

The two facets of pride and how they influence prosociality

Thomas C. Covers

S3974804

Bachelor Thesis

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

Examiner/Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ernestine Gordijn

Second evaluator: Dr. Lisette de Jonge-Hoekstra

April 2, 2024

Abstract

Authentic pride has been described by literature as being an adaptive form of pride which is linked to prosocial behavior. However, *hubristic pride* is said to be linked to antisocial behavior and narcissism. The current study was a correlational study ($N=253$). The main purpose of this study was to find a relation between two forms of pride (authentic and hubristic) and tolerance. A simple linear regression analysis was performed to explore the relationship between all variables. When possible a mediation analysis was performed to test if empathy mediated the relation between pride and tolerance. Self-reported authentic pride was a positive predictor of tolerance but not for empathy. Interestingly, when authentic pride was coded it predicted less tolerance. When objectively coded, hubristic pride was a negative predictor for empathy and also for tolerance. A mediation analysis revealed that empathy mediated the relation between coded hubristic pride and tolerance. Our findings would suggest a difference between how pride is (said to be) felt and how it is perceived by others. Furthermore, the current study designed a new hubristic pride measurement which was based on a top-down approach. This new hubristic pride scale produced a higher mean average compared to the original hubristic pride scale.

Keywords: Pride, Authentic pride, Hubristic pride, New hubristic pride scale, Tolerance, Empathy

The two facets of pride and how they influence social interactions

As a researcher writing an article is always a difficult, long but also exciting process. You have to work hard to correctly execute your research plan. When your work is published and you see that it is positively conceived by the academic world, you feel proud. You feel proud either because you now have acquired the prestige you worked so hard for, or because of your personal qualities that made you achieve this success. This is one of many examples of situations where people experience pride. It is a positive emotion that makes people feel good about themselves. However, it has been described as the deadliest of the seven sins by Dante in '*the divine comedy*'. How can pride be described as being a positive emotion but at the same time be described as deadly? Maybe the concept of pride is more complex than it looks at first glance. Indeed, according to Tracy and Robins (2004, 2007) there are two forms of pride. A form of pride that is socially adaptive and a form that is socially maladaptive.

The current study is initiated to find out if these two differently described forms of pride have different outcomes on how people act in social situations. Of particular interest is the relationship between how a person experiences pride compared to the amount of tolerance that is shown towards a person who does not share their view. It builds on previous research (Cheng et al., 2010; Ashton-James & Tracy, 2011) which indicates that both forms of pride have different outcomes regarding sociality. The current study sought to find out if the amount of empathy someone has mediates the found relationship. This study is based on the methodology used by Byun (2023). Furthermore, the current study set out to make a new measure for hubristic pride as the original hubristic pride scale has been subjected to criticism (Holbrook et al., 2014; Murphy & Dickens, 2023).

The two facets of pride

In the Cambridge dictionary *pride* is described in three different ways. First as 'a feeling of satisfaction at your achievements or the achievements of your family or friends'.

Second as ‘a respect that you feel for yourself’. Last as ‘the belief that you are better or more important than others’. The first description can be seen as a ‘satisfactory’ form of pride, the second as a ‘self-respect’ form, and the last as an ‘importance’ form of pride. Therefore, one could say that pride is a self-centered concept with a feeling of satisfaction due to achievements and a feeling of superiority.

Tracy and Robins (2004, 2007) described two forms of pride that incorporate these descriptions. Authentic pride is a form of pride which is associated with self-esteem and achievement, while hubristic pride is associated with narcissism and feelings of superiority. Feelings of authentic pride are associated with attributing success to internal, unstable and controllable causes (effort). Meanwhile success that is attributed to internal, stable and uncontrollable causes (personal traits/characteristics) was generally found in people experiencing hubristic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007). The model of Tracy and Robins (2004) suggests that these feelings of pride are elicited when people experience events that involve their self-identity, which makes them focus on themselves. These events have to be in line with their ‘identity goals’. Furthermore, the outcome of the event has to be attributed to some internal cause. Striving to feel authentic pride is a way to minimize the feeling of guilt associated with internal, unstable and controllable causes (“I failed because I did not put forth enough effort”). Meanwhile, striving for hubristic pride is said to be a way to minimize the feeling of shame associated with internal, stable and uncontrollable causes (“I failed because I am a failure”) (Tracy & Robins, 2004).

Tracy and Robins (2007) have made scales which are supposed to measure both forms of pride. They asked lay-people to describe pride and integrated the associated words into an *authentic pride scale* and a *hubristic pride scale*. However, the scale made for hubristic pride is using words associated with arrogance (Tracy and Robins, 2007). It could be argued that this measurement of hubristic pride does not measure a positive emotion. It could be argued

that attributing pride to characteristics/personality traits might be seen as arrogant, but that does not necessarily mean that people actually experience this. Do people really feel arrogant or is this more an evaluation made by outsiders? Or do people acknowledge this pride because they associate themselves with this negativity? Holbrook et al. (2014) questioned the *hubristic pride scale* in whether it is measuring what it is supposed to measure. They point out that the *hubristic pride scale* combines excessive display of pride with the emotion of pride itself. In other words, people acknowledging this scale are acknowledging that they are aware of the fact that their display of pride is not in line with socially accepted norms. Therefore, according to Holbrook et al. (2014) the hubristic scale is not a measurement of true experienced emotion. Dickens and Murphy (2023) support this notion that the hubristic pride scale does not measure pride at all. Furthermore, according to them, the authentic pride scale is a “fully generic pride scale”, which is not solely based on effort. In the original pride-scales by Tracy and Robins (2007) a bottom-up approach has been used (where they ask lay-persons about the concept of pride) to construct both scales. According to Dickens and Murphy (2023) this approach should be top-down instead of bottom-up, as a top-down approach is theory driven. This way the item generation should naturally be more similar to the theory-based concept of pride. Furthermore, according to Dickens and Murphy (2023), because the hubristic pride scale is so negatively worded few people relate to it. This causes a zero-inflation effect. In the current research we will incorporate these concerns (Holbrook et al., 2014; Murphy & Dickens, 2023) and make a new hubristic pride scale that is less negatively frased and has less items which are suggestive of the excessiveness of pride. The new hubristic pride scale will (as well as the original scale) be used as a measurement for our analyses to measure feelings associated with the theory behind the concept of hubristic pride.

The social function of pride

Although pride is a self-centered emotion, it appears to also have a social function. Tracy et al. (2010) are the first to note that the distinction of both prides can be compared with the terms ‘power’ and ‘status’. Power is seen as the possibility to obtain resources, while status is seen as the possibility to obtain social attention. Power is obtained through displaying dominance, while status is obtained through prestige. According to Williams (2018) social interaction has the intentions of ‘getting along’ and ‘getting ahead’ in life. Both concepts are obtained through “excellence of the self”. With regard to these sources (Tracy et al., 2010; Williams, 2018), one might notice that the concepts of ‘getting ahead’ and ‘power’ are linked. This link is also evident in ‘getting along’ and ‘status’. Cheng et al. (2010) found that authentic pride is associated with prestige, whilst hubristic pride is associated with dominance. This is an interesting finding, as it suggests that the display of pride shows the intention of people to either obtain power or obtain status. In other words: the way people express pride might be a way to either ‘get along with’ or ‘get ahead of’ someone. This connection between pride, prestige/dominance and social status has been found by Bolló et al. (2018). Therefore, it might be possible that people who display authentic pride could also display a certain open-mindedness towards others, as it is geared towards getting along with someone. Meanwhile, hubristic pride is geared to get ahead of someone and should therefore lead to closed-mindedness towards others. If this distinction in displaying pride has different goals, then perhaps it also has different outcomes with regard to prosociality. For example in tolerating others.

Feeling proud and tolerating someone

Tolerance is defined by the Cambridge dictionary as “a willingness to accept behavior and beliefs that are different from your own, although you might not agree with or approve of them”. Tolerance has been said to promote further prosociality (Dusche, 2002), and is said to be an important factor in obtaining an altruistic society (Hoffman, 2000). From a perspective

of ‘getting along’ with others it would be beneficial to display tolerance as it leads to more social attention and therefore better status. Meanwhile, from the perspective of ‘getting ahead’, tolerating opposing views might undermine the chance of getting a power-advantage.

In a study by van Cappellen and LaBouff (2022) prejudice towards Christians (by atheists) led to less tolerance towards them. It was noted that this displayed prejudice was partially due to a superiority belief the atheist had. This superiority belief is a key feature of hubristic pride. Might it be that hubristic pride then also leads to more prejudice? Indeed, Ashton-James and Tracy (2011) found that hubristically proud individuals were prone to prejudice and discrimination towards people that they saw as a minority. Meanwhile, authentically proud individuals were said to be more open towards others.

In a meta-analysis by Ng et al. (2021) it is noted that openness to experience is negatively correlated to prejudice. Furthermore, they noted that openness to experience is associated with more tolerance towards one another. Combining these findings (Ashton-James and Tracy, 2011; Ng et al., 2021; van Cappellen & LaBouff, 2022), one could suggest that authentic pride (which is associated with openness towards others) might be positively related to tolerance. Meanwhile, hubristic pride (associated with prejudice) might be negatively related to tolerance. If this is the case, is there an underlying motivation that might lead to this distinction?

The link between empathy, tolerance and pride

According to the Cambridge dictionary *empathy* is “the ability to share someone else’s feelings or experiences by imagining what it would be like to be in that person’s situation”. The amount of empathic concern someone has for a person has been found to be the best predictor for people to act on tolerance intentions (Butrus & Wikenberg, 2013).

In a study by Byun (2023), humility was found to be positively correlated to tolerance. In this study, the relation between humility and tolerance was found to be mediated by

feelings of empathy. Tracy, Mercadante and Hohm (2023) noted that authentic pride “fosters a sense of humility rather than arrogance” as it focuses on the hard work someone has done, rather than focussing on personal qualities. As authentic pride might foster a sense of humility, might it be that the relationship found between humility and tolerance will also be found in this instance? If that is the case, and empathy is said to be the best predictor for people to act on tolerance intentions (Butrus & Wikenberg, 2013), might empathy mediate this relation? As hubristic pride is a form of pride which elicits a sense of arrogance rather than humility, will it have a negative relationship with tolerance? If this relationship is found, might it be that the amount of empathy a person experiences is the underlying factor.

Current study

The current study examines the relationship between both forms of pride (Tracy and Robins, 2007) with tolerance. Furthermore, we explore the possibility of a mediation-effect of empathy on the relationship between pride and tolerance. The current study measures pride as a state-like moment of being. Instead of solely using self-report measures, we also implemented an objective measure in our study. Furthermore, we fabricated a new hubristic pride scale which took into account concerns (Holbrook et al., 2014; Murphy & Dickens, 2023) regarding the original hubristic scale (Tracy and Robins, 2007). Two separate analyses are performed to investigate the relationship between both forms of pride, tolerance and empathy. Therefore the following six hypotheses have been drafted:

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

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

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

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

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 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 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 re-lived 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 ($\kappa = .678$; $\kappa = .853$), *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 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 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 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* ($M = 4.96$, $SD = .85$, $\alpha = 0.772$) 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
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 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

The current study was to examine whether two forms of pride would predict tolerance by mediation of empathy. As the pride scales were subjected to criticism, the current study had multiple ways of testing the six hypotheses.

First, we hypothesized that individuals who experience more authentic pride feel more empathy towards those who do not share their view. However, neither self-reported authentic pride, nor perceived authentic pride was related to empathy.

Second, we hypothesized that individuals who experience more hubristic pride feel less empathy towards those who do not share their view. Self-reported hubristic pride was not related to empathy. However, the *hubristic pride scale* measure indicated that there was a negative trend regarding the relationship with empathy. This was not found for the *new hubristic scale* measure. When hubristic pride was perceived, the expected relationship did emerge. What must be noted is that only the *coded new hubristic pride* has been used as an instrument to measure hubristic pride, as participants did not describe themselves to be arrogant.

Third, we hypothesized that individuals who experience more authentic pride are more tolerant towards those who do not share their view. As expected, self-reported authentic pride was found to be related to tolerance. However, the relationship between authentic pride and tolerance reversed when authentic pride was perceived by someone else.

Fourth, we hypothesized that individuals who experience more hubristic pride are less tolerant towards those who do not share their view. Neither instrument for the measurement of self-reported hubristic pride showed a relation between hubristic pride and tolerance. However, the *hubristic pride scale* measure showed a negative trend regarding the

relationship with tolerance. When perceived as being high in hubristic pride, the expected relationship did present itself.

Fifth, we hypothesized that the relationship between authentic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. This mediation was not possible as no instrument of authentic pride measured a positive relation with empathy. Therefore we found no support for this hypothesis.

Last, we hypothesized that the relationship between hubristic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. When hubristic pride was observed by someone, the expected relationship was found. The *coded new hubristic pride* found a negative relation with self-reported tolerance. This relation was mediated by self-reported empathy feelings

The self-report measures and the objectively perceived measures had different outcomes. Interestingly, when authentic pride was self-reported it was positively related to tolerance, however when authentic pride was observed it was negatively related to tolerance. Another interesting finding is that self-reported hubristic pride was not negatively related to tolerance, however when observed this expected relationship was present. Furthermore, the self-reported measures for hubristic pride seemed to differentiate in their relation to empathy-feelings as well as tolerance. The negatively framed *hubristic pride scale* did show a trend towards the expected relationships with empathy and tolerance. However, the more positively framed *new hubristic pride scale* did not show a trend.

Theoretical implications

The current study focussed on the concept of pride and the possible social benefits/deficits it has. The study is a correlational study and all data are therefore not interpretable on a causal basis. However, the current study has several possible implications with regard to the concept of pride as emotion, as well as the consequences of feeling pride and displaying pride.

We found that when people experience high levels of self-reported pride people are not more empathetic to people who don't share their view. Moreover, this same pattern is found when authentic pride of people is perceived by others. These results suggest that feeling more authentically proud is not something that is associated with feeling more empathy towards someone. This is not in line with findings by Ashton-James and Tracy (2011) where empathic concern was related to authentic pride. A possible explanation for the difference in findings is the measurement used. In the study of Ashton-James and Tracy (2011) an empathic concern questionnaire (Davis, 1980) has been used. According to Baldner and McGinley (2014) this questionnaire is a reflection of the concept of *sympathy* rather than *empathy*. The current study uses a measure based on Byun (2023) which is based on affective- as well as cognitive empathy. Therefore, the findings of the current study might be a better representation of the relation between authentic pride and empathy.

Self-reported authentically proud people reported being more tolerant towards someone they did not relate to. This was in line with our hypotheses. A possible explanation for this is the notion that people feeling hubristically proud are “fostering a sense of humility (Tracy, Mercadante & Hohm, 2023) by focussing their hard work, rather than their personal qualities”. However, when authentic pride was observed people reported being less tolerant towards others they did not relate to. This is an interesting finding, as it suggests that there might be a discrepancy between what people experience (emotion) during moments of pride and how others interpret their description of pride. There seems to be no relation between these measurements while they are supposed to measure the same construct. This can be seen when we look at the relation between the variables *coded authentic pride* and *authentic pride* (see Table 2). Perhaps something in the pride-descriptions of the participants makes it hard for others to correctly assess it as authentically proud. However, might it be possible that participants tell a different story to others than what they actually feel during a pride

experience? Or are other people not good assessors of authentic pride in others? Research (Liu et al., 2016) showed a small to moderate positive relation for agreement on feelings of authentic pride between self-report and stranger-report. However, this study was done using a trait-measurement of authentic pride, while the current study used a state-design. It might be possible that people are less good in predicting authentic pride feelings of others when it is situational dependent compared to traitlike characteristics. Future research might focus on self-other ratings on situational pride display.

There was no relation found between self-reported hubristic pride and how empathic people felt towards someone that did not share their view. There is however a negative trend visible when using the *hubristic pride scale*. An explanation as to why we do not find the hypothesized relation is in measurement of empathy. As said before, Ashton-James & Tracy (2011) have used a different empathy measurement which has been subjective to criticism (Baldner & McGinley, 2014). The concept of *empathic concern* (Davis, 1980) is more closely related to *sympathy*. Looking at how empathy is portrayed by literature (Hoffman, 1985), it involves components of affect but also cognition and should therefore be more accessible for everyone than *sympathy* (which is solely affect-based). Therefore, it could be that the concept of *sympathy* is negatively related to experiencing hubristic pride, as opposed to *empathy*. As we measured with a more representative instrument, this might have influenced the relationship between hubristic pride and empathy as compared to Ashton-James & Tracy (2011). An interesting follow-up study would be to replicate the current study, but use the amount of felt sympathy as a variable instead of the amount felt empathy. Moreover, when hubristic pride was perceived by others the expected negative relation with empathy did emerge. In other words, when other people perceived the stories as hubristically proud, people reported being less empathetic towards someone who does not share their view. This might be due to a social desirability bias. Perhaps people are not completely forthcoming in regard to

how hubristically proud they actually felt. Another possibility is that others are not good at assessing the amount of feelings of hubristic pride in another person, although Liu et al. (2016) have found that there is a low to moderate relation in self-reported and other-perceived hubristic pride. The current study found a comparable positive relation between the self-reported hubristic pride measures and the other-perceived hubristic pride.

When people felt more hubristically proud it was not related to lower levels of tolerance. What must be noted is that the *hubristic pride scale* showed a negative relational trend with tolerance. However, when observed by others hubristic pride was related to lower levels of tolerance. Even more striking is the fact that this relationship was mediated by empathy. There is again a possibility that a social desirability is at play here and participants were underreporting their feelings of hubristic pride which is why we did not find the hypothesized relation. It could be that the opinion of the perceiver on the hubristic pride experience of someone is a good predictor of tolerance and empathy. Future research must focus on this aspect. Perhaps perceiving the ‘excessive boasting of personal qualities’ with regard to hubristic pride (Tracy and Robins, 2007) is important with regard to negative social behavior of people.

The current study set out to make a new hubristic pride measure as the negativity of the old hubristic pride measure could possibly lead to a social desirability bias. A new hubristic pride scale was designed, which according to factor-analysis measured the same construct. When looking at the mean averages of these scales a difference can be seen. The *new hubristic scale* might therefore be a better tool for getting less socially desirable answers from people with regard to hubristic pride-feelings. Although the general idea of both hubristic pride measures is the same, the data shows differentiating results. Even though both measurements are not valid predictors for tolerance and empathy, the old hubristic pride scale is better predictive of tolerance and empathy than the new hubristic scale. That is an

interesting finding as it would suggest that the negativity (words like arrogant, stuck-up, smug, etc.) in the old hubristic scale possibly influence feelings of tolerance and empathy if people identify with this negativity. This difference could be seen as evidence for the claims made by Holbrook et al. (2014) about the *hubristic pride scale*. It could well be that people who associate themselves with words like ‘arrogance’ perceive themselves as being excessively proud. However, our research is not sufficient evidence for this claim. Therefore future research must further explore the influence of negativity on *the hubristic pride scale*

Strengths, weaknesses and future research

Our study was well-powered and consisted of a heterogeneous participant pool in terms of age and gender. The study succeeded in confronting people with situations and people they don’t agree with. What must be noted is that the participants were solely British. Therefore, generalizability is limited to British people. However, generalizability could also extend to countries with similar attitudes.

The concept of hubristic pride has been questioned by multiple sources (Holbrook et al., 2014; Murphy & Dickens, 2023). The negative wording of this scale was said to be generating socially desirable answers. Furthermore, the *new hubristic pride scale* is based on a top-down approach and is therefore a more theory-driven instrument. The current study therefore designed the *new hubristic pride scale*. This measure turned out to be producing a higher mean average of answers than the original hubristic pride scale and was therefore supposedly less prone to socially desirable answering. This study has used a different self-report measure for hubristic pride compared to previous studies (Tracy & Robins, 2007; Cheng et al., 2010; Holbrook et al., 2014). Future research can build upon these measurements.

The use of a more objective measure (coding pride-descriptions) is also a strength of the current study. The objective measure has displayed substantially different results than the

self-reported measures (especially hubristic pride). This difference is an indication that further research is warranted regarding the subject of pride.

The current study uses a correlational design and therefore we cannot determine causality. We don't know which way the relationship is. Does experiencing high feelings of pride make people to be less/more tolerant or is the relationship actually reversed? Follow-up studies can explore this by performing an experiment.

Another disadvantage of the study is that the concept of pride might culturally differ. In culture there is a distinction between interdependent societies and independent societies. Both societies have different values and would probably also have different ways of how they conceptualize certain emotions (like pride). Therefore future research might investigate if there are any differences between these societies.

Conclusion

The current study investigated whether the research that had been done with respect to the concepts of pride in relation to prosocial and antisocial behavior could be replicated by using different kinds of measures of pride. There is some evidence that feeling authentically proud might lead to being more tolerant towards others who do not share our view. People who feel hubristically proud are not necessarily less tolerant or empathetic towards people they do not relate to, or at least so they indicate. Social desirability might cause self-report measures on hubristic pride to be low in credibility. However, an indicator for display of negative social behavior might be present in perceiving hubristic pride descriptions in other people, although further research is needed to investigate this claim. All in consideration, be wary of people displaying 'arrogance' in their pride, they might not have the best intentions (even though they say otherwise). People who work hard and are proud because of this, these are the people you might want to trust to do good.

References

- 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/10.1177/0146167211429449>
- Baldner, C., & McGinley, J. J. (2014). Correlational and exploratory factor analyses (EFA) of commonly used empathy questionnaires: New insights. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(5), 727–744. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-014-9417-2>
- Bolló, H., Bóthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Orosz, G. (2018). Pride and social status. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01979>
- 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, J. (2023). The relation between humility and tolerance and the mediating role of empathy.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31(5), 334–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004>
- Van Cappellen, P., & LaBouff, J. P. (2022). Prejudice toward Christians and atheists among members of nonreligious groups: Attitudes, behaviors, and mechanisms. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 25(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220906860>
- Davis, M. H. (1980). *A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy*. Corte Madera, CA: Select Press.

- 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*, 23(3), 886–893. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001142>
- 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.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1985). Interaction of affect and cognition in empathy. In C. E. Izard, J. Kagan, & R. B. Zajonc (Eds.), *Emotions, cognition, and behavior*. (pp. 103–131). Cambridge University Press.
- Holbrook, C., Piazza, J. R., & 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>
- 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/10.1177/1948550616649240>
- Ng, D. X., Lin, P. K. F., 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>
- Tracy, J. L., Mercadante, E., & Hohm, I. (2023). Pride: The emotional foundation of social rank attainment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 74, 519–545. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-032720-040321>
- Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., & Cheng, J. T. (2010). A naturalist’s view of pride. *Emotion Review*, 2(2), 163–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073909354627>

- 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
- 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>
- Williams, L. A. (2018). Emotions of excellence: Communal and agentic functions of pride, moral elevation, and admiration. In H. C. Lench (Ed.), *The function of emotions: When and why emotions help us*. (pp. 235–252). Springer International Publishing/Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77619-4_12
- 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
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
.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. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

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

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
	.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

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

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

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

