the relationship between this form of pride and tolerance. We tested this first for the self reported scales and second for the coded scales of the variables.

Self reported variables

The first regression analysis revealed that the model explained low variance ($R^2 = .011$), when both authentic pride and hubristic pride were added as predictors of empathy. The analysis showed that authentic pride did not predict more empathy ($\beta = .029$, $p = .64$; 95% *CI* [-.950, .153]). This is not in line with the first hypothesis. However, hubristic pride negatively predicted empathy ($\beta = -.105$, $p = .098$; 95% *CI* [-.169, .015]), which is in line with the second hypothesis, although this was only a trend. (See Appendix C).

Furthermore, when both authentic pride and new hubristic pride were added as predictors of empathy, the model did not explain much variance ($R^2 = .001$), and authentic pride did not significantly predict empathy ($\beta = 0.24$, $p = .714$; 95% CI [-.103, .149]) , which is not consistent with our first hypothesis. In addition, new hubristic pride did not predict less empathy ($\beta = -.023$, $p = .722$; 95% CI [-.094, .066]) when both authentic pride and new hubristic pride were added as predictors of empathy. This finding is not in line with our second hypothesis. (See Appendix C).

Regarding tolerance, the model explained low variance ($R^2 = .036$) when authentic pride and hubristic pride were added as predictors. Authentic pride significantly predicted more tolerance ($\beta = .159$, $p = .011$; 95% CI [-.036, .300]), which is in line with the third hypothesis. Furthermore, in line with the fourth hypothesis, hubristic pride predicted less tolerance ($\beta = -.119$, $p = .057$; 95% CI [.195, .005]). However, this was only a trend. (See Appendix C).

When new hubristic pride was added with authentic pride as predictors of tolerance, the model explained low variance ($R^2 = .028$). Authentic pride predicted more tolerance ($\beta = .163$, $p = .011$; 95% CI [.038, .306]), which is in line with the third hypothesis. However, new hubristic pride did not predict less tolerance ($\beta = -.078$, $p = .211$; 95% CI [-.136, .032]), which is not in line with the third hypothesis. (See appendix C)

With no form of pride being significant to both empathy and tolerance, performing a mediation analysis was not possible. This is therefore evidence against our fifth and sixth hypothesis.

In summary, self-reported authentic pride significantly predicted tolerance, but not empathy. Hubristic pride also did not predict empathy, but did show a negative relationship with tolerance, although this relation was not significant. New hubristic pride did not predict both

empathy and tolerance. There were no mediation effects of empathy for the relationship between all forms of self-reported pride and tolerance.

Coded variables

As we objectively coded the variables in terms of authentic pride, hubristic pride and new hubristic pride, we looked at their impact on empathy and tolerance. As previously noted, no variation was observed when coding hubristic pride.

When both coded authentic pride and coded new hubristic pride were added in a regression analysis as predictors of empathy, the model explained some variance ($R^2 = .127$). Moreover, coded authentic pride predicted less empathy ($\beta = -.031$, $p = .633$; 95% *CI* [-.191, .117]). This is not in line with our first hypothesis. However, this relationship was not significant. On the other hand, in line with our second hypothesis, new hubristic pride significantly predicted less empathy ($\beta = -.133$, $p = .044$; 95% *CI* [-.237, -.001]). (See Appendix C).

Regarding tolerance, when considering both coded authentic pride and coded new hubristic pride as predictors, regression analysis explained variance ($R^2 = .159$). Coded authentic pride significantly predicted less tolerance ($\beta = -.131$, $p = .046$; 95% *CI* [-.332, .0]), which is not in line with the third hypothesis. Furthermore, in line with our fourth hypothesis, coded new hubristic pride significantly predicted less tolerance ($\beta = -.137$, $p = .038$; 95% *CI* [-.261, -.005]). (See Appendix C).

With coded New Hubristic Pride being a significant predictor for tolerance ($\beta = -.137$, $p = .038$) as well as empathy ($\beta = -.133$, $p = .044$), we could perform a mediation analysis to test hypothesis 6. To do this we used model 4 of the PROCESS macro in SPSS by Andrew Hayes (Version 4.2, 2022), which allows us to perform a mediation analysis. In the model, coded authentic pride was included as a covariate. The model explained a significant amount of

variance ($R^2 =.497$). In line with hypothesis 6 there was an indirect effect (IE) of -.0632 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -.1200 to -.0015, indicating that coded new hubristic pride predicted more tolerance through increased empathy. (See Appendix C).   With respect to the coded results, coded new hubristic pride significantly predicts less tolerance, as well as less empathy. Interestingly, coded authentic pride also negatively predicted tolerance. Only in the relationship between new hubristic pride and tolerance, a mediation effect of empathy was found.

To summarize, we found support for a positive relationship between tolerance and authentic pride, but only with respect to self reported authentic pride. However, regarding the coded measures only negative relationships between different forms of pride (authentic/new hubristic) and tolerance and empathy were observed. Only for the relationship between coded new hubristic pride and tolerance, empathy showed a mediation effect.

Discussion

This study aimed to research whether various forms of pride (more specifically, authentic pride and hubristic pride) predict tolerance and whether empathy mediates the relationship between pride and tolerance. In our study we formed six hypotheses. We will first discuss the findings for the three hypotheses that concern authentic pride, followed by the three hypotheses that concern hubristic pride.

Findings for the hypotheses

Authentic pride

Looking at the hypotheses for authentic pride, we first hypothesized that (H1) Individuals who experience more authentic pride feel more empathy towards those who do not share their views. This hypothesis was not supported because of the weak relationship between felt authentic pride and increased empathy. When we examined participants who expressed more authentic pride, we found a small negative relation with empathy, contrary to the hypothesis.

Secondly, we hypothesized that (H3) Individuals who experience more authentic pride are more tolerant towards those who do not share their views. Our results show that people who say to feel more authentic pride when they talk about their success, show more tolerance towards others, confirming our second hypothesis for felt authentic pride. Additionally, we found a predictive relationship between expressed authentic pride and decreased tolerance, contrary to the hypothesis.

Thirdly, we hypothesized that (H5) The relationship between authentic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. This hypothesis could not be tested for authentic pride since

the first hypothesis could not be confirmed for both felt authentic pride and observed authentic pride.

Hubristic pride

Looking at the hypotheses for hubristic pride, we first hypothesized that (H2) Individuals who experience more hubristic pride feel less empathy towards those who do not share their views. When looking at our results, we found that when people say they feel more hubristic pride talking about their success, they also feel less empathy, even though this relation was small. However, when they say they feel more new hubristic pride, this relation with empathy was not found. Overall, both felt hubristic pride and felt new hubristic pride did not have a strong enough relationship with empathy to confirm our first hypothesis for felt hubristic pride. Furthermore, we found that when we observed participants to describe new hubristic pride talking about a moment in which they felt proud, they also felt less empathy, confirming our hypothesis for observed new hubristic pride.

Secondly, we hypothesized that (H4) Individuals who experience more hubristic pride are less tolerant towards those who do not share their views. Our results show that people who say to feel more hubristic pride when they talk about their success, also show less tolerance towards others, even though this relationship was small. Even so, we did not find an association between felt new hubristic pride and tolerance. In summary, both felt hubristic pride and felt new hubristic pride did not have a strong enough relationship with tolerance to confirm our second hypothesis for the self-report measurements of hubristic pride. When we observed new hubristic pride in our participants, they also showed to be less tolerant towards others, again confirming this hypothesis for observed new hubristic pride.

Thirdly, we hypothesized that (H6) The relationship between hubristic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. This hypothesis could not be tested for felt hubristic pride, nor for felt new hubristic pride, since the first and second hypothesis were not confirmed. For observed new hubristic pride, however, a mediation analysis could be conducted. This mediation analysis showed that the relationship between observed new hubristic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. Specifically, individuals who express more new hubristic pride are less likely to empathize with those who hold different views, resulting in lower tolerance.

Theoretical and practical implications

This study is a contribution to the existing body of research on the relationship between different forms of pride, empathy and tolerance (Tracy & Robins, 2007; Neff, 2003). The exploration of these psychological constructs has important implications for the understanding of the dynamics that shape the attitudes and behaviors of individuals towards those with whom they disagree. While previous research (Byun, 2023) has suggested a positive association between humility and tolerance, mediated by empathy, our study introduces the concept of pride as a potential counterforce. Distinguishing between hubristic and authentic pride, as proposed by Tracy and Robins (2007), reveals a multifaceted nature of pride. Our study yielded mixed results, some consistent with existing research and with what we hypothesized, and some not so consistent. The study's partial departure from the mainstream literature prompts a re-evaluation of existing models. This nuanced understanding highlights the importance of taking into account the different manifestations of pride and their different relationships with empathy and, as a consequence, with tolerance.

Authentic pride. First, Individuals who felt more authentic pride showed a greater tendency to be tolerant. This is in line with the findings of previous research (Tracy & Robins, 2007; Neff, 2003). It is consistent with the understanding that a secure sense of self-worth, coupled with authentic pride, promotes empathy and altruistic behavior, and fosters acceptance of and respect for diverse opinions. By highlighting the role of authentic pride in promoting a more tolerant society, the theoretical implications extend the existing literature. However, contrary to previous research (Tracy & Robins, 2007; Neff, 2003), the results of the observed pride showed the opposite, suggesting a negative association between observed authentic pride and tolerance. Apparently, there seems to be a difference in what people say to feel and what people express when they think of their own success. Furthermore, we found no evidence that authentic pride predicts greater empathy. Overall, when looking at authentic pride, it is difficult to draw any theoretical implications from this research. The results of our study were not able to confirm our hypotheses for the relationships between authentic pride and both empathy and tolerance. Moreover, the results of felt authentic pride measures showed opposite relationships with empathy and tolerance compared to observed authentic pride. Therefore, our study rather raises the question of why our results for the felt pride measures and the observed pride measures are inconsistent. It seems that feeling pride is something else than expressing pride.

Hubristic pride. Second, people who felt more hubristic pride showed to feel less empathy and tolerance towards others, in line with previous research (Tracy & Robins, 2007a; Tracy & Robins, 2007b). However, this relation was small, so our study can not say anything about the relationship between hubristic pride and empathy and tolerance. Felt new hubristic pride, on the other hand, was not as much associated with less empathy and tolerance, which raises the question if the trend that was found for felt hubristic pride is caused by the more

negatively worded questions of the hubristic pride scale. Furthermore, our results provide actual evidence of a negative association between observed new hubristic pride and both empathy and tolerance. This is consistent with our hypotheses and, more importantly, allowed us to conduct a mediation analysis that introduced empathy as a mediator in the relationship between observed new hubristic pride and tolerance (Batson et al., 2002; Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). These findings suggest that observed new hubristic pride reduces individuals' ability to accept diverse perspectives. It also highlights the importance of empathy as a mechanism through which observed new hubristic pride influences tolerance, and provides theoretical insights into the interplay of these psychological factors. Hubristic pride, however, was not expressed by our participants, suggesting that when asked to describe an event in which they felt proud of themselves, people are more likely to describe themselves in a more positive way. This raises the question of whether the distinction between authentic pride and hubristic pride is a valid one to make, and if so, what is the best way to measure hubristic pride? The theoretical implication of our study when it comes to hubristic pride is therefore to add even more question marks around the definition and measurement of hubristic pride. This has already been a topic of discussion in several previous studies (Dickens & Murphy, 2023; Murphy & Dickens, 2023; Holbrook, 2014), and when reflecting on this study, it is still an important topic to explore further. The results of our study did show that our new hubristic pride items measured more felt pride. There is a possibility that the original hubristic pride scale was too negatively worded and therefore our more positively worded new hubristic pride scale contributed to the search for a better way to measure hubristic pride.

Strengths and limitations of current findings and future research

Our study has several strengths. By researching the relationship between different forms of pride with empathy and tolerance, this study contributed to the research field aimed at investigating factors that might influence tolerance, which is important research when aiming to foster a world in which we respect and accept each other. Additionally, our study contributed to research concerning the measurement of pride. Previous studies have criticized the measurement of pride proposed by Tracy and Robins (2007) (Dickens & Murphy, 2023; Murphy & Dickens, 2023; Holbrook, 2014), but no research yet has come up with an alternative measurement. Our research provided the new hubristic pride scale as an addition to the pride scales by Tracy and Robins (2007) to assess these measurement challenges. Moreover, this study made use of both self-report and coded measures of pride. This dual approach allowed for a broader analysis of the phenomena under investigation, providing a comprehensive and expanded view of the relationship between pride, empathy and tolerance.

Despite these strengths, there are limitations that need to be acknowledged. These limitations can lay the foundation for future research to explore the relationships between pride, empathy and tolerance in greater depth. First, the challenges in measuring hubristic pride, as evidenced by the discrepancies between felt pride and observed pride, highlight the need for further refinement in conceptualizing and measuring this construct. Future research could explore alternative methods or scales that more accurately capture the nuanced aspects of hubristic pride. The development of more reliable and valid assessments could be guided by investigating whether individuals tend to portray themselves more positively in self-report measures.

Second, this study was not an experiment. It was only correlational. To establish causality and temporal relationships, future research could use experimental study designs. This would provide a more dynamic understanding of how these constructs influence each other, allowing researchers to track changes in pride, empathy and tolerance over time. Longitudinal studies could also explore potential developmental trajectories and identify critical periods for interventions aimed at promoting authentic pride and mitigating hubristic pride.

In addition, the generalisability of our findings may be limited due to the cultural bias inherent in our sample, which consisted primarily of British participants. Future studies could address these limitations through the inclusion of more diverse samples and the use of measures to reduce social desirability effects and to increase the generalizability of findings. The investigation of the influence of cultural nuances on the relationship between pride, empathy and tolerance could provide valuable insights into the universality or contextuality of these dynamics.

Lastly, future research could investigate additional mediating factors that contribute to the relationship between pride and tolerance, as the results of our study only found a mediating relation of empathy between coded new hubris pride and tolerance. It is very important to investigate factors that may have a crucial role in the formation of individuals' attitudes towards people with different opinions. Our understanding of the complex interplay between psychological constructs may be enhanced by exploring these mediating mechanisms.

Conclusion

In order to promote more harmony in societies, this study aimed to explore what makes people tolerant. In summary, the present study has examined the dynamics between hubristic pride and authentic pride, empathy and tolerance.

Felt hubristic pride showed small negative relationships with empathy and tolerance, in line with our expectations, whereas felt new hubristic pride did not. Observed new hubristic pride showed a more robust negative relationship with tolerance, mediated by empathy. Authentic pride, when felt, appeared to foster tolerance, aligning with previous research. However, when expressed, it exhibited a negative association with tolerance. These contrasting results between felt and observed pride raise questions about the discrepancy in individuals' self-perceptions and their outward expressions of pride.

The introduction of a new hubristic pride scale suggested its potential as a more accurate measure. Our findings challenge established ideas about the role of pride and they emphasize the need to consider different manifestations.

Finally, by suggesting the need for refined measures of hubristic pride, experimental designs, and investigation of additional mediating factors, our research lays the groundwork for future exploration. The broadening of the cultural scope of research is crucial for a more universal understanding of the dynamics of pride. With acknowledged strengths and limitations, this study provides valuable insights for evidence-based interventions and strategies aimed at the promotion of a more inclusive and tolerant society.

References

Adelman. L., Verkuyten. M., & Yogeeswaran. K. (2022). Distinguishing Active and Passive Outgroup Tolerance: Understanding Its Prevalence and the Role of Moral Concern, PoliticalPsychology. 43, 4. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12790

Ashton-James, C. E., & Tracy, J. L. (2012). Pride and prejudice: How feelings about the self influence judgments of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(4), 466–476. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1177/0146167211429449

Batson, C. D., Ahmad, N., Lishner, D. A., & Tsang, J.-A. (2002). Empathy and altruism. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), Handbook of positive psychology (pp. 485–498). Oxford University Press.

Batson, C. and Powell, A. (2003) Altruism and Prosocial Behavior. In: Millon, T. and Lerner, M., Eds., Handbook of psychology Volumen 5 Personality and Social Psychology. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken. https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei0519

Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, *2*(2), 107–122. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0202_1

Butrus. N. & Witenberg. R. T., (2013) Some Personality Predictors of Tolerance to Human Diversity: The Roles of Openness, Agreeableness, and Empathy, Psychologist, 48:4, 290-298, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9544.2012.00081.x

Byun, J. (2023). The Relation Between Humility and Tolerance and The Mediating Role of Empathy. Masterthesis. University of Groningen.

Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the

    empathy–altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, 73(3), 481–494.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.481

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of Self-Esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*,

    130(3), 392–414. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.3.392

Davis, M. H. (1983). The effects of dispositional empathy on emotional reactions and helping: A

    multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality, 51, 167–184.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00860.x

Dickens, L., & Murphy, B. A. (2023). The authentic and hubristic pride scales do not validly

    assess the two-facet model of pride: time to rewind and reboot with new measures.

    Emotion, *23*(3), 886–893. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001142

Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, Stereotyping and

    Discrimination: Theoretical and Empirical Overview. In *SAGE Publications Ltd eBooks*

    (pp. 3–28). https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200919.n1

Dusche, M. (2002). Liberal tolerance between people(s). Paper presented at the International,

    Intercultural and Interdisciplinary Conference on "Tolerance in the Context of

    Interculturality and Globalisation," Department of German and Russian, University of

    Mumbai, India.

Feshbach, N. D. (1978). Studies of empathic behavior in children. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress

    in experimental personality research (Vol. 8, pp. 1–47). New York: Academic Press.

Garber, J., Robinson, N. S., & Valentiner, D. P. (1997). The relation between parenting and adolescent depression. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *12*(1), 12–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743554897121003

Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), Handbook of personality psychology (pp. 795–824). San Diego, CA: Academic Press

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). Empathy and moral development: implications for caring and justice. New York: Cambridge University Press

Holbrook, C., Piazza, J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2014). Further challenges to the "authentic"/"hubristic" model of pride: conceptual clarifications and new evidence. *Emotion*, *14*(1), 38–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035457

Holmgren, R., Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). The relations of children's situational empathy-related emotions to dispositional prosocial behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *22*(1), 169–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/016502598384568

Joireman, J., Parrott, L., & Hammersla, J. F. (2002). Empathy and the Self-Absorption paradox: support for the distinction between Self-Rumination and Self-Reflection. *Self and Identity*, *1*(1), 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/152988602317232803

Kusano, K., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2022). The quest for (Eliciting) Hubristic Pride: nomological Shockwaves/Networks, attributions, and social desirability across different experimental manipulations. *Collabra*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.38634

Mondak, J. J., & Sanders, M. S. (2003). Tolerance and Intolerance, 1976–1998. *American Journal of Political Science*, *47*(3), 492–502. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5907.00035

Monroe, K. R., & Martinez-Martí, M. L. (2008). Empathy, prejudice, and fostering tolerance. *PS Political Science & Politics*, *41*(4), 857–863. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049096508081122

Murphy, B. A., Costello, T. H., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2018). Is empathic contagion helpful or harmful? Overlooked heterogeneity in the Empathy Index. *Psychological Assessment, 30*(12), 1703–1708. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000641

Murphy, B. A., & Dickens, L. (2023). Authentic/hubristic pride controversies as a window on broader emotion measurement issues: Reply to Tracy et al. (2023). *Emotion*, *23*(3), 899–902. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001197

Oveis, C., Horberg, E. J., & Keltner, D. (2010). Compassion, pride, and social intuitions of self-other similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*(4), 618–630. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017628

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(6), 922–934. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.504

Pre-registration protocol. (2023, November 14). AsPredicted. https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=7R8_YR3\

Tangney, J. P., Burggraf, S. A., & Wagner, P. E. (1995). Shame-proneness, guilt-proneness, and psychological symptoms. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 343–367). Guilford Press.

Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., Robins, R. W., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2009). Authentic and hubristic pride: the affective core of self-esteem and narcissism. *Self and Identity*, *8*(2–3), 196–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860802505053

Tracy, J. L., Mercadante, E., & Hohm, I. (2023). Pride: the emotional foundation of social rank attainment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *74*(1), 519–545. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-032720-040321

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(3), 506–525. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.506

United Nations Educational, Scientifc and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1995). A global quest for tolerance—1995 United Nations year for tolerance. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/fght-againstdiscrimination/promoting-tolerance/1995-united-nations-year-for-tolerance/.

Vogt, W. P. (1997). Tolerance & education: learning to live with diversity and difference. *Choice Reviews Online*, *35*(04), 35–2257. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.35-2257

Witkower, Z., Mercadante, E., & Tracy, J. L. (2022). The chicken and egg of pride and social rank. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 13*(2), 382–389. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211023619

Worthington, J. E. L. (1998). An empathy‑humility‑commitment model of forgiveness applied within family dyads. *Journal of Family Therapy*, *20*(1), 59–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.00068

Footnotes

[1] We used the platform Prolific to pay participants for participating in our study. Participants were paid if they completed the survey successfully, if they did not finish all of the questions they would not get paid. We intended to recruit 250 participants, so we set out to pay 250 people for participating in our study. Given that people could choose not to get paid, and that Prolific also counted participants who did not complete the survey as participants, we ended up with more participants than intended in our pre-registration.

[2] The complete version of the new hubristic pride scale included the items: "I felt like I was more important than others", "I felt like I was the only person who mattered", "I felt like little effort was needed, because I was simply up for the task", "I felt like I was the center of attention", "I felt superior and I felt content with myself".

Appendix A

Open Question: Pride induction

Next, please recall a recent event in which you were successful, making you feel very proud.

This experience of pride could be due to the effort you have invested prior to success, or due to

how you are as a person (i.e., your natural talent or abilities), or perhaps a combination of both.

- Describe in what context this success took place (e.g., work, school, sports, hobbies, etc.)

- Describe the situation ~ What happened?

- Describe what you felt/experienced during this successful event and especially how it felt

afterwards.

- Describe why you felt proud (e.g., I worked really hard, I am simply skilled).

- Describe why you saw this event as being a success.

Please describe this in the textbox below (about 200 words).

Next, we would like to know how the experience that you described made you feel. Please

indicate for each statement to what extent you agree (1=absolutely disagree; 7=absolutely agree).

How did the experience that you described make you feel? (1=absolutely disagree; 7=absolutely

agree).

Appendix B

Preliminary analyses of self reported feelings: Rotated component matrices

Table A.

Rotated component matrix of the pride items (all original items)

	1	2	3	4
Content with myself	-.043	*.747*	-.066	.048
Confident	.029	**.664**	-.112	.491
Arrogant	**.762**	-.137	-.064	.016
Modest	-.075	.082	**.703**	.125
More important than others	*.778*	.006	-.178	.135
Egotistical	**.794**	.049	-.135	.093
Superior	*.751*	.155	-.223	.178
Like I am achieving	.129	**.804**	.090	-.080
Smug	**.607**	.172	-.280	.143
Both strengths and weaknesses	-.153	.020	**.567**	.027

Only person who mattered	***.668***	.083	.008	.119
Center of attention	***.635***	.235	.174	-.220
Productive	.011	**.676**	.255	-.177
Stuck-up	**.789**	-.102	.036	-.041
Humble	-.039	.102	**.826**	-.064
Accomplished	.106	**.811**	.086	-.038
Little effort was needed because I was simply up for the task	.279	-.142	.180	***.813***

Note. Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation. Component 1 represents items indicating hubristic and new hubristic pride. Component 2 mostly includes items reflecting authentic pride (except for content with myself) , Component 3 represents items indicating humility and Component 4 includes only 1 item (one that originally was intended to measure new hubristic pride). Scores in italic refer to the newHubristic items.

Appendix C

Self -reported variables

Table B.

Regression Analysis between empathy (dependent variable) and hubristic and authentic pride (predictors)

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	.011					
(constant)		4.650	.377	[3.896,5.404]		<.001
AP		.029	.062	[-0.95,.153]	.029	.642
HP		-.077	.046	[-.169,.015]	-.105	.098

*Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05*

a. Dependent Variable: empathy
b. Predictors: (Constant), HP, AP

Table C.

Regression Analysis between empathy (dependent variable) and authentic and new hubristic pride (predictors)

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	.001					
(constant)		4.549	.374	[3.801,5.297]		<.001
AP		.023	.063	[-0.103,.149]	.024	.714
HPnew		-.014	.040	[-.094,.066]	-.023	.722

*Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05*

a. Dependent Variable: empathy
b. Predictors: (Constant), HPnew, AP

Table D.

Regression Analysis between tolerance (dependent variable) and hubristic and authentic pride (predictors)

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	.036					
(constant)		4.158	.404	[3.350,4.966]		<.001
AP		.168*	.066	[.036,.300]	.159	.011
HP		-.095	.050	[-.195,.005]	-.119	.057

Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05

a. Dependent Variable: tolerance
b. Predictors: (Constant), HP, AP

Table E.

Regression Analysis between tolerance (dependent variable) and new hubristic and authentic pride (predictors)

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	.028					
(constant)		4.058	.401	[3.256,4.860]		<.001
AP		.172*	.067	[.038,.306]	.163	.011
HPnew		-.052	.042	[-.136,.032]	-.078	.221

Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05

a. Dependent Variable: tolerance
b. Predictors: (Constant), HPnew, AP

Coded variables

Table F.
Regression Analysis between empathy (dependent variable) and coded new hubristic and coded authentic pride (predictors)

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p

		B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
.127						
(constant)		5.027	.364	[4.299,5.755]		<.001
cAP		-.037	.077	[-.191,.117]	-.031	.633
cHPnew		-.119*	.059	[-.237,-.001]	-.133	.044

*Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05*

a. Dependent Variable: empathy
b. Predictors: (Constant), cHPnew, cAP

Table G.

Regression Analysis between tolerance (dependent variable) and coded new hubristic and authentic pride (predictors)

	R²	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	.159					
(constant)		5.885	.394	[5.097,6.673]		<.001
cAP		-.166*	.083	[-.332,0]	-.131	.046
cHPnew		-.133*	.064	[-.261,-.005]	-.137	.038

*Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05*

a. Dependent Variable: tolerance
b. Predictors: (Constant), cHPnew, cAP

Table H.

Regression Analysis between tolerance (dependent variable) and coded new hubristic (with covariate coded authentic pride). Mediated by empathy

	R^2	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	.497***					
(constant)		3.290	.461	[2.383,4.198]		<.001
cHPnew		-.072	.057	[-.183,.40]	-.074	.206
Empathy		.516***	.060	[.397,.635]	.475	<.001
cAP		-.147	.073	[-.291,-.003]	-.116	.045

*Note. *** p < .001, ** < .01, *p <.05*

a. Dependent Variable: tolerance
b. Predictors: (Constant), cHPnew, Empathy; Covariant: cAp

Appendix D

Empathy and Tolerance Questionnaire

Next, please read the following stories about different people and answer some questions about the people described in these stories. (1=absolutely disagree; 7=absolutely agree).

Story 1: John

John is a 70-year-old man who has lived a long and fulfilling life. However, his world was shattered when he lost his only daughter, Mary, to a brutal murder. The pain and anguish he feels are beyond words, and he could not comprehend how someone could commit such an evil act. John has always been a firm believer in justice, and he cannot rest until the person responsible for his daughter's death was brought to justice. He supports the death penalty for the perpetrator, as he believes that the perpetrator deserved to pay the ultimate price for the horrible crime they had committed. For John, justice means closure, and he will not stop until he finds it.

	1: absolutely disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7: absolutely agree
I find it difficult in this case to take the perspective of John	O		O	O	O	O	O	O

	1: absolutely disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7: absolutely agree
I can easily place myself in the shoes of John	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I empathize with John	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I could not care less for John	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
John should have the right to live and think how he wishes	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I respect John's beliefs and opinions	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I like to spend time with John, even if he thinks differently about important issues than me	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Story 2: Jack

As a Jehovah's Witness, Jack, a 45-year-old man, refuses blood transfusions for himself and for his children. It is an important part of Jack's faith, as he believes it is a commandment from God. However, if his 4-year-old daughter needed a blood transfusion to survive, it would be an incredibly difficult decision for him. While Jack believes that blood transfusion goes against God's will, his love for his daughter and his desire to see her live would also be very strong. In such a situation, Jack would explore every alternative medical treatment that does not involve the use of blood, and Jack would pray for guidance and wisdom to make the best decision for his daughter's health and spiritual well-being. Ultimately, Jack would leave the decision in the hands of God, and trust that God would provide the strength and guidance that his family needs

	1: absolutely disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7: absolutely agree
I find it difficult in this case to take the perspective of Jack							

	1: absolutely disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7: absolutely agree
	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I can easily place myself in the shoes of Jack	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I empathize with Jack	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I could not care less for Jack	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Jackshould have the right to live and think how he wishes	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I respect Jack's beliefs and opinions	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I like to spend time with Jack, even if he thinks differently about important issues than me	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Story 3: May

May, a 35-year-old woman, believes that a woman's primary role is to care for her family and home and that by doing so, she is fulfilling a noble and important purpose. For May, being a housewife and caring for her husband and children (3-year-old Jane, and 6- year-old Sam) brings her great joy and fulfillment. May is happy she has the opportunity to create a warm and nurturing environment for her family and to ensure that their needs are met. May sees it as a way of honoring God's plan for women and contributing to the wellbeing of her family. For May, being a housewife is the best choice, and she is grateful she can fulfill this role.

	1: absolutely disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7: absolutely agree
I find it difficult in this case to take the perspective of May	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

I can easily place myself in the shoes of May	O		O	O	O	O	O	O
I empathize with May	O		O	O	O	O	O	O
I could not care less for May	O		O	O	O	O	O	O
May should have the right to live and think how he wishes	O		O	O	O	O	O	O
I respect May's beliefs and opinions	O		O	O	O	O	O	O
I like to spend time with May, even if he thinks differently about important issues than me	O		O	O	O	O	O	O