

**The Relation Between Different Forms of Pride with Empathy and Tolerance**

Samantha Werkman

S4002725

Bachelor Thesis - Psychology

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

Examiner/ Daily supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ernestine Gordijn

Secondary supervisor: Lisette de Jonge-Hoekstra

February 19, 2024

## **Abstract**

Pride is a complex emotion with two distinct forms: hubristic and authentic pride. Hubristic pride is associated with antisocial behavior, while authentic pride is linked to prosocial behavior. This study aimed to investigate how these types of pride relate to tolerance and empathy. In the current study, 253 participants were asked to describe a situation about a personal success, after which we assessed how proud they felt. This study devised a new hubristic pride scale, which contained more positively worded items. To get a more objective indication of pride, we coded these descriptions in terms of observed hubristic and authentic pride. Additionally, in order to investigate the correlation with empathy and tolerance, participants were confronted with people who thought very differently about certain situations. We then assessed the extent to which they could still feel empathy and tolerance towards these people. Firstly, hubristic pride showed a pattern in the expected direction. We found negative relations with both tolerance and empathy. However, this pattern was stronger for observed hubristic pride than felt hubristic pride. Secondly, the results of the authentic pride measures showed some mixed findings: while felt authentic pride was positively related to more tolerance, observed authentic pride was related to less tolerance. In the case of hubristic pride, the negative relation with tolerance was mediated by less empathy. This study emphasizes the importance of external evaluations in assessing pride. The findings suggest that when we observe high feelings of pride in people, whether that pride is authentic or hubristic, this was related to lowered tolerance towards others.

## **The Relation between Different Forms of Pride with Empathy and Tolerance**

There is a multitude of research in understanding the psychological factors that contribute to prosocial behaviors and the promotion of interpersonal relationships. One of the important constructs that may play a role in this is feeling proud of oneself. Pride is an emotion that has a notable impact on an individuals' behavior in both social situations and group settings (Tracy et al., 2007). Exhibiting pride enables individuals to communicate their social standing. Additionally, it also enables individuals to strive for success and social acknowledgement. Thus, pride plays a vital role in interpersonal relations and behavior.

However, according to research, pride is a multifaceted construct, consisting of hubristic pride and authentic pride (Tracy et al., 2007). Hubristic pride is related to generally more negative traits, such as narcissism, arrogance, superiority and egotism. This type of pride stems from success that is attributed to internal, stable and uncontrollable causes. An example of this is pride about one's talent. Individuals with high hubristic pride showcase the mentality that they are proud, simply because of who they are. Conversely, authentic pride is related to typically positive traits, including accomplishment, humility and authenticity (Tracy et al., 2007). Authentic pride arises from success that is attributed to internal, unstable and uncontrollable causes. An example of this is being proud about one's achievements because of hard work.

Research revealed that these two distinct forms of pride are associated with prosocial behavior and interpersonal relationships in different ways (Ashton-James et al., 2011). In the current study we focused on the relation of the two distinct forms of pride with tolerance and empathy. Tolerance enables individuals of all different backgrounds to coexist peacefully, through respect, acceptance and appreciation (UNESCO, 1995). It entails the notion that individuals are free to uphold their own beliefs and acknowledge that others may adhere to

theirs. Other research has found that traits such as agreeableness and openness are related to tolerance, but it had a particularly strong relation to empathy (Butrus et al., 2013). They also found that individuals with higher levels of empathy were more inclined to exhibit tolerance towards others who differ from them.

Even though prior research has explored the relation between empathy and tolerance, there have not been many studies researching the relation of the feeling of pride with these constructs. The aim of this study is to examine the relation between the two different forms of pride and tolerance, and the function of empathy as a mediator.

### **The two sides of pride**

Pride is an emotion we all experience from time to time. However, pride has been subject of discussion in research, as it is a more complex emotion than it may seem at first sight. What does it mean to feel proud? We can feel proud of ourselves in different ways, for example when we take pride in our achievements, talents or characteristics. Additionally, we may experience pride in external elements, such as feeling proud of others or the culture we belong to. According to research, pride is a key emotion that significantly influences how people behave in social situations and within groups (Tracy et al., 2007). It plays a crucial role in human achievement and success. Displaying pride allows an individual to convey their social standing. The internal feeling of pride, or feeling proud of oneself, can further strengthen the actions that lead to such feelings, bolster one's self-esteem, and convey to the individuals that they deserve a higher status. Additionally, pride is considered a self-conscious emotion (Tracy et al., 2007). This implies that, similar to emotions of shame and guilt, feeling pride involves self-assessment. It requires the ability to reflect on oneself and to have mental representations of oneself. Self-aware emotions are experienced when one becomes conscious of whether they have met, exceeded or

fallen short of their ideal self-perceptions. In short, pride is the feeling that drives individuals to strive for success and social recognition. Feeling proud of oneself or others could therefore be related to prosocial behavior and positive interpersonal relations.

However, many studies have found that pride is composed of multiple facets. In a study by Tracy et al., pride was found to be composed of two distinct facets: hubristic pride and authentic pride (2007). Hubristic pride has a more negative connotation, since it is associated with arrogance, self-aggrandizement, superiority and egotism. These traits promote prejudice and discrimination. Hubristic pride results from success that is attributed to internal, stable and uncontrollable causes. Additionally, it is associated with insecure self-worth, defensive self-esteem, and narcissism (Ashton-James et al., 2011). This can lead to aggression, hostility and a disregard for the rights and feelings of others. On the other hand, authentic pride has a far more positive connotation, since it is associated with self-confidence, accomplishment and humility (Ashton-James et al., 2011). This promotes more positive attitudes toward outgroups and stigmatized individuals. Authentic pride results from success attributed towards internal, unstable and uncontrollable causes. It is also associated with genuine feelings of self-worth and self-integrity, reflected by secure self-esteem and authenticity (Tracy et al., 2007).

Given that pride consists of two different forms, it is reasonable to assume that these forms would influence various constructs associated with interpersonal relationships and prosocial behavior differently. According to research, one of these distinctions is related to interpersonal goals. Hubristic pride is associated with personal advancement at the expense of others (Ashton-James et al., 2011), as it correlates with self-centeredness and antisocial interpersonal behavior. This ‘getting ahead’ goal is also associated with assertiveness and dominance (Chen et al., 2019). On the other hand, authentic pride is related to a wider range of

interpersonal goals, since it is connected to both personal advancement and fostering positive relationships with others (Ashton-James et al., 2011). This ‘getting along’ goal is associated with warmth, prosocial behavior and extraversion (Chen et al., 2019).

### **Pride and its relation with empathy**

It is crucial to better understand the factors impacting tolerance in order to understand what makes individuals tolerant. As mentioned above, one of the main factors influencing tolerance is empathy (Butrus et al., 2013). Then what exactly is empathy? Over years of research, the concept of empathy has known multiple definitions. It has been described as the cognitive acknowledgement of another individuals’ inner experiences, consisting of their thoughts, perceptions and emotions (Hoffman, 2000). Thus, empathy is not a singular construct, but instead consists of both cognitive and affective components. Additionally, it has been defined as the empathetic emotional response to another individual (Hoffman, 2000). This involves psychological processes that cause one individual to have congruent feelings with another’s situation. According to Hoffman, empathy may serve as a stimulus for altruistic and prosocial behavior. Both are of importance in moral behavior and development. Empathy as a personality trait, or dispositional empathy, used to be described as the responses of an individual to the witnessed experiences of another (Davis, 1983). Studies show that agreeableness has a strong positive relation with empathy (Graziano et al., 1997). Other research shows that attitudes towards others are positively influenced by empathy, whether it was dispositional or situationally induced (Hoffman, 2000).

Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that both forms of pride relate to empathy in different ways. Individuals who have more hubristic pride tend to demonstrate antisocial personality characteristics, including hostile and antisocial interpersonal behavior, aggression

and disagreeableness (Ashton-James et al., 2011). This way, individuals who experience more hubristic pride may also experience lowered empathic concern for others, which would consequently increase prejudice. The concept of prejudice is characterized by negative attitudes towards outgroups, which leads to a mental separation between the prejudiced individual and their target (Finlay et al., 1999). As a result, individuals will not be stimulated to understand those they are prejudiced against. Conversely, individuals who have more authentic pride tend to display more prosocial personality traits, such as cooperative and generous behaviors towards others, conscientiousness and agreeableness (Ashton-James et al., 2011). Experiencing more authentic pride could possibly be related to a sense of empathic concern for others, which, as a result, would reduce prejudice towards others. Thus, empathy appears to have a negative relation with prejudice.

### **Pride and its relation with tolerance**

Having established the connection between pride, empathy and prejudice, we will now explore its relation with tolerance. The aforementioned relation between empathy and prejudice is in line with the findings from previous research, which found that individuals who have a high degree of empathic concern will more likely display behavior that stimulates tolerance and reduces prejudice towards others (Byun, 2023). Tolerance as a construct is reflected in personality, attitudes and behavior. Individuals all have their differences, in terms of culture, ethnicity, religion and characteristics. In a multicultural society, tolerance enables individuals to coexist harmoniously, by being respectful, accepting and forbearing (UNESCO, 1995). Tolerance plays a pivotal role in shaping individuals' attitudes and behaviors towards others. This starts with our perceptions of those around us, which are shaped by the cognitive processes that are involved in classifying and categorizing others based on our own values and beliefs

(Martinez et al., 2008). Therefore, tolerance appears to be of significant importance for an integrated and respectful society. Understanding what makes people tolerant could increase our understanding of the function and influence of pride on human behavior. Authentic pride is currently defined as the type of pride related to accomplishment, positive attitudes towards outgroups and authenticity (Tracy et al., 2007). Authentic pride also shares similarities with the concept of humility, which has shown to predict more tolerance through a mediation effect with empathy (Byun, 2023). Thus, we expect there to be a positive relation between tolerance and authentic pride.

Regarding hubristic pride, we expect this type to relate negatively to tolerance, as it is associated with feelings of superiority and egotism (Chen et al., 2009). These traits foster discrimination and bias towards others, therefore potentially resulting in lowered tolerance. Following Byun's theory again, humility and hubristic pride could be considered as opposing constructs. We would therefore expect an individual who has more hubristic pride to exhibit more prejudice, and therefore less tolerance, towards others. Thus, it appears that the feeling of pride impacts the extent of empathic concern individuals experience toward others, subsequently affecting their prejudices and tolerance levels towards others.

### **Existing literature**

So far, pride has mostly been measured in studies using the Authentic and Hubristic Pride (AP/HP) scales devised by Tracy et al. (Tracy et al., 2007), each comprising seven items relating to either hubristic or authentic pride traits. The items used on the HP scale consist of snobbish, pompous, stuck-up, conceited, egotistical, arrogant, and smug, while the items used on the AP scale are accomplished, successful, achieving, fulfilled, self-worth, confident and productive. However, criticism regarding the scales' validity have emerged. Holbrook et al. argued that the

HP scale does not measure pride itself, but rather perceptions of excessive pride, arising from instances where pride is deemed undeserved or displayed inappropriately (Holbrook et al., 2014). Additionally, they found authentic pride to be linked to narcissism and dominance-oriented behaviors, suggesting it is not purely prosocial. Dickens et al. echoed these concerns, labeling the AP scale as a generic pride measure and highlighting issues with the HP scale (Dickens et al., 2023). The HP scale is susceptible to social desirability bias and faces a zero-inflation effect. On the HP scale, individuals are asked to rate themselves using terms that can be found offensive, such as ‘pompous, arrogant, stuck-up’. This makes participants resist rating themselves above 1 (“not at all”) on the 5-point-Likert scale, which leads to insufficient variance on the scale. Dickens et al. advocate for the advancement of new measurement tools, where the scale items are designed to align with the underlying theory. The current study aims to adjust the HP scale, by including less negatively worded items. For example, instead of asking participants if they felt “pompous” or “stuck-up”, participants were asked to rate items such as “I felt more important than others” or “I felt egotistical”. The expectation is that participants would be more likely to rate themselves above 1 (“not at all”) on the scale, therefore reducing the zero-inflation effect previously found on the HP measure.

Moreover, this study will employ both a self- and other-rated measure for pride. Previous research has employed similar methods of external rating, both yielding promising outcomes. In research done by Bai et al., friends and family rated the participants about moral pride and hubris (Bai et al., 2023), similar to the concepts of authentic and hubristic pride used in the current study. The results of this study show that the self-other agreement for moral pride and hubris was medium to large, which indicates that it is possible to rate another person and still get a representative view of their characteristics. Moreover, a study conducted by Kusano et al. (2022)

provided further evidence of individuals' reluctance to associate themselves with hubristic pride. The research revealed a consistent variance in participants' ratings between how they estimated the level of hubristic pride others would experience in the experimental situation compared to their own experience. When tasked with rating their own feelings of pride, participants did not show a consistent pattern of high hubristic pride. However, they predicted that others would feel significantly more hubristic pride in the same situation. This suggests that when it comes to hubristic pride, individuals often encounter resistance in acknowledging their own pride as hubristic, while they find it easier to attribute such characteristics to others. Once again, this highlights the difference between self-assessment and assessment of others, particularly in measuring hubristic pride. Thus, the current study will add an objective measurement of pride alongside the self-report measurement. We expect that this will also improve the function of the AP/HP scale.

### **Present study**

In this study, pride was included as a predictor variable, tolerance as the dependent measure and empathy as a mediating variable. As mentioned above, empathy is considered an essential predictor of tolerance, and therefore expectedly functions as a mediator in the relation with pride. Building upon previous research that has highlighted the significance of empathy in predicting tolerance (Butrus et al., 2013), we seek to further explore the unique contribution of respectively authentic and hubristic pride. In order to examine these relationships, a two-step approach was utilized. First we presented an open-ended question asking about a moment when the participants experienced a personal success. This question aimed to induce pride. The second step was intended to assess the degree of empathy and tolerance in the participants. It consisted of counterattitudinal stories to assess whether participants, despite the differences with their own

norms and values, still exhibit tolerance and empathy towards the characters in the stories. Of all constructs mentioned above, empathy has long been a major subject in social psychology and sociology research. On the other hand, while the concept of pride has also received significant attention in research, the categorization of pride into authentic and hubristic subtypes is a relatively recent development. Consequently, there currently exists limited literature about the relationship between tolerance and these distinct types of pride. The present study aims to fill in the gap in academic literature and to provide more information about tolerance and its correlation with both forms of pride. Our hypotheses regarding authentic and hubristic pride are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Method**

### **Participants and Design**

The participants were recruited through Prolific. The sample consisted of non-religious adults from the UK. Participants received £1.20. We used a Monte Carlo power analysis for

indirect effects to estimate the minimum number of participants necessary to test hypotheses 5 and 6 based on a power of .80%. For the power, we set a small to medium correlation of .23 between pride and tolerance, and .23 between pride and empathy. The correlation we set ( $r = .397$ ) for empathy and tolerance was based on previous findings by Byun (2023). This resulted in an estimate of at least 148 participants for a simple mediation with one predictor. Given that we tested our model with two predictors we aimed to recruit at least 220 participants. To account for possible exclusions and drop-outs we aimed to sample at least 250 participants. However, more people participated which resulted in a final sample of 293 participants<sup>1</sup>. As per the pre-registration protocol ([https://aspredicted.org/7R8\\_YR3](https://aspredicted.org/7R8_YR3)) for this study, participants who met the following criteria were excluded from the research: participants who: answered less than 50% of the dependent measures (40 participants), completed the survey in less than 120 seconds (30 of the 40 already eliminated participants), showed flat responses (none), failed at least two out of three attention checks (none), and participants who omitted an answer to the open-ended question about the experience of pride or provided no description of pride (none). After the exclusion of these participants, our final sample consisted of 253 participants (143 females, 110 males), reaching sufficient power to test our hypotheses.

The age range of the participants varied from 21 to 74 ( $M = 42.84$ ,  $SD = 13.40$ ). The predominant age cohort within the participant pool was between 30 and 39 years, representing 27.7% of the sample. Subsequently, the 40-49 age group represented 23.3%, followed by the 20-29 (18.6%), 50-59 (15.8%), 60-69 (11.9%) and 70-80 (2.8%) age groups.

The main focus of the study was to examine the relationship between two types of pride (hubristic and authentic) and tolerance. Additionally, the role of empathy as a mediator was investigated. In this study, pride was included as an independent variable, tolerance as the

dependent variable, and empathy as a mediating variable. On the basis of criteria, outlined by the EC-BSS at the University of Groningen, the study was exempt from full ethical review.

## **Procedure**

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

## **Measurements**

### ***Pride (hubristic/authentic)***

The relived experience measure by means of an open question is an adaptation from the research done by Ashton-James and Tracy (2011). The function of this question was to investigate whether described state feelings of pride are also distinguishable into hubristic and authentic pride and how these described experiences relate to the tolerance and empathy measures. To make sure the participants were not primed to either respond in a hubristic or authentic manner, the question included hubristic as well as authentic examples and was stated as follows: “Next, please recall a recent event in which you were successful, making you feel very proud. This experience of pride could be due to the effort you have invested prior to success, or

due to how you are as a person (i.e., your natural talent or abilities), or perhaps a combination of both" (see Appendix A).

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

Authentic pride was assessed using the items: "I felt productive", "I felt like I am achieving", "I felt accomplished" and "I felt confident". The internal consistency for this scale was .773, which is acceptable. Hubristic pride was assessed using the items: "I felt smug", "I felt arrogant", "I felt stuck-up" and "I felt egotistical". The  $\alpha$  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"? 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  $\alpha$  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 ( $\kappa$ ) for the coded variable "Effort" was .820, which shows a good internal consistency. The  $\kappa$  for the coded variable "Ability" was .777, and the  $\kappa$  for the coded variable "Internal versus external attribution" was .704. These alphas show an acceptable internal consistency. The  $\kappa$  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	<b>.818</b>	.052
More important than others	<b>.812</b>	-.010
Superior	<b>.793</b>	.143
Stuck-up	<b>.763</b>	-.084
Arrogant	<b>.763</b>	-.120
Smug	<b>.666</b>	.134

Only person who mattered	<b>.663</b>	.120
Centre of attention	<b>.558</b>	.275
Accomplished	.073	<b>.838</b>
Like I am achieving	.094	<b>.826</b>
Productive	.064	<b>.751</b>
Confident	.102	<b>.645</b>

*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 objective of this study was to investigate whether the two forms of pride serve as predictors of tolerance, mediated by empathy. Firstly, we hypothesized that individuals who have more authentic pride feel more empathy towards those who do not share their views. With self-reported feelings of authentic pride, we did not find any support for this hypothesis. Moreover, observed feelings of authentic pride also did not show support for the hypothesis. There was no relation found between observed authentic pride and empathy. However, a small negative

relation was found, which suggests that when more authentic pride was observed, this was related to being slightly less empathetic towards others. This would suggest that when we observed more authentic pride, we also observed lowered empathy towards others. This could be due to the focus on personal achievements and accomplishments associated with authentic pride (Tracy et al., 2007), potentially resulting in individuals having a higher focus on the self. Perhaps, when individuals have more authentic pride, they concentrate less on others and are therefore less involved with other's perspectives and experiences. This, in turn, could result in a lowered empathy towards others.

Secondly, we hypothesized that individuals who have more hubristic pride feel less empathy towards those who do not share their views. With felt hubristic pride, we only found weak support for our hypothesis. This suggests that hubristic pride does to some extent relate to lowered empathy towards others. However, when hubristic pride was expressed more positively, we saw no relation with empathy. This suggests that when people report experiencing pride in a more positive way, this is not related to less empathy towards others. On the other hand, with observed feelings of pride, we found strong evidence for the hypothesis. With the more positively worded hubristic pride scale, we found a negative relation with empathy. This suggests that when people experience hubristic pride in a more positive way, this is related to lowered empathy. This suggests that people who report experiencing hubristic pride in a more positive way do not see themselves as less empathetic, while this relation with lowered empathy was clearly visible when their feelings of pride were observed by others.

Thirdly, we hypothesized that individuals who have more authentic pride are more tolerant towards those who do not share their views. For this hypothesis, we found contradicting evidence. Firstly, with self-reported feelings of pride, we found that authentic pride was

positively related to tolerance, supporting the hypothesis. However, with observed pride, we found that authentic pride had a negative relation with tolerance, contradicting the hypothesis. An interesting observation is that when people reported to have more authentic pride, they also reported to feel more tolerance towards others. However, when their feelings of pride were observed, we do not see this relation anymore and instead see a relation with lowered tolerance towards others.

Regarding the fourth hypothesis, we expected that individuals who have more hubristic pride are less tolerant towards those who do not share their views. With self-reported feelings of pride, we found no relation between hubristic pride and tolerance. However, we did find weak evidence for a negative relation between felt hubristic pride and tolerance. This would suggest that when hubristic pride is experienced in a negative way, this is related to lowered tolerance towards others. With observed feelings of pride, we also found evidence to support the hypothesis. When hubristic pride was experienced in a positive way, this was related to lowered tolerance. This could be due to a higher focus on the self and egotism, two of the characteristics associated with hubristic pride (Tracy et al., 2007). People with high hubristic pride could therefore be less focused on others' experiences and perspectives, therefore resulting in less empathetic and tolerant views.

Next, we hypothesized that the relation between authentic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. Given that authentic pride did not show any relations with empathy and only showed a relation with tolerance when it was observed, it was not possible to conduct a mediation analysis. We could therefore find no evidence to support this hypothesis.

Lastly, we hypothesized that the relation between hubristic pride and tolerance is mediated by empathy. With self-reported feelings of pride, whether that was positively

experienced or not, hubristic pride did not show any relations with empathy or tolerance. It was therefore not possible to conduct a mediation analysis. We could therefore find no evidence to support this hypothesis with felt hubristic pride. However, with observed pride, when hubristic pride was experienced in a positive way, this was related to lowered tolerance and empathy. Thus, with positively expressed hubristic pride, we found a mediation effect. This would suggest that when people experience hubristic pride in a more positive way, this is related to less tolerance, through lowered empathy. This provides support for the hypothesis. In conclusion, this study discovered a positive correlation between tolerance and self-reported feelings of authentic pride. On the other hand, observed feelings of authentic and hubristic pride showed negative associations with both tolerance and empathy. However, a mediation effect between positively experienced hubristic pride and tolerance through empathy became apparent, only when observed by others.

### **Theoretical and practical implications**

The present study makes several theoretical additions to the current body of knowledge regarding the interplay among the different forms of pride, tolerance and empathy. These additions improve our understanding of the role pride plays with regard to prosocial behavior, as indicated by tolerance and empathy in this research. The findings of the self-reported feelings of pride also further emphasize the distinction between authentic and hubristic pride, aligning with the study done by Tracy et al. (2007). However, when looking at observed feelings of pride, authentic and hubristic pride show fairly similar patterns.

Overall, we found very mixed results. Firstly, the study findings provide evidence for a positive relation between authentic pride and tolerance, but only with self-reported feelings of pride. This would suggest that people who indicate to experience more authentic pride are also

more tolerant towards others. This is in accordance with existing literature, where a positive relation between authentic pride and prosocial behavior was also found (Ashton-James et al., 2011; Tracy et al., 2007). According to Tracy et al. authentic pride is a more prosocial form of pride that promotes positive attitudes towards outgroups (2007). This could explain how authentic pride could foster tolerance. Secondly, the results from self-reported feelings of pride provided some evidence for the relation between hubristic pride and lower empathy and tolerance. Despite this evidence being weak, it does seem to support the theory that hubristic pride is related to less tolerance, for example through its associations with narcissism and egotism (Tracy et al., 2007). These findings would imply that individuals who feel more hubristic pride would be less empathetic and tolerant towards others. Additionally, we found evidence for a negative relation between observed hubristic pride and tolerance, when hubristic pride was expressed in a more positive manner. This suggests that people who experience hubristic pride in a positive way would be less tolerant and empathetic towards others.

However, regarding observed feelings of pride, the results show a contrast in the relation between authentic pride and empathy and tolerance. Firstly, we found no evidence for a correlation between observed authentic pride and empathy. However, a correlation between empathy and authentic pride was found in previous research (Ashton-James et al., 2011), and it is remarkable that we did not find this same relation. This could be due to the fact that we employed other-rated measurements for pride. Furthermore, existing literature often links authentic pride with prosocial behavior and altruism. We see this for example in the definition of tolerance, where it is associated with forbearance (UNESCO, 1995) and in other research, where authentic pride was found to be associated with increased empathic concern for others, consequently leading to lowered prejudice (Ashton-James et al., 2011). Given that prejudice and

tolerance towards others are opposing constructs, we would expect that authentic pride has a positive relation with forbearing behavior and therefore expectedly also with tolerance. This makes our findings very unexpected: when we observed authentic pride in people, we found a negative relation with tolerance. This would imply that people who have higher authentic pride would be less tolerant towards others who do not share their views. Further research is needed to fully understand this relation.

Moreover, in previous research, a positive relation between humility, tolerance and empathy was found (Byun, 2023). Research has also shown that humility is a characteristic associated with authentic pride (Ashton-James et al., 2011). This could imply that a higher level of authentic pride would correlate with a higher level of empathy and tolerance towards others. The measurement of empathy and tolerance in the research by Byun was comparable to the measurements employed in the current research. This difference in findings might thus be explained by the utilization of other-rated measurements in the current study. Our research has provided evidence for the incremental value of using an other-rated system to elicit more candid responses in topics that are susceptible to social desirability.

### **Strengths, limitations and future research**

With self-reported feelings of pride, authentic pride was positively related to more tolerance. However, when we observed feelings of pride, we also found contrasting evidence to this relationship. When we observed pride, we found a negative relation between authentic pride and tolerance, shedding light on potential adverse effects of authentic pride. This is in line with critique on the authentic pride scale, highlighting that authentic pride is not exclusively oriented towards prestige and prosocial behavior (Holbrook et al., 2014). This emphasizes the difference between how one feels pride and feelings of pride as observed by external sources. For instance,

when an individual reports to experience authentic pride in a positive way, this was related to more tolerance towards others. On the other hand, when we observed more authentic pride in people, they also appeared to be less tolerant towards others. Since this is a very interesting finding, future research should further investigate this difference.

The current research has a number of notable strengths. Firstly, this study developed a modified hubristic pride scale, resulting in a higher mean response compared to the original hubristic pride scale. This implies that when people are asked about hubristic pride in a more positive way (“I felt like the center of attention”, “I felt more important than others”), we see more responses than when asking about hubristic pride in a negative way (“I am arrogant”, “I am egotistical”). This would suggest that feeling arrogant and egotistical predicts less tolerance towards others, whereas feeling important does not. This offers greater insights into the experience of pride in participants and is therefore a valuable contribution to the research of pride. Secondly, the pride measure previously faced an internal validity problem. For instance, people who felt guilty about experiencing pride could have scored themselves higher on items associated with hubristic pride, which would reflect humility rather than for example arrogance. Conversely, people who would actually be arrogant might not perceive their feelings of pride as hubristic and may score themselves lower on the items associated with hubristic pride. In order to combat this issue, the current study added more positively worded items to the hubristic pride scale and also employed an objective coding procedure.

Moreover, the measurement of (hubristic) pride has previously proven to be problematic, partly due to its susceptibility to social desirability bias. An interesting observation is that individuals appeared to be reluctant to associate themselves with hubristic traits, resulting in a zero-inflation effect of the hubristic pride scale. Participants in this study could have given

responses they considered to be socially acceptable, leading to the possibility of bias and inaccuracies in the reported associations. The current study addressed this problem by employing both an observed measure and a self-report measure. Furthermore, this research emphasizes the difference in found results in pride measurement outcomes between self- and external ratings. The results from this study show that when introducing an objective rating procedure to the measurement of pride, a notable difference emerges in how one describes their own feelings of pride as opposed to how others observe the degree of pride expressed. Consequently, we were able to obtain more responses and insights on feelings of pride in participants. Therefore, future research might further delve into the distinction between self- and external assessment. Other research where similar methods of external rating were employed have also yielded more representative results (Bai et al., 2022; Kusano et al., 2022). This research provides further evidence that when participants are evaluated by significant others or strangers, a more representative image of their actual feelings of pride emerges. Nevertheless, further investigation into the variance between self- and other-rated measures could deepen our understanding of how the various types of pride influence tolerance and empathy.

However, the research did have some limitations. Firstly, our research was correlational. Therefore we can not speak of causality, but merely of relations between pride, empathy and tolerance. Additionally, it introduces the possibility of a directionality problem, which shows a correlation between variables, without clarifying which variable influences the other or whether there is a bidirectional relationship. Thus, future research into feelings of pride and its effects on empathy and tolerance could focus on more experimental studies, in order to also show causal relations between these constructs.

Secondly, it is important to acknowledge that the study focused on a specific context and population, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other cultural or demographic groups. The sample predominantly consisted of people from the United Kingdom. The Western concept of pride may differ from, for instance, Asian countries or the United States. Such cultural distinctions may be of significant influence on the perception of pride and its correlation with empathy and tolerance. This may affect the reliability of the empathy and tolerance measures. The chosen sample of this study was based on the need for participants to fully comprehend the questions and to be fluent in the English language. Moreover, due to our chosen measurement of tolerance and empathy, it was imperative for the scenarios presented along with the empathy and tolerance questionnaires to be counter-attitudinal. For instance, in the United States, where the death penalty is more accepted, participants might experience less difficulty relating to such a scenario, making it less counter-attitudinal. Thus, exploring potential cultural variations in the perceptions and consequences of pride should be a focal point for future research. By placing emphasis on incorporating a sample with participants from various cultural and demographic backgrounds, there would be more information about pride across different regions of the world, also resulting in a broader understanding of the concept and its effects. The inclusion of a more diverse sample would therefore contribute to a greater generalisability of the research findings.

Furthermore, this study employed a two-rater coding procedure to determine whether the stories provided by participants predominantly reflected hubristic or authentic pride. Similar to the concerns raised about other measures, this method is susceptible to subjectivity. Despite our efforts to ensure inter-rater reliability, raters are inevitably influenced by their individual perceptions of concepts like pride and arrogance. The adequacy of inter-rater reliability might

also stem from similarities among the raters themselves, given that they share similar cultural, demographic and educational backgrounds. While these characteristics align with those of the participants, they could have influenced the results of the coded variables. Therefore, in order to improve the reliability of the coding system utilized in this study, future studies could aim to preferably find raters with more diverse cultural and demographic backgrounds.

Moreover, in the current study, the potential interference of social desirability bias has been identified as a confounding factor to candid and precise measurement of feelings of pride. An interesting observation is that individuals were reluctant to associate themselves with hubristic traits. Since hubristic pride appeared to be more effectively assessed when rated by external sources, future research might further delve into the distinction between self-report and external rating. Other research where similar methods of external rating were employed have also yielded more representative results (Bai et al., 2022; Kusano et al., 2022). This provides further evidence that when participants are evaluated by significant others or strangers, a more representative image of their actual feelings of pride emerges. However, more research is needed on this subject. Further investigation into the variance between self- and other-rated measures could deepen our understanding of how the various types of pride influence tolerance and empathy.

In general, the present findings point to the need for continued research and theory concerning both facets of pride and their (behavioral) effects. There should be a particular emphasis on further refining the measurement of hubristic pride. While the present study has made improvements to the hubristic pride scale, the measurement remains imperfect and still has room for enhancements.

## **Conclusion**

The main conclusion of this study is that how feelings of pride are measured will be of notable influence on the research findings. This was clearly visible in the difference in findings between felt pride and observed feelings of pride. The current study highlights the incremental value of procedures involving external ratings in assessing feelings of pride. Regarding the additional results found in this study, hubristic pride only showed negative relations with empathy and tolerance. This is in line with previous research, which characterized hubristic pride as associated with egotism (Tracy et al., 2007) and narcissism (Ashton-James et al., 2011). The current study emphasizes the necessity of further developing an accurate scale for assessing pride, especially concentrating on the hubristic pride scale.

Moreover, the relation between authentic pride and empathy and tolerance is more unclear, given that we found contrasting results. With self-reported feelings of pride, authentic pride indeed appeared to have a positive relation to both empathy and tolerance. This implies that when people describe their feelings of pride as positive, this is associated with a more tolerant and empathetic view towards others. Conversely, observed feelings of authentic pride showed more negative relations with empathy and tolerance. This implies that when we observe more pride in a person, this has a relation with more self-centered and less altruistic behavior. Such tendencies could possibly reduce prosocial behavior and lead to lowered tolerance and empathy. This would be in line with the definition of pride made by Tracy et al., where it is characterized as a self-aware emotion, prompting individuals to focus on themselves and their behavior (Tracy et al., 2007). However, this research found positive effects of the feeling of authentic pride, which would contradict our findings. Thus, this type of pride particularly deserves more attention in future research.

In summary, pride appears to be a multifaceted emotion, both in its conceptualization and its effects. Further research is needed to refine scales that measure the different manifestations of pride and to explore the benefits of self- versus other-assessment procedures, especially in the discipline of social psychology.

## References

- Ashton-James, C. E., & Tracy, J. L. (2012). Pride and prejudice: how feelings about the self influence judgments of others. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(4), 466–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211429449>
- Bai, F., Lin, K. J., & Zhang, J. (2023). Self-other agreement and criterion-related validity of moral pride and hubris. *Journal of Personality*, (20230613).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12859>
- 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. Master Thesis. University of Groningen.

Chen, W., Hu, J., Jiang, K., Zhang. (2019). Getting ahead, getting along, and getting prosocial: examining extraversion facets, peer reactions, and leadership emergence. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(11), 1369–1386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000413>

Davis, M. H. (1983). The effects of dispositional empathy on emotional reactions and helping: a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality*, 51(2), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00860.x>

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>

Finlay, K., & Stephan, W. G. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 729–743. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00144>

Graziano, W. G., & Tobin, R. M. (2002). Agreeableness: dimension of personality or social desirability artifact? *Journal of Personality*, 70(5), 695–727. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1111/1467-6494.05021>

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). Empathy and moral development : implications for caring and justice. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1017/CBO9780511805851>

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* (Washington, D.c.), 14(1), 38–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035457>

Kusano, K., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2022). The quest for (eliciting) hubristic pride: nomological shockwaves/networks, attributions, and social desirability across different experimental manipulations. *Collabra: Psychology*, 8(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.38634>

Monroe, K. R., & Martinez-Martí, M. L. (2008). Empathy, prejudice, and fostering tolerance. *Ps: Political Science & Politics*, 41(4), 857–863.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508081122>

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

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

[https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=7R8\\_YR3](https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=7R8_YR3)

Tracy, J. L., Mercadante, E. J., & Robins, R. W. (2023). The viability and validity of the authentic and hubristic pride scales: reply to dickens and murphy (2023). *Emotion* (Washington, D.c.), 23(3), 894–898. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001183>

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: a theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(2), 103–125.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Emerging insights into the nature and function of pride. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(3), 147–150.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00493.x>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1995). A global request for tolerance—1995 United Nations year for tolerance.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000151830>

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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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	<b>.762</b>	-.137	-.064	.016
Modest	-.075	.082	<b>.703</b>	.125
More important than others	<b>.778</b>	.006	-.178	.135
Egotistical	<b>.794</b>	.049	-.135	.093
Superior	<b>.751</b>	.155	-.223	.178
Like I am achieving	.129	<b>.804</b>	.090	-.080
Smug	<b>.607</b>	.172	-.280	.143
Both strengths and weaknesses	-.153	.020	<b>.567</b>	.027
Only person who mattered	<b>.668</b>	.083	.008	.119
Center of attention	<b>.635</b>	.235	.174	-.220
Productive	.011	<b>.676</b>	.255	-.177
Stuck-up	<b>.789</b>	-.102	.036	-.041

Humble	-.039	.102	<b>.826</b>	-.064
Accomplished	.106	<b>.811</b>	.086	-.038
Little effort was needed because	.279	-.142	.180	<b>.813</b>
I was simply up for the task				

---

*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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	<b>.011</b>					
(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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	<b>.001</b>					
(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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	<b>.036</b>					
(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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	<b>.028</b>					
(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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	<b>.127</b>					
(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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
	<b>.159</b>					
(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 <sup>2</sup>	B	S.E.	95%CI	Beta	p
--	----------------	---	------	-------	------	---

---

**.497\*\*\***

(constant)	3.290	.461	[2.383,4.198]	<.001
cHPnew	-.072	.057	[-.183,.40]	.206
Empathy	.516***	.060	[.397,.635]	.475
cAP				.045
	-.147	.073	[-.291,-.003]	

---

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

### Story 3: May

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

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