Chapter 25

The meaning of pride across cultures

Yvette M. J. van Osch,[1] Seger M. Breugelmans, Marcel Zeelenberg, and Johnny J. R. Fontaine

The emotion literature suggests that we by now have a pretty good picture of what characterizes the emotion pride. We experience the social emotion pride when we compare ourselves to others after an achievement or the acquirement of desired resources (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). Pride temporarily enhances our feeling of social self-worth and status (Leary, 2007). It motivates us to show a more dominant posture, to draw social attention to achievements, and to put effort in maintaining or even extending the achievement and its positive social consequences (Fredrickson, 2001; Kövecses, 1986; Williams & DeSteno, 2008). However, it may be questioned whether these characteristics are universal across cultures. There have been various suggestions in the cross-cultural literature to the effect that this is not the case. In the current chapter, we use the GRID data to test several hypotheses about cross-cultural differences in pride.

The social aspect of pride is especially important for cross-cultural differences (Kitayama, Markus, & Kurokawa, 2000). On the one hand, pride can be a pleasant emotion (positive VALENCE) because it generally arises from situations that have positive outcomes for oneself. On the other, pride can be a negative, socially disruptive emotion because it distinguishes oneself from other people. It has been argued that cultures that emphasize the autonomy of the individual or the uniqueness of the self (e.g., individualist, or independent cultures) tend to focus on the positive aspects of pride, resulting in an evaluation of this emotion as pleasurable and desirable (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Cultures that emphasize the social embeddedness of the individual (e.g., collectivist or interdependent cultures) tend to focus on the socially disruptive aspect of pride, resulting in an evaluation of this emotion as undesirable. Pride can thus be seen as either a socially engaging or disengaging emotion, dependent on the construction of the self as either independent or interdependent (Kitayama, Markus, & Matsumoto, 1995).

There is scant empirical evidence for the view that in Asian (interdependent) cultures pride is seen as a more negative and undesirable experience than in Western (independent) cultures. The clearest support comes from a study by Stipek (1998). She found that: "Chinese respondents had a negative view of experiencing and expressing pride in personal accomplishments (. . .) In contrast, American respondents valued pride and did not, on average, agree that it was inappropriate to experience or express pride in personal accomplishments" (p. 626). Chinese respondents did feel positively toward experiencing pride for achievements that benefit others. A drawback of Stipek's study is that it focused mainly on cross-cultural differences in *antecedents* of pride, the type of events that elicit pride, rather than those concerning the *meaning* of emotion terms. Antecedents

[1] Correspondence can be addressed to Yvette van Osch, Tilburg University, Department of Social Psychology, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE, Tilburg. The Netherlands. E-mail Y.M.J.vanOsch@uvt.nl

do not necessarily say much about the meaning of the emotion pride or about the way pride is experienced or expressed. Another study by Scollon, Diener, Oishi, and Biswas-Diener (2004) also argued that "pride may be considered pleasant or unpleasant in particular cultures" (p. 321). They found that pride clustered with negative instead of positive emotions for respondents from India. However, this was not the case for respondents from Japan and the United States (US), two groups that should differ on the basis of cross-cultural theories about self-construal. So, it can be tentatively concluded that *theoretically* various differences have been suggested in the meaning of pride across cultures (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Kitayama, Markus, & Matsumoto, 1995), but that there is still a lack of *empirical* evidence supporting this claim.

On the basis of cross-cultural studies on emotion experience there is actually little reason to expect broad cross-cultural differences in pride. Many studies have shown very limited cross-cultural variation in the experience of emotions (Matsumoto, Nezlek, & Koopmann, 2007; Scherer & Wallbott, 1994; Wallbott & Scherer, 1986). Many emotion characteristics, such as appraisals (Scherer, 1996), phenomenology (Breugelmans & Poortinga, 2006; Fontaine et al., 2006), body sensations (Breugelmans et al., 2005), facial expressions (Ekman, 1994; Matsumoto et al., 2008), and nonverbal expressions (Tracy & Robins, 2008) show notable cross-cultural similarities. Those differences that are found tend to be item specific or situation specific (e.g., display rules; Ekman, 1973). The discrepancy between these studies and the theoretical expectations with regard to cultural differences in pride, calls for a more thorough analysis of cross-cultural variation in this emotion. The GRID data set provides a unique opportunity for such an analysis.

We investigated the extent of cultural variation in the meaning of pride at three different levels of analysis. At the *Emotion Dimension Level*, we explored the data for cross-cultural similarities and differences at the level of the four basic dimensions of emotional space. These dimensions are VALENCE, POWER, AROUSAL, and NOVELTY (Fontaine, Scherer, Roesch, & Ellsworth, 2007; see Chapter 7). We used several country level indices (see method section of the current chapter) to predict the factor scores of pride from each sample on the four emotion dimensions. Factor scores are the correlations between the variable (i.e., the item; in this case the country level indices) and the factor (i.e., underlying dimension; in this case one of the four emotion dimensions that underlie all emotional meaning). Higher factor scores indicate that an item is stronger related to the emotion dimension; alternatively, it could be said that the higher the factor score of an item, the better it represents the emotion dimension. The most important dimension for potential cross-cultural differences would be the first dimension of VALENCE (positive–negative). Based on cultural theory, it could be expected that a strong endorsement of individualism, which corresponds with an independent self-construal (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002), is related to a more positive meaning of pride. Cultures high in individualism endorse the distinctness of an individual, allow people to "do their own thing," and make the leaving and finding of in-groups easier (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). Because pride is associated with distinguishing oneself from the in-group, in cultures where uniqueness is valued, the word pride is expected to have a more positive association, than in cultures where conformity is valued. This should express itself as a higher factor loading for pride on the VALENCE dimension for cultures scoring high on individualism.

At the *Pride Aspect Level*, we identified specific items that are most relevant to the emotion pride. The GRID project is aimed at a broad selection of emotions, including 144 emotion features to study 24 emotion terms. Not all 144 emotion features are equally relevant for pride. We selected 22 items that are most relevant for this emotion (see Table 25.1). Item selection was based on an extensive literature review. Pride results from meaningful achievements that are attributed to the self (Leary, 2007; Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, & O'Connor, 1987), leading to the selection of the items

Table 25.1 Centered mean scores on the 22 pride items for the samples from the US and Japan

Item	US	Japan	Mean difference
Felt in control	1.45	1.51	–0.06
Tried to control intensity of the emotional feeling	–0.28	0.01	–0.29
Consequences able to live with	0.68	0.63	0.05
Center of attention	1.58	1.51	0.07
Important and relevant for person's goals	1.40	1.48	–0.08
Smiled	1.89	1.99	–0.10
Felt positive	1.80	1.41	0.39
Wanted to sing and dance	1.38	0.84	0.54
Wanted the ongoing situation to last or be repeated	1.57	0.42	1.15
Showed the emotion to others less than (s)he felt it	–0.08	0.08	–0.16
Felt good	1.75	1.93	–0.18
Showed the emotion to others more than (s)he felt it	0.88	0.65	0.23
Consequences positive for person	1.30	1.78	–0.48
Moved toward people or things	0.92	–0.47	1.39
Felt powerful	1.78	1.70	0.08
Wanted to show off	1.89	2.06	–0.17
Felt energetic	1.50	1.25	0.25
Wanted to be seen, to be the center of attention	1.91	2.06	–0.15
Felt strong	1.64	1.25	0.39
Had an assertive voice	1.29	1.49	–0.20
Felt dominant	1.77	1.64	0.13
Caused by the person's own behavior	1.25	0.59	0.66

"important and relevant for a person's goals," "felt in control," and "caused by the person's own behavior." People generally feel good about themselves and feel positive about the future when they experience pride (Herrald & Tomaka, 2002; Stipek, 1998; Tracy & Robins, 2007b), leading to the selection of the items "smiled," "felt positive," "felt good," "consequences positive for the person," "consequences able to live with," and "wanted to sing and dance." Pride makes people want to communicate their achievement to others in order to attain status (Leary, 2007; Tracy & Robins, 2007b), leading to the selection of the items "felt dominant," "had an assertive voice," "felt strong," "wanted to show off," "felt powerful," "wanted to be seen," "to be the center of attention," "showed the emotion to others more (and less) than (s)he felt it," "center of attention," "tried to control the intensity of the emotional feeling," and "felt energetic." Pride motivates achievement (Herrald & Tomaka, 2002; Higgins et al., 2001; Verbeke, Belschak, & Bagozzi, 2004; Williams & DeSteno, 2008), and social behavior (Boezeman & Ellemers, 2007; Hart & Matsuba, 2007; Tracy & Robins, 2004b), leading to the selection of the items "wanted the ongoing situation to last or be repeated", and "moved toward people or things."

From a subset of these items we constructed three scales of aspects of pride that, based on theory, are expected to differ across cultures (see method section of the current chapter). First, we composed a *Positivity* scale because the VALENCE of pride is said to differ across cultures (e.g., Scollon et al., 2004). Second, we composed a *Perception of Control* scale because the responsibility for an event is crucial in the elicitation of pride, and is suggested to differ across cultures. For instance, Americans mostly report pride for achievements they themselves controlled (i.e., caused), whereas Chinese also report instances in which the achievement was controlled by someone else (Stipek, Weiner, & Li, 1989). Third, we composed an *Expressivity* scale because cultural norms on the expression of pride are said to differ across cultures (Matsumoto et al., 2008) and are thought to affect pride. Markus and Kitayama (1991) hypothesized that in interdependent cultures the expression of pride may be avoided because it could be interpreted as being proud of one's unique attributes, which is contrary to the ideology of an interdependent culture. Thus, theory would predict cultural differences on all three scales, mainly along the dimensions of individualism; cultures low on individualism should lead to experiences of pride that are less positive, less controllable, and with less expression.

At the *Individual Item Level* we searched for clusters of countries on the basis of their scores across the 22 selected pride items. Thus, we tried to cluster countries according to their pattern of scores on the pride-relevant items. If cross-cultural differences are systematic, we would expect countries with a similar culture to cluster together and those with a different culture to appear in different clusters.

At the *Individual Item Level* we also focused on pride as a specific case comparison between the US and Japan and in a second comparison between a cluster of Western and Asian countries. The US and Japan are by far the most studied countries in cross-cultural comparisons of emotion (Van Hemert, Poortinga, & Van de Vijver, 2007) and are often put forward as the prototypes of interdependent and independent cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Standardized mean scores of both samples on the 22 pride items were probed for differences between these two cultures. Each sample was treated as one observation. On the basis of theory, we again expected pride to be seen as more negative, less controllable, and less desirable to express in Japan than in the US. In the second analysis, we looked at the extent to which differences between the US and Japan can be generalized to differences between Western countries (independent cultures) and East-Asian countries (interdependent cultures). The same differences in pride were expected between these two clusters as between the two countries.

25.1 **Method**

Data from 27 samples in the GRID data file were used: Canada (French), China (Mandarin), the Czech Republic, England, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy (samples from Bari and Bologna)[2], Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain (the peninsular samples were Spanish from Southern Spain and the Basque Land, and Basque from the Basque Land), Taiwan, Tunisia, Turkey, Switzerland (French and Romanisch), Ukraine, and the United States. Characteristics of the individual datasets can be found in Chapter 6.

Analyses at the *Emotion Dimension Level* and the *Pride Aspect Level* used several country level indices to explain cross-cultural differences in the factor scores of pride on the four overall factors

[2] Because the samples in this book were treated as independent samples, we also treated all samples as independent, even though some samples were similar in country and language.

of VALENCE, POWER, AROUSAL, and NOVELTY (see Chapter 7). Due to the quasi-experimental nature of cross-cultural designs, any difference between countries can be attributed to a large number of potential cultural characteristics (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). In other words, countries often differ on hundreds of characteristics such as economic level, climate, political system, and values. It is unclear which of these characteristics can explain any cross-cultural differences, when found. In order to be more specific in which country characteristics can explain cross-cultural differences in the meaning of the emotion term pride, we included several economic, political, and psychological variables.

As economic variables, we included the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and the Human Development Index (HDI). We used the GDP per capita (PPP US$) and HDI value over 2005. GDP is a measure for a nation's annual income and output in regard of the economy. The HDI index indicates how "developed" a country is and takes matters such as literacy, education opportunities, life expectancy, and GDP into account. Both indices were obtained from the United Nations Development Programme (2007), which is a report on human development in the period 2007–2008. GDP and HDI measures were not available for Taiwan.

As a political variable, we included the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) from the United Nations Development Programme (2007). The GEM indicates the level of inequality in a country, regarding the opportunities men and women have. GEM measures were not available for Taiwan and Tunisia.

As psychological variables, we included the country-level value scores of Hofstede Schwarz values. Five Hofstede (2001) value dimensions were included: Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, POWER Distance, and Long Term Orientation. Data were not available for Tunisia and Ukraine. Schwarz values were obtained from the World Value Survey (2005). These values originated from a shortened version of the Portrait Values Questionnaire. For every value, one item was included. Data for Canada, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Israel, Italy, Singapore, Slovakia, and Tunisia were not available.

At the *Pride Aspect Level*, we constructed three scales, each representing one of the aspects of pride that were expected to differ across cultures. Selection was done from the 22 pre-selected items that were relevant for pride (see introduction). Items were subsequently selected based on the content of the item and its relation to the three aspects. The scales were: (1) *Positivity*, which comprised the items: "felt positive," "felt good," "consequences positive for person," "consequences able to live with," and "important and relevant for person's goals" (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.66$); (2) *Perception of Control*, which comprised the items: "felt in control," "felt powerful," "felt energetic," and "felt strong" ($\alpha = 0.72$); and (3) *Expressivity*, which comprised the items: "wanted to show off," "wanted to be seen," "to be the center of attention," and "showed the emotions to others more than (s)he felt it" ($\alpha = 0.73$).

25.2 **Results**

Level 1: Emotion Dimension Level

Inspection of the factor scores for pride on each emotion dimension revealed that pride in all samples was seen as positive (ranging from 0.32 to 1.49) and powerful (0.52 to 2.31). In all but one sample (Turkey) pride was thought of as predictable (–1.56 to 0.05). On the AROUSAL dimension larger variation was found (–1.22 to 0.24); four samples had a positive score on this dimension (the UK, Singapore, Italy [Bari sample], and Israel). This means that pride in all countries was seen as a positive and potent emotion. Pride is generally also seen as an emotion that is predictable and, for most countries, pride is an emotion that is neutral to low in AROUSAL.

Factor scores of pride on each emotion dimension across samples were correlated with the country level indices. GDP showed a significant relation with the AROUSAL dimension, $r(26) = 0.41$, $p = 0.04$. This means that the higher the GDP of a country is, the higher the AROUSAL is that is associated with pride. So, in wealthy countries people see pride as an emotion with more AROUSAL than people in less wealthy countries. Uncertainty Avoidance also correlated with the AROUSAL dimension, $r(25) = -0.41$, $p = 0.04$, indicating that the larger the Uncertainty Avoidance is, the less AROUSAL is associated with pride. In other words, the more people rely on rules on how to behave the less AROUSAL they associate with pride. POWER Distance correlated significantly with the VALENCE dimension, $r(25) = -0.53$, $p = 0.01$; the larger the POWER Distance (i.e., the inequality of POWER relations) in a culture the more pride is seen as a negative emotion. POWER Distance was also correlated with the POWER dimension, $r(25) = 0.42$, $p = 0.04$; the larger the POWER Distance in a culture the more pride is seen as a powerful emotion. Finally, POWER Distance was negatively correlated with the AROUSAL dimension, $r(25) = -0.42$, $p = 0.04$; the larger the POWER Distance the less pride is seen as an emotion with high levels of AROUSAL. Correlations among the country level indices were: $r_{\text{GDP–UncertaintyAvoidance}}(24) = -0.25$, $p = 0.25$, $r_{\text{GDP–PowerDistance}}(24) = -0.66$, $p > 0.001$, $r_{\text{UncertaintyAvoidance–PowerDistance}}(25) = 0.06$, $p = 0.79$. GDP and POWER Distance were highly negatively correlated, which means that POWER Distance is less strong in more wealthy countries. Uncertainty Avoidance was unrelated to the other two indices. Even though GDP and POWER Distance were highly correlated, their unique variance related in the opposite direction to the AROUSAL dimension.

Level 2: Pride Aspect Level

Inspection of the sample scores on the three pride aspect scales revealed that the largest variation among samples was on the *Expressivity* scale (0.48 to 2.27) followed by the *Positivity* scale (0.81 to 1.80), and the *Perception of Control* scale (1.15 to 1.93). This means that, across countries, most differences are found on the question to what extent pride is an emotion that should be expressed or rather an emotion that should be kept to oneself. Less variation is found on the question whether pride is a positive or negative emotion, and least variation is found on the question whether pride is an emotion that is related to feelings of control.

Two of the three pride aspect scales were correlated to the country level indices. The *Positivity* scale correlated negatively with POWER Distance, $r(25) = -0.40$, $p = 0.05$, meaning that the larger the POWER Distance in a country the less positive pride feels. This finding is consistent with findings at the *Emotion Dimension Level* where we found that higher POWER Distance was related to a negative score on the VALENCE dimension of emotions. Significant correlations were also found between the *Perception of Control* scale and the Schwartz values of POWER, $r(17) = -0.51$, $p = 0.04$, and tradition, $r(17) = -0.49$, $p = 0.05$, indicating that in countries where social status and prestige are valued, or in countries where dominance over people and resources is valued, pride is seen as an emotion that is to a lesser extent under one's personal control. At the *Emotion Dimension Level* we saw that higher scores on POWER Distance were associated with higher scores on POWER. In contrast, at the *Pride Aspect Level* we see an inverse relationship; the more POWER is valued the less control is perceived. In interpreting these seemingly contradictory results, it is good to keep in mind that POWER Distance refers to the perceived inequality of actual POWER relations in a country, whereas the Schwartz value of POWER refers to the extent to which people want to have POWER and social status. In fact, both country level indices were highly negatively correlated, $r_{\text{PowerDistance–Power}}(16) = -0.75$, $p > 0.01$, meaning that people value the possession of POWER and status less in countries in which POWER is more unequally divided. Possibly, this shows that people adapt their aspirations

(wanting to obtain POWER) to the reality of their society (the possibility to obtain POWER). In any case, it does explain the inverse relationship between POWER Distance and pride, and Schwartz' value of POWER and pride. No country level indices were related to the *Expressivity* scale.

Level 3: Individual Item Level with country specific comparisons

Hierarchical cluster analysis was used in order to uncover meaningful clustering between samples on the pride items. Hierarchical cluster analysis combines two cases (samples) with the lowest squared Euclidean distances in subsequent steps, and thus seeks out similarity in scores (Norušis, 2008). The analysis starts out by taking each sample as an individual cluster (in this case, 27 different clusters), and in the final step all samples are in one cluster. In essence, this exploratory analysis will tell you to what extent groups of samples score a similar pattern on the items. Our samples were clustered on all 22 pride items (see introduction). The Agglomeration Schedule did not indicate a good solution; the distance statistic showed the largest drop between a solution with 25 and 26 clusters. With 27 samples in total this means that there is little similarity in patterns on these items across samples according to this fit index, and that almost each sample has a unique pattern. However, inspection of the vertical icicle plot and dendrogram, that both indicate the clusters at subsequent steps revealed an interesting pattern for a solution with nine clusters. The vertical icicle plot and dendrogram indicate, at each step, which samples cluster together. The solution with nine clusters consisted of two clusters of countries plus seven individual countries that each formed their own individual cluster (Czech Republic, Tunisia, Slovakia, Canada, Finland, Turkey, and Italy [Bari sample]). When we for the moment ignored these individual countries for the sake of exploring potentially meaningful clusters, we found on the one hand a Western cluster consisting of US, Switzerland (French sample), Germany, Estonia, Italy (Bologna sample), UK, and the Netherlands (listed in order of subsequent steps in the clustering) and on the other hand an East-Asian cluster consisting of Japan, Taiwan, and China. This latter cluster already appeared in a solution with 12 clusters, so it is quite stable. Even though these clusters are not pure the East versus the West (e.g., Singapore [English sample] could also be included in the Western cluster), it does suggest that there may be distinct cultural clusters that have a somewhat different take on what the word pride means. As representatives of the two clusters, we compared the item scores between Japan and the US (see Table 25.1). Inspection of the differences of item mean values suggests that North-Americans see pride as more positive, want the experience to last longer, celebrate it (sing and dance) more, try to socially connect (move toward others) more, and believe that they themselves are more responsible for the event that caused the person to feel pride. On the other hand, the Japanese see consequences of pride as more positive for the person than respondents from the US.

We also looked at whether similar differences in the meaning of pride would emerge if we compared the Western and Eastern clusters that emerged from the cluster analysis. If the differences between the US and Japan represent general cultural differences, we could expect the findings from this comparison to generalize to a comparison between East-Asian and Western cultural clusters. For each cluster, we computed mean scores for all pride items. We used data from the US, Switzerland (French sample), Germany, Estonia, Italy (Bologna sample), UK, and the Netherlands to compute a "Western score," and data from Japan, Taiwan, and China to compute an "Eastern score." Subsequently, we ran a MANOVA with these two clusters as the independent groups and all pride items as the dependent variables. As can be seen in Table 25.2, seven significant differences were found between the clusters on the items "tried to control the intensity of the emotional feeling," "felt positive," "wanted the ongoing situation to last or be repeated," "wanted to show off," "wanted to be seen, to be the center of attention," "felt strong," and "caused by the person's own behavior."

Table 25.2 Centered mean scores on the 22 pride items for a Western (US, Switzerland [French sample], Germany, Estonia, Italy [Bologna sample], UK, and the Netherlands) and an Eastern Cluster (Japan, Taiwan, and China)

Item	Western	Eastern			
	M (SD)	M (SD)	Mean difference	*F* (1,10)	Partial η^2
Felt in control	1.41 (0.23)	1.61 (0.19)	–0.20	1.72	0.18
Tried to control intensity of the emotional feeling	–0.46 (0.34)	0.16 (0.21)	–0.62	8.50*	0.52
Consequences able to live with	0.43 (0.28)	0.67 (0.05)	–0.24	2.15	0.21
Center of attention	1.56 (0.09)	1.55 (0.04)	0.01	0.10	0.01
Important and relevant for person's goals	1.40 (0.13)	1.11 (0.34)	0.29	4.26	0.35
Smiled	1.90 (0.19)	2.02 (0.04)	–0.12	1.10	0.12
Felt positive	1.83 (0.09)	1.32 (0.08)	0.51	72.94***	0.90
Wanted to sing and dance	1.42 (0.27)	1.20 (0.31)	0.22	1.33	0.14
Wanted the ongoing situation to last or be repeated	1.56 (0.019)	0.78 (0.33)	0.78	24.10**	0.75
Showed the emotion to others less than (s)he felt it	–0.04 (0.20)	0.08 (0.17)	–0.12	0.80	0.09
Felt good	1.84 (0.17)	1.66 (0.26)	0.18	1.83	0.19
Showed the emotion to others more than (s)he felt it	0.66 (0.17)	0.55 (0.09)	0.11	0.96	0.11
Consequences positive for person	1.43 (0.17)	1.65 (0.20)	–0.22	3.31	0.29
Moved toward people or things	0.79 (0.25)	0.29 (0.66)	0.50	3.52	0.31
Felt powerful	1.72 (0.16)	1.74 (0.08)	–0.02	0.03	0.00
Wanted to show off	1.63 (0.20)	2.08 (0.05)	–0.45	14.16**	0.64
Felt energetic	1.64 (0.22)	1.42 (0.15)	0.22	2.26	0.22
Wanted to be seen, to be the center of attention	1.73 (0.20)	2.06 (0.01)	–0.33	7.64*	0.49
Felt strong	1.73 (0.15)	1.35 (0.17)	0.38	13.01**	0.62
Had an assertive voice	1.37 (0.20)	1.22 (0.64)	0.15	0.40	0.05
Felt dominant	1.59 (0.27)	1.81 (0.15)	–0.22	1.77	0.18
Caused by the person's own behavior	1.27 (0.14)	0.85 (0.28)	0.42	10.41*	0.57

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001

In the Eastern cluster the intensity of pride was controlled more, pride was more associated with showing off and trying to be the center of attention than in the Western cluster. On the other hand, in the Western cluster, pride was felt as a more positive and stronger emotion, it was a desirable emotion that people wanted to last longer or repeat more than in the Eastern cluster. Furthermore, in the Western cluster, pride was more associated with a person having caused his or her own pride than in the Eastern cluster.

A comparison of the results for the US–Japan and East–West comparison shows substantial overlap in the direction of the differences in the pride items. Interestingly, the largest differences are found in the expression of pride. In contrast to what would be expected from the cultural theory of independent and interdependent selves, in the Eastern cluster, pride was associated more with controlling the emotion, showing off and wanting to be the center of attention. The Eastern cluster did rate the experience of pride as being less positive than the Western sample, which is in line with the cultural theory, but it must be noted that the score was still positive (i.e., pride is a positive emotion). These findings are in line with the results from the pride aspects, which indicated that the largest variation was found in the expressive components of pride, not in its experiential components of perceptions of control and positivity.

25.3 **Discussion**

In this study, we explored the GRID data for cross-cultural differences in the meaning of pride that could be expected on the basis of theories of cultural differences. In general, the results of this study are in line with previous cross-cultural studies on emotions (Matsumoto et al., 2007; Scherer & Wallbott, 1994); the meaning of pride shows strong similarities across cultures. Cross-cultural differences, when found, are mostly located in specific items and specific countries. At the level of *Emotion Dimensions* the data showed that people in most countries thought of pride as positive, powerful, predictable, and not very high in AROUSAL. At the *Pride Aspect Level* minor differences were found. Most variation was found in the expressivity of pride. Minor differences were found in the positivity of pride and the perception of control, based on cultural differences in the Schwartz value of POWER or POWER distribution. Cluster analysis at the *Individual Item Level* hinted at a division between Eastern and Western societies. Some differences were found between the US and Japan on individual pride items; these differences tended to generalize to differences between a cluster of Western and Eastern countries. Even though we did find notable differences at item level, it should be noted that differences were only found on seven of the 22 pride items. Thus, the data should not be interpreted in terms of large-scale differences in the meaning of pride. Evidently, the meaning of pride is to a large extent similar across these cultures. Differences are mainly found indicated in the expressive element of pride.

So, how do these results relate to the cross-cultural differences expected on the basis of cultural theories? The answers to these questions are sobering to researchers who assume strong effects of culture on the emotion of pride. Contrary to what was expected, the individualism–collectivism dimension did not relate at all to the evaluation dimension, nor to any of the other emotion dimensions and pride aspects. If anything, POWER Distance was the strongest correlate of cross-cultural differences in pride, both at the level of *Emotion Dimensions* and at the *Pride Aspect Level*. At the level of individual pride items, more differences were found, albeit in a minority of the comparisons (i.e., 7 out of 22). In line with cultural theories, pride was found to be less positively evaluated in Eastern than in Western cultures (though still positive in an absolute sense). However, most differences were found in items related to expressivity. Surprisingly, Eastern samples associated pride with *more* expression (i.e., showing off and wanting to be the center of attention) than Western

samples. This would seem to go against what would be expected on the basis of differences between individualism–collectivism and interdependent–independent cultures. Maybe it is exactly because pride is more expressive in Eastern countries that it is evaluated a bit less positively, but the size of the differences, in any case, does not warrant the expectation of large cross-cultural differences in the meaning of this emotion.

Our findings have implications for theoretical expectations about cross-cultural differences in emotions. In line with numerous studies on the experience of emotions (e.g., Breugelmans & Poortinga, 2006; Matsumoto, Nezlek, & Koopmann, 2007; Scherer & Wallbott, 1994; Wallbott & Scherer, 1986), we found that the characteristics of the emotion pride are to a very large extent universal. Any cross-cultural differences in pride are culture specific and item specific. This implies that theories on cross-cultural differences in emotion should be mainly concerned with a detailed level of emotion. By this, we mean that the cross-cultural variation should be searched for in specific items and specific situations. For example, pride may be experienced and expressed similarly across cultures, but the antecedents of pride as well as its specific behavioral expression may be affected by cultural situation-specific normative scripts (e.g., Yamagishi, Hashimoto, & Schug, 2008). Theories of broad cultural differences in emotion appear to have little rationale in empirical data. This is good news for emotion psychologists in general. Studies of the experience and function of emotions in one cultural setting are most likely to also bear validity for other cultural settings. Of course, this message should not be taken as a licence to conveniently ignore culture in emotion studies. Minor cross-cultural differences in the antecedents or experience of emotion can have major consequences for behavior as well as intercultural communication (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, & Sam, 2011).

One of the surprising findings of this study is that not individualism–collectivism, but rather POWER Distance is the most important dimension in cross-cultural differences in the meaning of pride. The greater the acceptance of POWER-inequality of a nation, the more negative pride is experienced. These findings seem to link to the idea that control and POWER are important aspects of pride (Lazarus, 1991a). How exactly cultural variables of control and POWER are related to pride is still unknown. We can only speculate that maybe the level of POWER-inequality of a country dictates the way pride is supposed to be experienced. For example, in a country where only a small percentage of the nation has most of the POWER, and where the majority will have no choice but to conform, people would not feel safe or comfortable to distinguish oneself from the group and become visible for the superior minority. Pride, almost by definition distinguishes oneself from the group, which in such societies can be an uncomfortable feeling, leading to insecurity. In any case, the dominance of POWER Distance suggests that any cross-cultural differences in emotion may not have so much to do with a focus on the individual or the collective, but rather with the social stratification and opportunities for social mobility in a country. This strongly suggests that comparisons between East-Asia and Western countries (notably the US) that are so pervasive in the cross-cultural emotion literature are not the best if we are to look for cross-cultural differences. A broader scope on the range of countries that are included in cross-cultural comparisons may open interesting new avenues for the development of theories regarding the relationship between culture and emotion.

One potential limitation of the GRID data file, and hence of the analyses that have been reported in this chapter, is that pride was studied by means of a single emotion term. Some languages distinguish between two terms that have different meanings and stand for two "types" of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). First, pride can be seen as authentic pride, which is the emotion we have been discussing in this chapter. Second, pride can be seen as hubristic or arrogant pride (e.g., Tissari, 2006). Another distinction is one between a morally good version of pride (e.g., the German term *stolz*), and a morally bad version of pride (e.g., the German term *hochmut*; Mulligan, 2009). For instance,

in the Basque language a distinction is made between *harrotasuna* and *harrokeria*. Even though *harrotasuna* is supposed to be the morally good version of pride in Basque, it is related to arrogance and haughtiness, and clusters into a negative-anger cluster of emotion words in a hierarchical cluster analysis (Alonso-Arbiol et al., 2006). The morally bad version of pride is often associated with vanity and narcissism, and is more a trait than a temporarily activated emotion state (Kövecses, 1986). People can act in a way that is vain or narcissistic, but this does not imply experiences of a specific emotion of pride. In this study, we focused on the emotion pride (we assume that the word for pride in other languages used in the GRID questionnaire referred to the emotion word for pride) and thus did not distinguish between the two types of pride. However, for the investigation of pride in countries where there are two words for pride, a distinction might be necessary.

An interesting possibility is that claims with regard to cross-cultural differences in pride are related to the morally distinct types of pride (which are denoted by different terms in other languages). As was stated in the introduction, pride can be a positive emotion (because we gain from pride) as well as a negative emotion (because we set ourselves apart from the group). These two sides show parallels with the distinction between a morally good type and a bad type of pride (for a similar discussion on envy see Van de Ven, Zeelenberg, & Pieters, 2009). So, it could be that the hypothesized cross-cultural differences in pride in the literature are caused by a different focus on different aspects of pride rather than on culturally distinct experiences of the emotion. So, if the word pride in, for instance, Japan is more associated with a negative view on pride, whereas in the US the word pride is more associated with a positive view on pride, then the differences we are talking about are not in emotion phenomenology but in semantics. Even so, the results of our analyses suggest that such semantic differences are restricted to specific items or characteristics of pride, not to the meaning of the emotion in general. A more extensive treatise on the two types of pride can be found in Chapter 24.

What does it mean to be proud? We set out to use the GRID data set to test theories with regard to cross-cultural differences in the meaning of pride. In theory, pride was a prime candidate for cross-cultural differences but we found little evidence for pervasive differences in the meaning of this emotion. POWER Distance (but not individualism–collectivism) was found to relate to cultural variation in emotion dimensions. However, none of the country level indices related to the expressivity of pride, which was the pride aspect that showed the largest cultural variation. Most differences that were found were confined to specific items. So, there may be subtle differences in meaning, but by and large pride refers to a similar emotion across cultural groups.

Acknowledgments

The data reported in this chapter was collected by several collaborators. They have also contributed helpful suggestions to the paper, and we would like to thank them for that. They are listed in alphabetical order (see the author index and list of GRID collaborators in this volume for additional details): Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, Roderick Cowie, Michael Eid, Shlomo Hareli, Ursula Hess, Keiko Ishii, Zoltan Kövecses, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marcello Mortillaro, Anna Ogarkova, Nataliya Panasenko, Hu Ping, Anu Realo, Klaus Scherer, Yuh-Ling Shen, Cristina Soriano, Diane Sunar, Heli Tissari, Eddie M. W. Tong, Aïda Zitouni. We thank Phoebe Ellsworth and Athanassios Protopapas for providing us with data from the US and Greece.