

**Experiencing and Expressing Different Pride States: the Relation with Empathy and
Tolerance**

Marrit Gemmink

S4368657

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

PSB3E-BT15: Bachelor Thesis

Supervisor: prof. dr. E.H. Gordijn

Second Evaluator: dr. L. de Jonge-Hoekstra

In collaboration with: Annick Bouma, Thomas Covers, Thom Oterdoom, Lieke Verbree and

Samantha Werkman

February 19, 2024

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

A thesis is an aptitude test for students. The approval of the thesis is proof that the student has sufficient research and reporting skills to graduate, but does not guarantee the quality of the research and the results of the research as such, and the thesis is therefore not necessarily suitable to be used as an academic source to refer to. If you would like to know more about the research discussed in this thesis and any publications based on it, to which you could refer, please contact the supervisor mentioned

Abstract

Pride is an emotion lacking clarity surrounding the question whether it has predominantly positive or negative effects. In research, it is commonly distinguished in two forms. Authentic pride, resulting from a focus on one's effort, is related to pro-social behaviour, whereas hubristic pride, resulting from a focus on one's talent, is related to anti-social behaviour. Given tolerance is linked to pro-social behaviour, the current research examines its relationship with pride. Additionally, the role of empathy is examined, since empathy is related to pride and can motivate tolerance. We hypothesized authentic pride to positively, and hubristic pride to negatively, predict tolerance and empathy. Furthermore, we expected the relationship between tolerance and authentic/hubristic pride to be mediated by empathy. We conducted a survey ($N= 253$), which included an open question and self-report questions. To account for critique on the usual assessment of pride we added a new, more positively phrased, hubristic pride scale and we used an objective coding system of a pride experience. Experienced pride showed responses in the expected direction regarding empathy and tolerance, but only the relationship between authentic pride and tolerance was significant. With respect to observed pride, new hubristic pride negatively predicted tolerance and this relation was mediated by empathy. Interestingly, authentic pride also negatively predicted tolerance. This adds to the belief that experiencing and observing pride might lead to different evaluations. To gain more insight on appropriate measurements and the multi-dimensional nature of pride, more research is needed.

Keywords: authentic pride, hubristic pride, tolerance, empathy

Experiencing and Expressing Different Pride States: the Relation with Tolerance and Empathy

In history, various religious thinkers deemed pride to be “the root of all evil”, “the deadliest of the seven deadly sins” or something that could lead a person into endless suffering (Tracy et al., 2023). On the contrary, some scholars, like the philosopher Nietzsche (2000), claimed it to be admirable when people were able to recognize their own worth and therefore to elicit pride. To this day, it is still not easy to answer the question on whether pride is a predominantly positive or negative concept. Quite likely there are two different types of pride, with different consequences for how people relate to each other. Indeed, the distinction of pride into two components was also found in psychological research by Tracy and Robins (2004). When they asked participants to list words relating to pride, two separate clusters of semantic meaning appeared: authentic and hubristic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Authentic pride was defined by positively connoting words such as “accomplished” and “confident” and conceptualized as something that is earned and associated with pro-social behaviour. On the other hand, hubristic pride was defined by negatively connoting words such as “arrogant” and “conceited” and conceptualized as something that is unearned and associated with narcissism.

These findings lay an interesting foundation for the research on the emergence of pro-social behaviours as a function of different types of pride. Behavior as a consequence of pride has been widely researched among different domains. Some examples of these previously researched behaviours are prejudice, emotion expression and the acceptance of unethical behaviour (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012; Septianto & Tjiptono, 2020; Mercadante et al., 2021). The current research emphasizes the role of tolerance, which is typically seen as a pro-social behaviour since it sustains social harmony and entails respect despite differences (Cuadrado et al., 2021). This is interesting taking into account that both hubristic and authentic pride experiences might relate differently to pro-social behavior (Tracy & Robins,

2007). Furthermore, empathy potentially plays an important role in the relation between pride and tolerance, because there are multiple studies that showed that empathy can motivate tolerance (Hoffman, 2001; Batson et al., 2002; Butrus & Witenberg, 2013).

Therefore, the aim of the current research is to examine whether different types of pride (hubristic/authentic), predict tolerance. Building on the previously mentioned research, the study also includes the potentially mediating role of empathy.

The Two Sides of Pride

Pride is an emotion with great relevance regarding social behaviour and group dynamics (Tracy et al., 2023). It also works as the motivator of success and the attainment of social status among humans. Additionally, pride expressions are recognized across individuals from divergent cultural backgrounds and therefore seems to be a universal human experience (Norenzayan & Heine, 2005). As mentioned before, Tracy and Robins (2004, 2007), are the founders of the widely used terms “authentic” and “hubristic” pride. Besides the fact that authentic pride was most commonly described by positively connoting words and hubristic pride by negatively connoting words, they also found differences in attributions (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Authentic pride is more likely to be the result of unstable, specific and controllable causes, like effort. An example of this could be “I passed the test because I studied every day”. Hubristic pride is more likely to be the result of stable, global and uncontrollable causes, like ability. An example of this could be “I passed the test, because I’m smart”. It was also found that authentic pride is positively related to all of the adaptive personality factors of the Big Five, except for Openness, while hubristic pride is negatively related to the two prosocial traits: conscientiousness and agreeableness (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Furthermore, Krettenauer and Casey (2015), found that authentic pride reflected an internal moral orientation, which means morality is experienced as a desire to be moral. On the other hand, hubristic pride reflected an external orientation that is more concerned with

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

seeming moral to others. The question is to what extent these different forms of pride are related to how open people are open to individuals with different views, or in other words, to what extent they are tolerant?

The Relevance and Drivers of Tolerance

Tolerance is defined by the UNESCO Declaration of Principles on Tolerance (1995) as “...respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world’s cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human”. In addition to this general definition, tolerance implies not interfering with the beliefs and practices of other people that are evaluated negatively and accepting ideas and lifestyles which are not compatible with ones own ideas and lifestyles (Cohen, 2004; Verkuyten & Killen, 2021). Moreover, tolerance is linked to pro-social behavior, equality, respect, and acceptance (Dusche, 2002). It is therefore imaginable that tolerance is a crucial factor for sustaining diverse societies and protecting individual rights and autonomy (Verkuyten & Killen, 2021). To truly understand and promote intercultural relations the study of tolerance is of great value (López-Rodríguez, 2014).

However, what makes people tolerant individuals? This is where empathy comes into play. Empathy is defined by a natural and exercised human ability to take in and understand another human being’s situation (Arman, 2023). Empirical results show that the most visible predictors of tolerance are traits like openness and agreeableness, but the overall best predictor seemed to be empathic concern (Butrus & Witenberg, 2013). The latter also mediated the relation between agreeableness and tolerance. Individuals who showcase a high level of empathetic concern exhibit more behaviours that play an important role in reducing prejudice and fostering tolerance (Batson et al., 2002). Empathy therefore plays a crucial role in creating tolerant attitudes (Monroe & Martinez-Marti, 2008). Additionally, Byun et al. (2023) found that humility predicted empathy and this in turn contributed to fostering greater tolerance. According to Byun et al. (2023) this could be explained by the fact that humble

people are more focused on what other people think and therefore take their perspective more easily. Since authentic pride is also associated with humility (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012), as opposed to hubristic pride, we expect that people experiencing authentic pride are more tolerant. On the other hand, we expect that people experiencing hubristic pride are less tolerant.

Pride as a Predictor of Empathy and Tolerance

The aim of this study is to investigate the relation between pride and tolerance, while also examining the role of empathy as a mediator. As stated before, research suggests empathy is important in fostering tolerance among individuals (Batson et al., 2002; Butrus & Witenberg, 2013; Monroe & Martinez-Marti, 2008). However, in the current study the unique contribution of the variable “pride” is added. Ashton-James and Tracy (2012) propose the idea that the overly self defensive attribute of hubristic pride might diminish one’s capacity to feel empathic concern. This might be explained by the fact that superiority and dominance, associated with hubristic pride, decrease feeling of similarity to weaker others (Oveis et al., 2010). On the other hand, authentic pride is linked to humility and self-worth and therefore enhances empathic concern and this in turn might reduce prejudice and discrimination (Batson et al., 1997; Neff, 2003).

The experimental research done by Ashton-James and Tracy (2012) confirmed hubristic pride decreases, and authentic pride increases, empathy for stigmatized others. This leads to increased prejudice in case of hubristic pride and reduced prejudice in the case of authentic pride. The question is what this means for tolerance. Researchers are divided on whether tolerance and prejudice are opposing or distinct constructs (Ng et al., 2021). Van Zalk and Kerr (2014) found that although both intolerance and prejudice significantly reduced from early to late adolescence, there was a significant difference in these developmental trajectories. Additionally, they found that a lower level of prejudice was not associated with a

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

lower level of intolerance. The distinction between prejudice and tolerance can also be found in the different definition. Prejudice is more about biased and negative evaluation of individuals belonging to a group “inferior” to your own, while tolerance is more about accepting and not interfering with people with different beliefs and lifestyles than your own (Fiske, 1998; Cohen, 2004; Verkuyten & Killen, 2021). So, while prejudice and tolerance are related, they do not seem to be the same construct, which is why the current research has additional value.

In the current research we aim to study to what extent the two different forms of pride predict empathy and tolerance. Since tolerance and prejudice seem to be related and authentic and hubristic pride are both impacting prejudice, through empathy, in opposing ways, we expect that people experiencing authentic pride are more empathetic and therefore more tolerant. On the other hand, we expect that people experiencing hubristic pride are less empathetic and therefore less tolerant.

Current Research

Taking into account the previously discussed research, the following hypotheses arise:

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.

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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

Investigating these relationships is valuable, because it may yield insights on whether pride promotes or reduces tolerance. Additionally, it might clarify the distinction between authentic and hubristic pride in fostering pro-social behavior, which in this case concerns tolerance. This study is innovative because pride is often researched at the trait level (e.g. Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). However, we examined the influence of experiencing state level pride, that is, pride as a response to a pride inducing experience. Furthermore, this study is valuable because it includes additional measurement methods to account for critiques on pride research. This topic will be further explored below.

Interestingly, previous research found that hubristic pride correlated with negative affect, which contradicts the general view of pride being experienced as a positive emotion (Holbrook et al., 2014). Therefore it is not surprising there are a lot of studies critically commenting on the measure of hubristic pride (Dickens & Murphy, 2023; Holbrook et al., 2014; Kusano & Kimmelmeier, 2022; Murphy & Dickens, 2023). Holbrook et al. (2014) proposed the idea that hubristic pride is actually not a measure of the emotion pride. They propose it rather tells if someone excessively expresses pride and whether people are self-aware enough about their own excessive pride to report it. Feeling like you take too much credit by experiencing excessive pride might in turn evoke negative feelings. There is also discussion surrounding the bottom-up approach used by Tracy et al. (2007), because it is based on folk understanding of pride rather than scientific psychological constructs (Murphy & Dickens, 2023). Additionally, the HP scale typically gains little response and variance, with a modal score of 1; most people are very reluctant to use the negatively connoting terms, such as feeling arrogant and stuck up, to describe themselves. Given this, Murphy and Dickens (2023) see another problem arise, as it makes it difficult to distinguish whether it is a measure

of self-reflection skills, low self-esteem or what one is actually trying to measure: pride. However, Tracy et al. (2023) state that these commentaries are most often made without scientifically tested suggestions to improve the hubristic scale. Therefore the current study aimed to address the criticism.

Taking the critiques of Dickens and Murphy (2023) into account, we added less negatively worded items to the hubristic scale. In addition, we used a more top-down approach when assessing pride by objectively coding the pride experience that participants described in terms of authentic and hubristic pride. We explored whether our new hubristic pride scale resulted in higher response values and variation than the original hubristic pride scale. Furthermore, we wanted to examine whether our new hubristic pride scale predicted tolerance and empathy in the same way as we expected the original hubristic pride scale to function. Additionally, we wanted to explore if objectively coded pride would show the expected relationships with empathy and tolerance, by testing the same hypotheses we also tested regarding the self-report answers.

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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

at least 250 participants. However, more people participated which resulted in a final sample of 293 participants¹. 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 (2012). 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 coded new 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 ($\kappa = .678$; $\kappa = .853$), 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 looked at 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-centred 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).

This way, 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 RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 alphas 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 counter-attitudinal 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 if, 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* ($M = 4.96, SD = .85, \alpha = 0.772$) 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* ($M = 4.65$, $SD = .78$, $\alpha = 0.719$) 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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
Center 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 new Hubristic 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 means was significant ($t(252) = 6.762$, $p < .001$).

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 the way they affected 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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

The aim of this research was to examine whether different types of pride, hubristic and authentic, predict tolerance. Additionally, we looked at the potentially mediating role of empathy. In summary, we found the expression of hubristic pride, when positively worded, to be associated with less tolerance and this relationship was mediated by empathy. However, we found authentic pride, when experienced, to be associated with more tolerance, but when expressed, to be associated with less tolerance. There was no evidence suggesting that empathy mediates the relationship between authentic pride and tolerance.

We expected individuals who experience more authentic pride to feel more empathy towards those who do not share their views. We found that self-reported, and thus experienced, authentic pride did not predict more empathy, which is not in line with what was expected. Interestingly, observed authentic pride predicted less empathy. However, this relationship was small.

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

In the case of hubristic pride we hypothesized that individuals who experience more hubristic pride feel less empathy towards those who do not share their views. In line with this expectation, we found that experienced hubristic pride predicted less empathy, although this was a small relationship. Additionally, our new, more positively formulated, hubristic pride scale predicted less empathy in both the experienced and observed measures. Although in case of the experienced positive hubristic pride, the relationship was small.

Regarding the expectation that individuals who experience more authentic pride are more tolerant towards those who do not share their views, we found mixed results. In line with what was expected, we found that experienced authentic pride predicted more tolerance. However, observed authentic pride predicted less tolerance, which is the opposite of what was expected. In other words, people that feel authentic pride seem to be more tolerant, but people showing authentic pride seem to be less tolerant.

On the other hand, we expected individuals who experience more hubristic pride to be less tolerant towards those who do not share their views. In line with this hypothesis we found that both the negative and more positive hubristic pride predicted less tolerance, when it was based on the participants' own experience. Moreover, this relationship was even stronger when people expressed more observable positive hubristic pride in what they described.

Lastly, we hypothesized that in case of both types of pride the relationship with tolerance would be mediated by empathy. Regarding this expectation, we found that the relationship between both experienced and observed authentic pride and tolerance was not mediated by empathy, which was not in line with our hypotheses. Because there were no observed reports of hubristic pride, we could not say anything about a mediation effect. However, the relationship between observed positive hubristic pride and tolerance was mediated by empathy.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The two concepts of pride

The results of this research add a lot of interesting perspectives concerning the construct of pride and whether you can distinguish hubristic and authentic pride. It also provides more insight on how pride relates to social attitudes and behaviours by examining the role of empathy and tolerance.

In line with what Tracy and Robins (2004, 2007) stated in their pride model, we distinguished authentic pride and hubristic pride, which have been found to be differently connected to pro-social behaviour. That is, authentic pride is typically seen as pro-social by being linked to humility and empathic concern (Batson et al., 1997; Neff, 2003). On the other hand, hubristic pride seems to be commonly viewed as the more anti-social form of pride, by being linked with superiority and increased prejudice (Oveis et al., 2010; Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). We found that, with respect to experiencing proud feelings, the two types of pride actually did predict tolerance and empathy in opposite ways, but these relationships were mostly very small. Therefore, the results do not show much evidence for the clear distinction made by Tracy and Robins (2004, 2007). In the current research participants were asked to describe a feeling of pride and these stories were objectively coded. So, in addition to the often used self-report measures, we also implemented a more top-down approach to assess pride. This way, we were able to distinguish between what people say they feel and what we observe in the way they express themselves. Interestingly, we found that no one described feelings of hubristic pride. This suggests that people are hesitant to describe themselves with terms like “arrogant or “stuck up”, which raises the question if hubristic pride is actually something that is experienced or something that people are honest about. Additionally, we found that observed authentic pride predicted less tolerance and empathy. In other words, people who express more pride in what they say, being authentic or hubristic, show less tolerance in how they respond to people who disagree with them.

These findings might add to the idea that pride is an inherently self-focused experience (Van Osch et al., 2017). When people rate themselves based on their experienced pride, they might feel good and therefore feel like they are also good to others and are tolerant. The fact that in our research experienced authentic pride did not correlate with observed authentic pride contributes to the idea that a pride experience is felt differently than how it is expressed. Authentic pride may be a concept that, when experienced, elicits more pro-social behaviour, such as tolerance. On the other hand, we find when people express pride, either authentic or hubristic, this seems to elicit less tolerance. Holbrook et al. (2014) propose an explanation that might clarify these results. They found that authentic pride presented a more internal-affective state and hubristic pride functioned more as an external display of pride. Possibly, by letting people not only feel, but also express their pride, we evoked self-focused feelings, which in turn led to less empathy and tolerance in both types of pride. Additionally, Holbrook et al. (2014) found both authentic and hubristic pride to be linked to narcissism, which also shows both types of pride can be associated with anti-social attributes. In conclusion, our research provides mixed results on whether there actually exists an anti-social and a pro-social side of pride. It might be possible they are the same thing, but more dependent on the difference between how people experience pride themselves and how they express it.

Empathy and Tolerance

Previous research suggests authentic and hubristic pride are differently linked to pro-social behaviour like tolerance (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Byun (2023) found that humility predicted tolerance and that this relationship was mediated by empathy. Humble individuals are characterized by the ability to accurately assess one's own skills, but are also appreciative of strengths of others and are open to different perspectives and ideas (Owens et al., 2013). This might explain why authentic pride, the pro-social type of pride has been linked to humility (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012), which is why we expected hubristic pride to predict less and

authentic pride to predict more tolerance and empathy. To measure both empathy and tolerance we used the same techniques as Byun (2023) and found they worked sufficiently. Interestingly, except for observed positive hubristic pride, no form of pride showed a relation with empathy. This is in contrast with previous research stating authentic pride can increase empathic concern for members of a group different than their own (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). However, in this study empathetic concern is measured with respect to how the participants view a stigmatized group, while we measured empathy by presenting a story of a made up individual. Additionally, the measure of empathic concern covers a broader range of emotions, such as feeling responsible and concerned, than just the feeling of empathy. This might explain why we did not find our expected relationships.

Like Byun (2023), we did find empathy and tolerance to be connected. Taken into account the existing and current research on the topic of empathy and tolerance, it is likely these constructs are linked to each other. To the question how pride exactly relates to them, we can only contribute mixed results. This might be dependent on the way we measured empathy and tolerance. It would be valuable to assess the level of empathy and tolerance of participants in different ways.

A More Positively Described Hubristic Pride

As stated before, there were nearly no participants that described a hubristic pride experience, based on our coding system. This was in line with previous research and commentaries on the hubristic pride scale (Dickens & Murphy, 2023; Murphy & Dickens, 2023). The main critique on this scale consisted of the fact that it did not gain varied and useful data, because people do not like to attribute hubristic characteristics to themselves. By adding a newly formed hubristic pride scale, with less negatively worded items, the current research implemented a new approach in the way hubristic pride is measured. The goal of implementing the new scale was to measure pride by using words that were less negatively

charged, but still hold the same meaning as the shortened version of the original hubristic pride scale by Witkower et al. (2021). Based on our factor analyses, we managed to make a scale that measured the same concept as hubristic pride and also gained a higher and more varied response rate. In that sense, we might have tackled the problem of low response values and variance when measuring hubristic pride, described by Murphy and Dickens (2023). However, when people experienced positive hubristic pride, it did not lead to less tolerance, which is not in line with how we would expect hubristic pride to function. Holbrook et al. (2014) stated that by assessing hubristic pride you actually might be measuring whether people feeling guilty about experiencing this type of pride and feel the urge to admit it. This might result in experiencing negative feelings about the self, which in turn leads to less tolerance, which is expected of hubristic pride (Oveis et al., 2010; Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). It might be possible that, by assessing hubristic pride in a more positive way, these negative feelings are diminished. This might be the reason that experienced positive hubristic pride, does not show the same negative relation with tolerance as the original hubristic pride.

On the other hand, we found observed positive hubristic pride to negatively predict tolerance and this effect was mediated by empathy. This might mean that people who behave more proud, are less empathetic and therefore less tolerant. So, although experienced positive hubristic pride has no relation with tolerance or empathy, expressed positive hubristic pride does show a negative relation.

Strengths, Limitations and Future directions

By building on previous research but also making our own additions and implementing critique we made a valuable contribution to the already existing knowledge on the concept and the effects of pride. However, the results of this study should be interpreted in the light of the limitations listed below.

Measuring Pride on a State Level

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

In our research we measured pride on a state level, which we have to keep in mind when interpreting our results. In a lot of previous research the focus was to link certain traits, like narcissism, self-esteem and dominance, to pride (Tracy et al., 2007; Tracy et al., 2009; Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). Because a state-level experience of pride was assessed, we can conclude nothing about how the participants experience pride in general. Maybe their written pride experience does not accurately represent whether they normally express and experience a more authentic or hubristic form of pride, which might explain why our findings do not entirely align with the research of Tracy & Robins (2004, 2007). On the other hand, Ashton-James and Tracy (2012) also researched the effect of pride states and found that hubristic pride states increased prejudice and authentic pride decreased prejudice and these relationships were mediated by empathic concern. These findings are in line with what we and previous research expects about the (anti/pro-social) nature of the different types of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007). Additionally, Ślaski et al. (2021) found the same relationships when examining state level levels of authentic and hubristic pride. Again, the fact that our research did not show the same results, could be due to the different methods used to measure empathy and tolerance. In most previous research prejudice and empathic concern measures are used. It might be interesting to investigate state level pride, while using different ways to measure tolerance and empathy.

Research design

Due to the nature of our research and the absence of a manipulation, we also have to take into account that it is not possible to make any causal claims. This means we can only say something about correlational relations and their strength, but not about direction. As mentioned before, coded new hubristic pride was the only type of pride where a mediation effect of empathy played a role in predicting tolerance. This is valuable, but unfortunately we do not know the direction of this relationship, which makes it hard to place in the context of

the practical world. To substantiate our findings, it would be relevant to implement a manipulation of the more positive hubristic pride in experimental research.

Participants and Measurements

Another mentionable point of our study is the participant pool. We recruited a large group of people with different demographics and a broad age range, which strengthens the validity of our research. On the other hand, these participants were exclusively from the United Kingdom and we only selected non-religious people. To assess empathy and tolerance we made use of beforementioned generated stories and we found that the UK participants had the same attitudes about them as the Dutch students used by Byun (2023). However, we do not know if this method of assessing empathy and tolerance will function in the United States or countries separate from WEIRD societies. Americans may hold more conservative views, which is for example shown in the fact that more than half of the adults in the United States are in favour of the death penalty (DPIC, 2023). This should be taken into account during the assessment of a suitable participant sample.

Additionally, empathy seems to be a multidimensional concept that is not just possessed but also acquired and effected by cultural norms of society (Jami et al., 2023). Chung et al. (2010) found that East-Asian adolescents have a different empathetic response to stories about others than their Western counterparts. Tolerance also seems to be a widely interpretable construct, which is seen in for example the distinction between tolerating certain beliefs and actually tolerating it when people behave accordingly to the beliefs (Verkuyten & Killen, 2021). Furthermore, pride is also a multifaceted construct, which is for example shown in the different ways and degrees pride is expressed in collectivist cultures, such as China and Japan, compared to individualistic cultures (Holbrook et al., 2014). Therefore, when the topic of empathy, tolerance and pride is researched, it is important to bear in mind our methodology might not apply in different cultural settings and there are most likely more facets to these

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

constructs than measured in the current study. However, it is very interesting to conduct further research on whether empathy and tolerance might have a different relationship with pride in other societies. Future research should focus on expanding the knowledge about pride, tolerance and empathy across different cultural context, while using measures accustomed to the participants beliefs about what these constructs mean.

Additional to our self-report system, we have to critically evaluate our objective rating system. To assess pride in a different manner, we made use of coding. The results of this measure did give more insights on the difference of experiencing pride and perceiving expressed pride in others, but it is important to question the validity of this measure. We made use of various self-formed scales based on the attributions ascribed to the different types of pride by Tracy and Robins (2007), in which ability is mainly ascribed to hubristic pride and effort to authentic pride. Ability had a significant positive correlation with hubristic pride and observed positive hubristic pride and also with authentic pride, but this relation was smaller. Effort correlated positively with authentic pride and negatively with (positive) hubristic, but not strongly. Although these findings are partly pointing in the expected direction, they are not very convincing. This can be due to the subjectivity of coding. Along the process, it became clear that constructs like ability and effort are arbitrary and susceptible to interpretational differences. Although the interrater-reliability eventually became sufficient, some scales needed revising and all stories were exclusively coded by two people, so there might still be a subjectivity problem. With analysing qualitative data comes the risk of non-correspondence between how other readers or participants themselves would categorize what they write and how coders categorize the content (Glazier et al., 2021).

However, coding also might be a valuable measure in the research of pride. When Holbrook et al. (2014) let participants describe a pride experience and let them self-report their attributions about their success, they found hubristic pride not to be associated with

ability. In that sense, our objective coding ratings might distinguish the different types of pride and their attributions better. To further clarify whether self report or coding measures are better suited for measuring pride, more research is needed. Liu et al. (2016) did also use ratings of other people to assess pride, but instead of reviewing the participants themselves, they recruited friends and strangers. Because of social desirability factors they propose other people's ratings would be more informative to measure hubristic pride, whereas authentic pride can best be measured by self-ratings. This is an interesting starting point for future research.

Conclusion

Taken together, this research provided more insight on the complex dynamics of pride, specifically distinguishing between authentic and hubristic pride, and its impact on empathy and tolerance. Our new positive hubristic pride measure negatively predicted tolerance and this relation was mediated by empathy. However, this relationship was only found in case of observed pride, so when the objective coding measure was used. Additionally, we found the relationship between authentic pride and tolerance to be affected by the difference between experiencing and expressing pride, considering observed authentic pride predicted tolerance negatively and experienced authentic pride predicted tolerance positively. Therefore, this study highlights the need to consider different measures, emphasizing the subjective nature of pride experiences. In conclusion, whether pride actually is "the root of all evil" might be in the eye of the beholder.

References

- Arman, M. (2023). Empathy, sympathy, and altruism—An evident triad based on compassion: A theoretical model for caring. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 37(3), 862–871. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1111/scs.13163>
- 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., Sager, K., Garst, E., Kang, M., Rubchinsky, K., & Dawson, K. (1997). Is empathy-induced helping due to self–other merging? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(3), 495–509. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.495>
- Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1656–1666. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702237647>
- Butrus, N., & Witenberg, R. T. (2013). Some personality predictors of tolerance to human diversity: the roles of openness, agreeableness, and empathy. *Australian Psychologist*, 48(4), 290–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9544.2012.00081.x>
- Byun, Jaehong (2023) The Relation Between Humility and Tolerance and The Mediating Role of Empathy. Master thesis, Psychology.
- Chung, W., Chan, S. F., & Cassels, T. G. (2010). The role of Culture in Affective Empathy: cultural and bicultural differences. *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 10(3–4), 309–326. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853710x531203>
- Cohen, A. J. (2004). What toleration is. *Ethics*, 115, 68–95. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421982>.

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

Cuadrado, I., Ordóñez-Carrasco, J. L., López-Rodríguez, L., Vázquez, A., & Brambilla, M.

(2021). Tolerance towards difference: adaptation and psychometric properties of the Spanish version of a new measure of tolerance and sex-moderated relations with prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 84, 220–232.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2021.08.005>

Dickens, L. R., & 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 (Washington, D.c.)*, 23(3), 886–893.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001142>

DPIC (2023, 17 augustus). *Opinion polls: Death penalty support and religious views*. Death Penalty Information Center. <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/facts-and-research/religiousstatements/opinion-polls-death-penalty-support-and-religion> ‘

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

Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology., Vols. 1-2, 4th ed.* (pp. 357-411). McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, A. P. (2020). The lexical fallacy in emotion research: Mistaking vernacular words for psychological entities. *Psychological Review*, 127(1), 95–113.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000174>

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

- Glazier, R. A., Boydston, A. E., & Feezell, J. T. (2021). Self-coding: A method to assess semantic validity and bias when coding open-ended responses. *Research & Politics*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20531680211031752>
- Hoffman, M. L. (2001b). Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for caring and justice. *Contemporary Sociology*, 30(5), 487. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3089337>
- Holbrook, C., Piazza, J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2014). Conceptual and empirical challenges to the “authentic” versus “hubristic” model of pride. *Emotion*, 14(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031711>
- Jami, P. Y., Walker, D. I., & Mansouri, B. (2023b). Interaction of empathy and culture: a review. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04422-6>
- Krettenauer, T., & Casey, V. (2015). Moral identity development and positive moral emotions: differences involving authentic and hubristic pride. *Identity*, 15(3), 173–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2015.1023441>
- 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>
- Liu, C., Yuan, L., Chen, C., & Yu, G. (2016). Authentic and hubristic pride as assessed by self, friends, and strangers. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7(7), 690–696. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1177/1948550616649240>
- López-Rodríguez, L., Navas, M., Cuadrado, I., Coutant, D., & Worchel, S. (2014). The majority’s perceptions about adaptation to the host society of different immigrant

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

groups: The distinct role of warmth and threat. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 40, 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.02.001>.

Mercadante, E., Witkower, Z., & Tracy, J. L. (2021). The psychological structure, social consequences, function, and expression of pride experiences. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 39, 130–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.03.010>

Monroe, K. R., & Martínez-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., & Dickens, L. R. (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>

Neff, K. D. (2003). Self-Compassion: an alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity*, 2(2), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860309032>

Ng, D. X., Lin, P., Marsh, N. V., Chan, K. Q., & Ramsay, J. E. (2021). Associations between openness Facets, Prejudice, and Tolerance: A scoping Review with Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.707652>

Nietzsche F. (2000). *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, transl. W. Kaufmann. New York: Modern Libr.

Norenzayan, A., & Heine, S. (2005). Psychological universals: What are they and how can we know? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(5), 763–784. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.5.763>

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

Oveis, C., Horberg, E. J., & Keltner, D. (2010). Compassion, pride, and social intuitions of self-other similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 618-630.

Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership. *Organization Science*, 24:1517-1538. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0795>

Pre-registration protocol. (2023, November 14). AsPredicted.

https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=7R8_YR3

Septianto, F., Tjiptono, F., & Arli, D. (2020). Authentically, proudly ethical: The effects of authentic pride on consumer acceptance of unethical behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 351–379. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1108/EJM-04-2018-0241>

Ślaski, S., Rogoza, R., & Strus, W. (2021). Pride as a state and as a trait: Polish adaptation of the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 40(4), 1995–2001.

<https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1007/s12144-018-0114-2>

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 JL, Mercadante EJ, & Robins RW. The viability and validity of the Authentic and Hubristic Pride scales: Reply to Dickens and Murphy (2023). *Emotion*. 2023 Apr;23(3):894-898. doi: 10.1037/emo0001183. PMID: 37079835.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the Self Into Self-Conscious Emotions: A Theoretical Model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(2), 103–125.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1502_01

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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>

UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of principles on tolerance*.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000101803.page=75>.

Van Osch, Y., Zeelenberg, M., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2017). The self and others in the experience of pride. *Cognition & Emotion*, 32(2), 404–413.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1290586>

Verkuyten, M., & Killen, M. (2021). Tolerance, dissenting beliefs, and cultural diversity. *Child Development Perspectives*, 15, 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12399>.

Van Zalk, M., & Kerr, M. (2014). Developmental Trajectories of Prejudice and Tolerance Toward Immigrants from Early to Late Adolescence. *Journal Of Youth And Adolescence*, 43(10), 1658–1671. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-014-0164-1>

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>

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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

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 new hubristic 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
.036						

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

(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
--	-------	---	------	-------	------	-----

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

.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)

	R^2	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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND 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

THE RELATION BETWEEN PRIDE AND TOLERANCE AND EMPATHY

I like to spend time with May, even if
he thinks differently about important
issues than me

