

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Pride: A Meta-Analytic Project

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1dc313n8>

Journal

Emotion, 22(5)

ISSN

1528-3542

Authors

Dickens, Leah R

Robins, Richard W

Publication Date

2022-08-01

DOI

10.1037/emo0000905

Peer reviewed

Emotion

Pride: A Meta-Analytic Project

Leah R. Dickens and Richard W. Robins

Online First Publication, November 12, 2020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000905>

CITATION

Dickens, L. R., & Robins, R. W. (2020, November 12). Pride: A Meta-Analytic Project. *Emotion*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000905>

Pride: A Meta-Analytic Project

Leah R. Dickens
Kenyon College

Richard W. Robins
University of California, Davis

Pride is a complex construct, at times conceptualized positively (as a positive emotional reaction to a personal success) and at other times defined negatively (as exhibiting arrogant or conceited feelings and beliefs). Based on this dichotomy, Tracy and Robins (2007) proposed that pride consists of two facets: authentic pride (AP) and hubristic pride (HP). For over a decade, researchers have used this two-facet model to investigate similarities and differences between AP and HP. The current work aims to synthesize this body of research by presenting findings from a meta-analysis of the association between AP and HP and a wide range of personality characteristics, mental health outcomes, social status constructs, and attributional tendencies. Comprised of 94 independent samples ($N = 64,698$) of predominantly North American adults, meta-analyses (both unweighted and weighted random effects models) were conducted for the relationship between AP and HP, and for each outcome variable separately, resulting in 103 total analyses ($ks = 2-93$). This project provides strong evidence that AP and HP are empirically distinct constructs (meta-analytic $r = .13$) that often align in opposite ways with personality and related variables, with AP exhibiting associations that suggest better psychological health than HP.

Keywords: pride, emotion, personality, meta-analysis

Within the realms of philosophy, religion, and psychology, pride has presented a challenge. Is it a positive attribute—a virtue—or a negative one—a sin? Should it be cultivated, or should it be minimized? Many theorists—spanning across centuries—could argue either side successfully. On the one hand, it is a positive construct, relating to accomplishment and success. A confident, successful person is one to be admired. On the other hand, it is negative, suggesting self-aggrandizement and conceit, a synonym to hubris. An arrogant person is one to be reviled.

To deal with this complicated, two-sided nature of pride from a psychological perspective, Tracy and Robins (2007) devised a theoretical model, positing that pride consists of two facets: authentic pride (AP) and hubristic pride (HP). In this way, they formalized the distinction between the two sides. AP reflects the genuine, positive emotion following a success. It feels good to feel proud, it inspires us to persevere against hardship, and it signals to others that we are someone to respect and admire. HP, in contrast, indicates a more generalized or self-aggrandizing feeling of pride in oneself. Due to our innate abilities, we feel good about ourselves, regardless of context, and at times, this may cause us to come across as a bit full of ourselves.

Such a conceptualization of AP and HP—positive and negative—makes sense on the surface. On the one hand, we encourage our children to be proud of their achievements. We praise our children's efforts and hang their art up on our fridges. We aim to build a sense of pride in our kids with participation trophies, even perhaps suggesting they experience pride in the absence of true achievement! Overall, we try to cultivate their self-confidence across various life domains. On the other hand, we do not tolerate bragging, and we react negatively when people seem arrogant or pompous. It seems that perhaps there is a “correct” kind of pride or amount of pride, and social norms attempt to prevent us from expressing excessive pride.

Perhaps in a way, these positive and negative styles of pride equate with AP and HP. Pride is seen as positive if it is warranted and proportional to the achievement (like if a child created a great painting). It is negative if it is not warranted, or appears excessive (such as bragging extensively about one's character). Indeed, attributions matter. That is, how one explains one's pride may play a role in whether it is positive or negative. For instance, Tracy and Robins (2007; Study 7) found that AP relates positively to attributions of effort (e.g., I did well because I tried hard), indicating perhaps a genuine, positive instance of pride. HP, in contrast, relates positively to attributions of ability (e.g., I did well because I am great) and negatively to effort attributions. AP could be thought to reflect internal, unstable, controllable attributions, whereas HP reflects internal, stable, and uncontrollable attributions. These differences could help explain the positive and negative outcomes for individuals. It can lead to positive outcomes, like self-confidence and others' perceptions of confidence, as well as negative outcomes, like social conflict or negative social perceptions. Indeed, at face value, these two understandings do seem in line with Tracy and Robins' AP and HP model.

 Leah R. Dickens, Department of Psychology, Kenyon College; Richard W. Robins, Department of Psychology, University of California, Davis.

Thank you to Judith Hall for providing guidance on this project, and to Karinne Robbins, Bryn Rediger, Lauren Castelbaum, and Hannah Benton for assisting with coding.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Leah R. Dickens, Department of Psychology, Kenyon College, 203 North College Road, Gambier, OH 43022. E-mail: dickensl@kenyon.edu

That said, when considering the evolution of AP and HP, the picture of a positive/negative dichotomy becomes less clear. Tracy and Robins (2007) argued that these two distinct types of pride evolved separately, to solve distinct adaptive problems. For example, AP might motivate behaviors that facilitate the long-term attainment and maintenance of status, whereas HP might be a “short-cut” solution, proving status that is more immediate but fleeting. More generally, AP may promote status through relationship-oriented, prosocial means (i.e., “getting along”), whereas HP may promote status more by obtaining the admiration, if not the liking, of others (i.e., “getting ahead”). Tracy and colleagues later provided a more comprehensive analysis of the potential adaptive functions of the two facets, arguing that AP evolved to facilitate social status through prestige whereas HP facilitates status through dominance (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013; Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010). The prestige route would involve gaining respect among one’s peers, and earning one’s place using expertise and merit. The dominance route would, in contrast, mean gaining one’s position using intimidation and strength. Although both routes lead to the same outcome (increased social rank), they rely on different tactics. Again, this seems like a plausible argument, indicating the value of both AP and HP in terms of social survival, reinforcing pride’s evolutionary role. When conceptualized in this way, both AP and HP could be considered positive in the sense that they are both functional. Perhaps, then, the positive-negative dichotomy of AP/HP is overly simplistic.

Tracy and Robins developed the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (AHPS) to measure both constructs at both the state and trait level (with a minor change in wording; Tracy & Robins, 2007). AP is measured by participant responses to seven items, with a 5-point Likert scale from *not at all* to *extremely*. Participants indicate to what extent they currently (or generally) feel each of the following: *accomplished/like I am achieving/confident/fulfilled/productive/like I have self-worth/successful*. HP is measured by participant responses indicating to what extent they currently (or generally) feel: *smug/arrogant/conceited/stuck-up/egotistical/pompous/snobbish*. When considered at the trait level, scoring high on one or both of these facets of pride would indicate that one tends to experience these feelings more frequently in life, whereas scoring low would indicate one rarely feels pride. The reliability and validity of these scales has been assessed (Tracy & Robins, 2014), as well as their cross-cultural generalizability (Shi et al., 2015).

Many studies since 2007 have assessed both AP and HP using the AHPS, providing a rich literature to analyze.¹ By conducting meta-analytic procedures on available data sets, we can draw conclusions about the correlates of AP versus HP across the pride literature. In this way, meta-analysis can contribute to a more cumulative science, based on more data. Given the complexity of these two related constructs, it seems useful to examine the unique relationships AP and HP may have with various personality variables, status variables, and types of attributions, as well as how they relate to each other. Some studies have found positive correlations between AP and HP, but others have found negative correlations. Overall, what does the existing literature tell us about these types of pride? How can the literature inform our conceptualizations of AP and HP as two facets of the same emotion?

We made several predictions about the relationships between these two types of pride and outcome variables. In general, we expected AP would show healthy associations with most personality variables, such as self-esteem, conscientiousness, and positive affect, whereas HP would show unhealthy associations. We also predicted that AP would show positive correlations with social status variables like status merit and sense of power; findings for HP seemed less clear. That is, perhaps HP would correlate positively, if it truly reflects a global, self-aggrandizing pride. However, perhaps it would correlate negatively if it reflects a more fragile, volatile pride. As for attributions, the literature provided some findings that went against earlier work by Tracy and Robins (e.g., Holbrook, Piazza, & Fessler 2014a, 2014b), so using meta-analysis provided a statistical way to analyze the literature in its entirety.

Most researchers using Tracy and Robins’ (2007) AHPS have focused on correlations, so the present meta-analytical work presents Pearson’s *r* coefficients. Some studies have tried to manipulate AP and HP experimentally, generally by having participants write about a time they experienced either AP or HP, but these are a very rare minority. So, too, have some studies examined state AP and HP, but again these represent a small minority. To be as comprehensive as possible, we included as many studies as possible, making note of potential moderators. Indeed, another benefit of meta-analysis is the ability to test possible moderators, enabling us to see what variables might be relevant to our interpretations of the findings in the field. The current article synthesizes the literature using meta-analytic techniques, while also adding commentary on the findings.

Method

Literature Search Procedure

Online literature searches were conducted using PsycINFO, Google Scholar, and simple Google searches, encompassing all years through December 2018. With PsycINFO, search terms included *pride* and *proud*, along with related wildcard extensions, for all titles of work, resulting in around 800 citations. Searching was less systematic with Google sites (a limitation we note in the Discussion section). Reference sections of relevant literature were also searched for additional relevant citations. Lastly, inquiries were made on the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) listserv and sent to authors of relevant articles, to request any unpublished data or more recent publications.

Inclusion Criteria

Any study investigating the association between AP and HP was included, along with any studies that reported correlations between

¹ It should be noted that some researchers have not defined pride in this way. In both the emotion literature as well as the educational psychology literature, some theorists have defined pride as an emotion that functions to motivate achievement goals and perseverance toward those goals (e.g., Herrald & Tomaka, 2002; Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier, 2009; Williams & DeSteno, 2008, 2009). These theorists ignore the presumed dichotomy and instead focus on what Tracy and Robins would call authentic pride. Such work was not relevant for this project, but does exist as part of the broader pride literature.

AP or HP and other variables (if investigated by two or more studies). Only findings based on data utilizing the whole scale (all seven items for AP and all seven items for HP) with the 5-point Likert scale were included (for example, partial scales, like those used by Bureau, Vallerand, Ntoumanis, & Lafrenière, 2013 and Bolló, Bóthe, Tóth-Király, & Orosz, 2018, and altered Likert scales like those in Cohen & Huppert, 2018 were excluded, as the scales in their entirety and original form were of interest). Only studies regarding personal feelings of AP/HP—rather than ratings by others for perceptions of authentic or HP—were included. Studies focusing on both state and trait level AP/HP were included; the state-trait distinction was coded as a potential moderating variable. If studies manipulated feelings of AP and HP (generally giving participants a pride-related writing task before having them fill out the AHPS), these were included, but again this was coded as a possible moderator. The logic here is that perhaps genuine short-term experiences of pride or experimentally induced (contrived) short-term instances of pride might show stronger or weaker relationships with other personality variables, as these measures of pride are less enduring or stable as trait levels would likely be. We coded for state versus trait measures of AP and HP so that any significant difference between the two could be measured.

Variables

Most studies analyzed more than one related variable, which can be organized into personality traits, social status correlates, types of attributions, and other pride measures. All variables studied by at least two samples were included. All variables were measured with self-report scales. These variables and scales, along with citations and sample items, are presented in Table 1.

For personality correlates, we examined the associations of both AP and HP with: (a) self-esteem, (b) narcissism, (c) the Big Five personality domains (Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience), (d) trait anxiety, (e) need to belong, (f) independent and interdependent self-construal, (g) positive and negative affect, (h) depression, (i) guilt-proneness, (j) shame-proneness, (k) social anxiety, (l) social phobia, (m) loneliness, (n) self-enhancement, (o) patience, (p) behavioral inhibition/activation systems (including Behavioral Inhibition Scale, Behavioral Activation Scale (BAS) Drive, BAS Reward Responsiveness, and BAS Fun Seeking), (q) aggression, (r) proactive coping, (s) contempt, (t) collective self-esteem, (u) self-efficacy, (v) public and private self-consciousness, (w) implicit self-esteem, (x) envy (split by benign and malicious, if applicable), (y) self-control, (z) genuineness, and (aa) fear of negative evaluation.

For social status correlates, we examined associations of AP and HP with: (bb) self-reported perceptions of social status, (cc) social dominance orientation, (dd) dominance, (ee) prestige, (ff) status merit, (gg) pride display, and (hh) sense of power.

For attributions, these included those relating to (ii) effort, (jj) ability, (kk) external sources, and (ll) stable causes. Again, both AP and HP were correlated with these variables.

For other pride scales, these included (mm) the Test of Self-Conscious Affect Version 3 (TOSCA-3; alpha pride) and (nn) the Pride subscale of the Dispositional Positive Emotion Scale (DPES).

Recorded Variables

Each relevant article was coded by at least two independent coders (the first author and at least one undergraduate coder, trained in the task). In addition to the outcome variables described above, the following coded demographic moderator variables were recorded: (a) publication status (published, unpublished), (b) age of sample (adolescents, college students, or adults), (c) gender proportions of the sample, and (d) nationality of sample (United States/Canada, Asian, European, Australian).

Additionally, for each outcome variable, we coded whether or not any variables were controlled for, as a potential moderator. For example, some studies measured self-esteem controlling for narcissism, and vice versa. We coded those that controlled as 0 and those that did not as 1, so that any differences in effect sizes could be assessed. Similarly, some studies measured shame-proneness (and guilt-proneness) as the shame score controlling for guilt (guilt score controlling for shame) on the TOSCA. Lastly, some studies controlled for the other facet of pride (e.g., effect of AP on outcome controlling for HP, and vice versa).

Finally, many of our samples were obtained through the Department of Psychology subject pool at the University of California, Davis (UCD), during the years 2006–2018 (fall, winter, spring, and summer terms). These participants filled out a number of self-report scales at the beginning of the term, so that researchers could recruit appropriate subjects for subsequent psychology studies. For our purposes, their prescreening questionnaires provided useful data for our meta-analyses, as we were able to correlate AP/HP with a number of outcome variables assessed in the prescreening. Given that these data have larger sample sizes than most other studies, we coded data so that the type of sample (UCD subject pool data vs. other data) could be assessed as a moderator.

Summary of Characteristics

In all, 94 samples were included ($N = 65,698$). All materials, data, and studies are available on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/wvg7a/>). Table 2 gives the full list of study attributes. Of these, 39 were published, and 55 were obtained from unpublished work. Of these 55 unpublished studies, 32 were obtained through the UCD subject pool. Sixty-seven of all the samples used college-aged participants, 25 used adult samples, one used an adolescent female sample (Mosewich, Kowalski, Sabiston, Sedgwick, & Tracy, 2011), and one used a sample ranging in age from 13 to 89 (Orth, Robins, & Soto, 2010). Sample sizes ranged from 53 to 3,630 ($Mdn = 344$), due to the inclusion of large subject pool data sets. Samples ranged in their gender makeup from all male samples to all female samples (mean percentage female = 65%).

Moderators

As mentioned, a number of potential moderators were coded for: (a) state versus trait measures of pride, (b) publication status, (c) country of sample, (d) gender makeup, (e) age, (f) controlling for other variables, and (g) UCD subject pool data versus other data. Given the nature of the literature, it turned out to be difficult to analyze many moderators. First, because samples assessing state

Table 1
Analyzed Outcome/Personality Variables, Measures, and Sample Items

Outcome/personality variable	Measure	Sample item
Big Five traits		
Agreeableness	Big Five Aspects Scale (BFAS; DeYoung, Quilty, & Peterson, 2007)	"I take an interest in other people's lives."
	Big Five Inventory (44 item; John & Srivastava, 1999); Brief Big Five Inventory (10 item; Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003)	"I see myself as someone who is generally trusting."
Conscientiousness	NEO-Five Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1985)	"I take others' interests into account."
	BFAS (DeYoung et al., 2007)	"I want every detail taken care of."
	Big Five Inventory (44 items; John & Srivastava, 1999); Brief Big Five Inventory (10 items; Gosling et al., 2003)	"I see myself as someone who does a thorough job."
Extraversion	BFAS (DeYoung et al., 2007)	"I make friends easily."
	Big Five Inventory (44 items; John & Srivastava, 1999); Brief Big Five Inventory (10 items; Gosling et al., 2003)	"I see myself as someone who is outgoing, sociable."
Neuroticism	BFAS (DeYoung et al., 2007)	"I get upset easily."
	Big Five Inventory (44 items; John & Srivastava, 1999); Brief Big Five Inventory (10 items; Gosling et al., 2003)	"I see myself as someone who gets nervous easily."
Openness	BFAS (DeYoung et al., 2007)	"I like to solve complex problems."
	Big Five Inventory (44 items; John & Srivastava, 1999); Brief Big Five Inventory (10 items; Gosling et al., 2003)	"I see myself as someone who has an active imagination."
Affective traits		
Positive affect (PA)	Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988)/PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994)	Both use the same 10 items for PA: "I feel excited."
Negative affect (NA)	PANAS (Watson et al., 1988)/PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994)	Both use the same 10 items for NA: "I feel upset."
Guilt-proneness	Guilt-Proneness subscale of the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (16-item TOSCA-3; Tangney, Dearing, Wagner, & Gramzow, 2000)	Gives a scenario and possible reactions to it, which participants report on a Likert scale their likelihood of responding in such a way. "You walk out of an exam thinking you did extremely well. Then you find out you did poorly." Guilt-proneness reaction: "You would think: 'I should have studied harder.'"
	Guilt-Proneness subscale of the Guilt and Shame Proneness Scale (GASP; Cohen, Wolf, Panter, & Insko, 2011)	After realizing you have received too much change at a store, you decide to keep it because the salesclerk doesn't notice. What is the likelihood that you would feel uncomfortable about keeping the money?
	Guilt-Proneness subscale of the Test of Self-Conscious Affect for Adolescents (TOSCA-A; Tangney, Wagner, Gavlas, & Gramzow, 1991)	Gives a scenario and possible reactions to it, which participants report on a Likert scale their likelihood of responding in such a way. "For several days you put off talking to a teacher about a missed assignment." At the last minute you talk to the teacher about it, and all goes well. Guilt-proneness reaction: "I would regret that I put it off."
Shame-proneness	Shame-Proneness subscale of the Test of Self-Conscious Affect (16-item TOSCA-3; Tangney et al., 2000)	Gives a scenario and possible reactions to it, which participants report on a Likert scale their likelihood of responding in such a way. "You walk out of an exam thinking you did extremely well." Then you find out you did poorly. Shame-proneness reaction: "You would feel stupid."
	Shame-Proneness subscale of the GASP (Cohen et al., 2011)	You rip an article out of a journal in the library and take it with you. Your teacher discovers what you did and tells the librarian and your entire class. What is the likelihood that this would make you would feel like a bad person?

(table continues)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Outcome/personality variable	Measure	Sample item
	Shame-Proneness subscale of the TOSCA-A (Tangney, Wagner, Gavlas, & Gramzow, 1991)	Gives a scenario and possible reactions to it, which participants report on a Likert scale their likelihood of responding in such a way. "For several days you put off talking to a teacher about a missed assignment. At the last minute you talk to the teacher about it, and all goes well." Shame-proneness reaction: "I would feel like a coward."
Contempt	Dispositional Contempt Scale (Schriber, Chung, Sorensen, & Robins, 2017)	"I tend to disregard people who fall short of my standards."
Benign envy	Benign subscale of the Benign and Malicious Envy Scale (BeMaS; Lange & Crusius, 2015)	"If I notice that another person is better than me, I try to improve myself."
Malicious envy	Malicious subscale of the BeMaS (Lange & Crusius, 2015)	"I feel ill will towards people I envy."
Envy (undifferentiated)	Envy subscale of the Belk Materialism Scale (Belk, 1985)	"I don't seem to get what is coming to me."
Mental health		
Depression	Beck Depression Inventory (21-item BDI; Beck & Steer, 1993)	Choose the response that best reflects your feelings over the past week: 0 (<i>I do not feel sad</i>) 1 (<i>I feel sad</i>) 2 (<i>I am sad all the time and I can't snap out of it</i>) 3 (<i>I am so sad and unhappy that I can't stand it</i>)
	Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (20-item CES-D; Radloff, 1977)	Indicate the number which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way, DURING THE PAST WEEK. "I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with the help from my family and friends."
	The General Behavioral Inventory (GBI; Depue et al., 1981)	"Have you become sad, depressed, or irritable for several days or more without really understanding why?"
	Mood and Anxiety Symptoms Questionnaire-Short Form (MASQ; Watson & Clark, 1991); Mini-MASQ (26 items; Casillas & Clark, 2000) ^a	"How much have you experienced each item during the past week: felt depressed."
Trait anxiety	Trait subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-T; Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983)	"Generally, I am tense."
Social anxiety	Social Anxiety subscale of the Self-Consciousness Scale (SCS-R; Scheier & Carver, 1985)	"It takes me time to get over my shyness in new situations."
	Social Interaction Anxiety Scale (20-item SIAS; Mattick & Clarke, 1998)	"I have difficulty talking with other people."
Social phobia	Social Phobia Scale (20-item SPS; Mattick & Clarke, 1998)	"I can get tense when I speak in front of other people."
Loneliness	Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (20 items; Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980)	"I lack companionship."
Self-perceptions		
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)	"I feel that I have a number of good qualities."
	Single-Item Self-Esteem Scale (SISE; Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001)	"I have high self-esteem."
Narcissism	Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; items; Raskin & Terry, 1988); NPI-16 (16 items; Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006)	"I am more capable than other people."
	Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire (18-item NARQ; Back, Küfner, Dufner, Gerlach, Rauthmann, & Denissen, 2013); Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire-Short Form (6-item NARQ-S, Leckelt et al., 2018)	"I deserve to be seen as a great personality."
Independent self-construal	Independent subscale of the Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994)	"I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects."
Interdependent self-construal	Interdependent subscale of the Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994)	"I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in."

(*table continues*)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Outcome/personality variable	Measure	Sample item
Self-enhancement	Over-Claiming Questionnaire (Paulhus, Harms, Bruce, & Lysy, 2003)	"Indicate how familiar you are with each of the following items." Three of the 15 items do not exist (cholarine, ultra-lipid, plates of parallax), so any claimed knowledge about them would be overclaiming.
	Self-Enhancement Scale (SE-4; Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2008)	Compared to the average, how would you rate your overall academic ability?
	Self-Deceptive Enhancement subscale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1991)	"I am a completely rational person."
Collective self-esteem	Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992)	"In general, belonging to this group is an important part of my self-image."
Implicit self-esteem	Name-Letter Task (Baccus, Baldwin, & Packer, 2004)	Indicate your degree of liking of each letter of the alphabet. Calculations compare personal initials versus other letters.
Self-efficacy	Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale—Shortened (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998)	"I am strong enough to overcome life's struggles."
	New General Self-Efficacy Scale (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001)	"I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind."
Public self-consciousness	Public Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975)	"I'm concerned about what other people think of me."
	Public subscale of the Self-Consciousness Scale-Revised (SCS-R; Scheier & Carver, 1985)	"I care a lot about how I present myself to others."
Private self-consciousness	Private subscale of the SCS-R (Scheier & Carver, 1985)	"I'm always trying to figure myself out."
Genuineness	Perceptions of Personal Genuineness Scale (Holbrook et al., 2014a)	Participants were assigned to write about a boasting experience, or a genuine achievement. Then they had to rate the degree to which each item reflects thoughts they had about themselves during that experience. "I felt phony."
Self-regulatory variables		
Patience	3-Factor Patience Questionnaire (Schnitker & Emmons, 2007)	"I find it easy to be patient with people."
Aggression	Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992); Aggression Questionnaire-Short Form (AQ-SF; Bryant & Smith, 2001) ^b	"I have trouble controlling my temper."
Proactive coping	Proactive Coping Scale (Subsection of the Proactive Coping Inventory; Greenglass, Schwarzer, & Taubert, 1999)	"I am a 'take-charge' person."
Self-control	Self-Control Scale-Brief Version (13-item SCS; Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004)	"I am good at resisting temptation."
Motives		
Need to belong	Need to Belong Scale (NBS; Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, 2013)	"I want other people to accept me."
Behavioral Inhibition	Subscale of the Behavioral Inhibition and Activation Scales (BIS/BAS; Carver & White, 1994)	"If I think something unpleasant is going to happen I usually get pretty 'worked up.'"
BAS Drive	Subscale of the BIS/BAS (Carver & White, 1994)	"When I want something, I usually go all-out to get it."
BAS Reward Responsiveness	Subscale of the BIS/BAS (Carver & White, 1994)	"When I get something I want, I feel excited and energized."
BAS Fun Seeking	Subscale of the BIS/BAS (Carver & White, 1994)	"I crave excitement and new sensations."
Fear of negative evaluation	Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (Leary, 1983)	"I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make."
Social rank variables		
Dominance	Dominance subscale of the Dominance and Prestige Scale (Cheng et al., 2010)	"I enjoy having control over others."
	Personality Research Form Dominance Scale (16-item PRF-DO; Jackson, 1984)	"The ability to be a leader is very important to me."
Prestige	Prestige subscale of the Dominance and Prestige Scale (Cheng et al., 2010)	"Members of my peer group respect and admire me."
Self-perceptions of social status	MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000)	"Select the rung of the ladder that best reflects your overall social status relative to others."
Status merit	Status Merit Scale (SMS; Holbrook et al., 2014a)	"I've genuinely earned my place in society through hard work."
Social dominance orientation	Social Dominance Orientation Scale (16 items; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994)	"Some groups of people are inferior to other groups."

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Outcome/personality variable	Measure	Sample item
Pride display	Social Dominance Orientation Scale (4 items; Van Laar, Levin, Sinclair, & Sidanius, 2005) Pride Display Scale (Holbrook et al., 2014b)	"Inferior groups should stay in their place." "When you succeed in life, to what extent do you find yourself walking in a proud way (i.e., swaggering)?"
Sense of power	Sense of Power Scale (Anderson, John, & Keltner, 2012)	"I think I have a great deal of power."
Other pride scales		
TOSCA Pride	TOSCA-3 (Tangney et al., 2000)	Gives a scenario and possible reactions to it, which participants report on a Likert scale their likelihood of responding in such a way. "Your boss singles you out for a bonus because the project was such a success." Pride reaction: "You would feel competent and proud of yourself."
DPES Pride	Pride subscale of the Dispositional Positive Emotions Scale (DPES; Shiota, Keltner, & John, 2006)	"I am proud of myself and my accomplishments."
Attributions		
Effort attribution	Causal attributions for recalled events (Holbrook et al., 2014a, 2014b) Multidimensional—Multiattributinal Causality Scale (MMCS; Lefcourt, von Baeyer, Ware, & Cox, 1979)	"The event may be attributed to my hard work." "In my case, the good grades I receive are always a direct result of my efforts."
Ability attribution	Causal attributions for recalled events (Holbrook et al., 2014a, 2014b) MMCS (Lefcourt et al., 1979)	"The event may be attributed to my abilities." "The most important ingredient in getting good grades is my academic ability."
External causes	Causal attributions for recalled events (Holbrook et al., 2014a, 2014b)	Participants recalled events where either the target was recognized for a positive achievement for which they rightly deserved credit, or where a target accepted credit for an achievement for which they did not deserve credit. They then responded to several questions regarding causal attributions. "The event may be attributed to another person besides them."
Stable causes	Appraisals of Stable Causes for Successes (Holbrook et al., 2014a, 2014b)	"My achievements came from an inner quality I have that is stable or permanent—something about me that has always been there."

^a For both MASQ versions, we averaged Anhedonic Depression and General Distress to create a depression composite. ^b For both Aggression Questionnaire versions, if more than one subscale was given, they were averaged together to create an aggression composite.

AP/HP were so rare, we could not assess the state versus trait moderator at all. Similarly, although the country of the sample was considered potentially relevant, the vast majority of the studies were conducted in the United States and Canada, with limited variation otherwise, so this could not be assessed. For age, most of the samples used undergraduates, or wide-ranging Mechanical Turk or community samples, which limited us to make comparisons between only college-aged versus adult samples (with adult samples at times imperfectly including college-age participants as well). Finally, limited studies assessed outcome variables while controlling for other variables. Moderator analyses were only possible when self-esteem was the outcome and narcissism was the control variable.

Statistical Analysis

Each effect size was measured as a Pearson's r correlation coefficient. Most were supplied directly in the articles. At times, they were provided by authors, or they were calculated using the original data files supplied by the researchers. With Comprehen-

sive Meta-Analysis (CMA; Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2013), data were analyzed with a weighted random effects model. Additionally, an unweighted random effects model was also used, given the size discrepancy of the samples. A weighted random effects model allows researchers to assume that the studies included in the meta-analyses may vary at both the participant and study level (perhaps due to moderator variables), and that the samples included in the analyses represent only a sample of possible studies that have been conducted or might be conducted in the future (Hedges & Vevea, 1998). Findings of the weighted random effects model are considered generalizable to samples beyond those directly included, and take into account sample size. Unfortunately, this means that if smaller studies use different methodology or demographics than the larger studies, the methodology and demographics of the larger studies get more weight in the meta-analyses. The unweighted random effects model, in contrast, does not include sample size in its calculation, instead focusing on differences at the study level only ("between-studies variance"). With this model, one can make broader inferences

Table 2
Study Attributes (Percentages)

Variable	%
Age	
Adolescents	1
College	71
Adults	27
Full range of ages	1
Nationality	
United States/Canada	87
Europe	6
Asia	3
Australia	1
Multinational	2
Gender of sample	
Only women	1
Only men	1
Both genders	95
Unknown	3
Type of pride	
State pride	1
Trait pride	99
Publication status	
Published	41
Unpublished ^a	59
Type of data set	
UC Davis subject pool	34
Other samples	66
Research team	
Tracy, Robins	66
Other researchers	34

Note. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

^a Of the unpublished data, 58% of the datasets were from the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) subject pool.

about new studies, even when faced with a literature that includes varying sample sizes and methodologies (Hall & Rosenthal, 2018). Conducting both analyses allows a comprehensive understanding of the data. It should be noted that the p values calculated with CMA will, in general, be much smaller than the p values calculated for the unweighted random effects model, as the unweighted model simply consists of a one-sample t test testing the mean r against zero, with varying degrees of freedom.

Effect size magnitudes are deemed small ($r = .10$), medium ($r = .30$), or large ($r = .50$), according to convention (Cohen, 1977, 1988). Positive values indicate a positive relationship between AP or HP and the outcome variable, whereas negative values indicate an inverse relationship. For any sample that provided two effect sizes for one outcome variable (e.g., 2 measures of aggression), one average effect size was calculated in order to maintain independence; this is considered a conservative practice (Rosenthal, 1991; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1986). In order to pool effect sizes, the Pearson's r coefficients are Fisher z transformed, averaged, and transformed back to Pearson's r , before being analyzed.

Organization of the Meta-Analyses

Separate meta-analyses were conducted for each of the correlates of AP and HP. Given the number of outcome variables, this resulted in a total of 103 meta-analyses (51 meta-analyses concerning AP, 51 concerning HP, and one meta-analysis concerning

the relationship between AP and HP). First, we consider the overall relationship between AP and HP, and then the rest of the meta-analyses are presented in sections devoted to AP/HP's personality correlates, status correlates, causal attributions, and other pride scales.

Results

The majority of the results are summarized in Table 3. For both tables and text, weighted random mean effect sizes are presented first, followed by unweighted random mean effect sizes. Given the importance of comparing and contrasting AP and HP, these first tables are organized with this in mind. Tables 4–7 present more comprehensive statistical information for AP and HP separately, divided by type of outcome variable. These tables include the number of effect sizes (k) in each meta-analysis, the number of participants (N), the weighted and unweighted r , the 95% confidence interval (two-tailed, for weighted random effects), the combined Z , the homogeneity chi-square test (Q), and two measures of publication bias: the file drawer N and the trim-and-fill adjusted effect size. The combined Z reflects the measure of significance for the weighted random effects model (whether or not the results differ significantly from 0). Large Z values indicate results are rare and likely not due to chance if the true effect is exactly 0. The homogeneity chi-square test (Q) gives a measure for how varied the effect sizes are in the meta-analysis. Larger values indicate more spread, and may indicate moderators are influencing effect sizes, whereas smaller values indicate the effect sizes do not vary more than one might expect due to sampling error. Finally, both the file drawer N and the trim-and-fill adjusted effect size are measures of publication bias. The file drawer N indicates how many studies with null effects would be required to reduce the observed effect to nonsignificance. Small N s indicate the effect may not be robust, as it would only require a few past studies to have null results (filed away in file drawers). This value is two-tailed, calculated using Rosenthal's (1979) Fail-safe N , and included when appropriate for all meta-analyses with a k of at least 3. The trim-and-fill method provides an adjusted effect size estimate. It is based on the assumption that observed effect sizes in a meta-analysis should create a symmetrical funnel plot. This method trims studies that create asymmetry and then calculates a new effect size estimate from the remaining studies, which arguably represents an effect size less affected by publication bias.

General Relationship Between AP and HP

In total, 93 samples included the observed correlation between AP and HP. The mean r was .13 (unweighted = .12), indicating a significant but small effect ($ps < .01$). The file drawer N was 9,503, indicating a robust effect, as it would take over 9,000 null effects to bring this finding to nonsignificance. The trim-and-fill adjusted r was .14, showing that, if anything, the true effect size might be slightly stronger without publication bias.

AP and HP and Their Personality Correlates

As predicted, self-reported AP has mainly positive relationships with personality correlates, indicating healthy functioning. Effect

Table 3

Effect Sizes Between Authentic and Hubristic Pride and the Studied Personality/Mental Health, Social Rank, and Attribution Variables

Outcome variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	AP	HP
Personality variables				
Big Five traits				
Agreeableness	41	41,527	.22** (.22**)	-.40** (-.40**)
Conscientiousness	41	41,501	.42** (.43**)	-.21** (-.21**)
Extraversion	39	40,441	.40** (.40**)	.06** (.05**)
Neuroticism	39	40,441	-.38** (-.38**)	-.04** (.05**)
Openness	39	40,441	.22** (.23**)	-.07** (-.07**)
Affective traits				
Positive affect	19	18,430	.66** (.66**)	.04** (.05*)
Negative affect	19	18,430	-.30** (-.28**)	.36** (.36**)
Guilt-proneness	14	10,601	.06 (.07)	-.18** (-.19*)
Shame-proneness	14	10,345	-.24** (-.24**)	.05 (.04)
Contempt	5	5,233	-.04 (-.03)	.32** (.32*)
Benign envy	3	877	.16** (.14)	.12** (.13**)
Malicious envy	3	877	-.22** (-.21)	.21 (.20)
Envy (undifferentiated)	2	1,019	.05 (.05)	.27** (.27**)
Mental health				
Depression	17	19,179	-.40** (-.39**)	.17** (.17**)
Trait anxiety	24	27,862	-.50** (-.49**)	.22** (.23*)
Social anxiety	12	14,839	-.39** (-.39**)	.11** (.11**)
Social phobia	11	16,349	-.45** (-.44**)	.10** (.01**)
Loneliness	10	11,228	-.45** (-.45**)	.24** (.24**)
Self-perceptions				
Self-esteem	57	47,866	.63** (.62**)	-.12** (-.12**)
Narcissism	46	44,258	.37** (.37**)	.35** (.35**)
Independent self-construal	20	20,798	.32** (.32**)	-.01 (-.01)
Interdependent self-construal	20	20,798	.08** (.09**)	-.12** (-.13**)
Self-enhancement	10	11,962	.38** (.38**)	.01 (.01)
Collective self-esteem	5	7,680	.13** (.11**)	-.03 (-.03)
Implicit self-esteem	3	2,702	.02 (.01)	-.12 (-.09)
Self-efficacy	4	1,324	.62** (.62**)	-.06 (-.06)
Public self-consciousness	3	1,976	-.10** (-.11)	.05 (.05)
Private self-consciousness	2	1,976	.05 (.04)	.05 (-.01)
Genuineness	2	220	.56** (.58)	-.65** (-.66)
Self-regulatory variables				
Patience	8	10,337	.20** (.19**)	-.34** (-.34**)
Aggression	8	4,105	-.17** (-.18**)	.33** (.35**)
Proactive coping	6	9,681	.56** (.54**)	-.07** (-.07**)
Self-control	2	1,086	.34** (.36)	-.19* (-.17)
Motives				
Need to belong	24	28,032	-.13** (-.13**)	-.014 (-.01)
Behavioral inhibition system	9	11,305	-.14** (-.14**)	-.20** (-.20**)
BAS: Drive	9	11,304	.27** (.27**)	.07** (.06)
BAS: Reward Responsiveness	9	11,305	.23** (.22**)	-.25** (-.25**)
BAS: Fun Seeking	9	11,305	.22** (.21**)	-.04 (-.04)
Fear of negative evaluation	2	603	-.33** (-.34)	.17** (.18)
Social rank variables				
Dominance	9	5,787	.20** (.20**)	.42** (.41**)
Prestige	6	4,841	.50** (.52**)	-.12* (-.13*)
Status merit	6	1,255	.58** (.58**)	-.13** (-.13**)
Perceived social status	5	1,444	.35** (.35**)	.11** (.10**)
Social dominance orientation	4	3713	.01 (.02)	.30** (.29**)
Pride display	3	639	.22** (.23)	.19** (.18**)
Sense of power	3	828	.46* (.46)	.10 (.09)
Attributions				
Effort attribution	7	2,026	.36** (.38**)	-.14** (-.16*)
Ability attribution	7	2,026	.29** (.31**)	-.02 (-.05)
External causes	3	713	-.13** (-.14**)	.19** (.22*)
Stable causes	2	800	.25** (.25*)	.04 (.07)

Note. AP = authentic pride; HP = hubristic pride; BAS = Behavioral Activation Scale. *k* indicates the number of samples included in each meta-analysis. The table presents weighted and (unweighted *r*).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Weighted and Unweighted Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, Combined Z, Tests of Heterogeneity, and Measures of Publication Bias for Authentic Pride Meta-Analyses Regarding Personality Variables

Outcome	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r_w</i>	<i>r_{uw}</i>	[95% CI]	<i>Z</i>	<i>Q</i>	Publication bias	
								File drawer	T-and-F <i>r_w</i>
Big Five traits									
Agreeableness	41	41,527	0.22	0.21	[.20, .24]	21.23**	157.81**	19,174	0.22
Conscientiousness	41	41,501	0.42	0.42	[.40, .45]	27.44**	398.78**	75,477	0.40
Extraversion	39	40,441	0.40	0.39	[.37, .42]	24.93**	387.43**	60,881	0.37
Neuroticism	39	40,441	−0.38	−0.37	[−.41, −.34]	−19.23**	593.76**	55,550	−0.34
Openness	39	40,441	0.22	0.23	[.20, .24]	22.59**	125.63**	16,956	0.21
Affective traits									
Positive affect	19	18,430	0.66	0.65	[.62, .70]	22.31**	392.55**	46,182	0.68
Negative affect	19	18,430	−0.30	−0.28	[−.32, −.27]	−22.86**	49.55**	7,318	−.30
Guilt-proneness	14	10,601	0.06	0.07	[−.02, .13]	1.52	152.36**		0.01
Shame-proneness	14	10,345	−0.24	−0.24	[−.30, −.19]	−8.96**	75.74**	1,893	−0.22
Contempt	5	5,233	−0.04	−0.03	[−.11, .03]	1.08	23.07**		−0.04
Benign envy	3	877	0.16	0.14	[.07, .24]	3.56**	3.03	13	0.16
Malicious envy	3	877	−0.22	−0.21	[−.31, −.12]	−4.17**	4.16	28	−0.22
Envy (undifferentiated)	2	1,019	0.05	0.05	[−.29, .37]	0.26	31.17**		
Mental health									
Depression	17	19,179	−0.40	−0.39	[−.46, −.33]	11.10**	405.48**	14,070	−0.42
Trait anxiety	24	27,862	−0.50	−0.48	[−.52, −.47]	−30.72**	184.59**	47,714	−0.46
Social anxiety	12	14,839	−0.39	−0.39	[−.42, −.36]	−23.80**	43.84**	7,154	−0.40
Social phobia	11	16,349	−0.45	−0.44	[−.47, −.43]	−42.01**	20.24*	10,262	−0.46
Loneliness	10	11,228	−0.45	−0.45	[−.45, −.43]	−42.90**	11.64	5,963	−0.45
Self-perceptions									
Self-esteem	57	47,866	0.63	0.61	[.60, .65]	32.30**	1,281.28**	309,416	0.59
Narcissism	46	44,258	0.37	0.37	[.35, .39]	33.60**	238.71**	71,424	0.36
Independent self-construal	20	20,798	0.32	0.31	[.24, .38]	8.28**	586.61**	8,959	0.30
Interdependent self-construal	20	20,798	0.08	0.09	[.06, .10]	6.75**	47.74**	568	0.07
Self-enhancement	10	11,962	0.38	0.38	[.30, .45]	8.48**	215.61**	3,605	0.34
Collective self-esteem	5	7,680	0.12	0.13	[.10, .14]	10.27**	4.25	143	0.12
Implicit self-esteem	3	2,702	0.02	0.01	[−.18, .22]	0.17	20.74**		0.02
Self-efficacy	4	1,324	0.62	0.62	[.56, .67]	17.02**	7.01	703	0.62
Public self-consciousness	3	1,976	−0.09	−0.11	[−.16, −.02]	−2.65**	3.46	10	−0.07
Private self-consciousness	2	1,976	0.05	0.04	[−.001, .10]	1.93	0.16		
Genuineness	2	220	0.56	0.58	[.04, .69]	5.78**	2.14		
Self-regulatory variables									
Patience	8	10,337	0.20	0.19	[.18, −.23]	14.83**	12.76	824	0.21
Aggression	8	4,105	−0.17	−0.18	[−.22, −.12]	−6.59**	15.73*	212	−0.16
Proactive coping	6	9,681	0.56	0.54	[.47, .64]	10.03**	188.83**	6,643	0.52
Self-control	2	1,086	0.34	0.36	[.25, .43]	6.81**	1.68		
Motives									
Need to belong	24	28,032	−0.13	−0.13	[−.17, −.10]	−7.85**	173.04**	2,627	−0.12
BIS	9	11,305	−0.14	−0.14	[−.16, −.12]	−15.03**	7.06	473	−0.14
BAS: Drive	9	11,304	0.27	0.27	[.25, .30]	20.93**	14.67	1,875	0.27
BAS: Reward	9	11,305	0.23	0.22	[.21, .25]	21.44**	9.95	1,246	0.23
BAS: Fun	9	11,305	0.22	0.21	[.18, .25]	11.77**	28.42	1,187	0.20
Fear of negative evaluation	2	603	−0.33	−0.34	[−.40, −.25]	−8.24**	0.51		

Note. BIS/BAS = Behavioral Inhibition and Activation Scales; *k* = number of effect sizes in the analysis. *N* = total sample size across all studies included. *r_w* indicates the weighted random mean effect size; *r_{uw}* indicates the unweighted random mean effect size. 95% CI indicates the 95% confidence interval based on weighted random mean *r*s. Combined *Z* values reflect weighted random effects. *Q* provides a measure of the homogeneity of effect sizes. File drawer indicates the number of null findings it would take in order to bring the observed effect to non-significance. T-and-F *r_w* indicates the trim-and-fill analysis, another measure of publication bias, which gives an adjusted effect size.

* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.

sizes (weighted/unweighted) are shown in Table 3, with more detailed statistics shown in Table 4. AP shows strong links with self-esteem, extraversion, conscientiousness, positive affect, proactive coping, and self-efficacy, whereas it has strong negative correlations with neuroticism, trait anxiety, social anxiety, social phobia, depression, and loneliness. In contrast, HP shows a somewhat different picture. HP has a significant negative relationship with self-esteem, and positive relationships with depression and

loneliness. Many other links are small but significant, such as the positive relationships with extraversion, neuroticism, positive affect, trait anxiety, social anxiety, and social phobia, and the negative relationships with conscientiousness and proactive coping. In 15 cases, HP shows an opposite pattern of significant effects to AP; at other times, HP has a nonsignificant effect, but is in line with the directionality of the effect shown with AP. In only two cases regarding personality correlates are the correlations similar

Table 5

Weighted and Unweighted Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, Combined Z, Tests of Heterogeneity, and Measures of Publication Bias for Hubristic Pride Meta-Analyses Regarding Personality Variables

Outcome	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r_w</i>	<i>r_{uw}</i>	[95% CI]	<i>Z</i>	<i>Q</i>	Publication bias	
								File drawer	T-and-F <i>r_w</i>
Big Five traits									
Agreeableness	41	41,527	−0.40	−0.39	[−.42, −.37]	−25.84**	387.70**	64,201	−0.37
Conscientiousness	41	41,501	−0.21	−0.21	[−.23, −.19]	−23.80**	112.08**	16,860	−0.21
Extraversion	39	40,441	0.06	0.05	[.05, .07]	9.84**	48.714	1,082	0.06
Neuroticism	39	40,441	−0.04	0.05	[.03, .06]	5.43**	72.09**	570	0.04
Openness	39	40,441	−0.07	−0.07	[−.08, −.05]	−8.89**	71.27**	1,485	−0.06
Affective traits									
Positive affect	19	18,430	0.04	0.05	[.01, .07]	2.61**	76.31**	81	0.05
Negative affect	19	18,430	0.36	0.36	[.32, .40]	17.45**	139.57**	10,439	0.38
Guilt-proneness	14	10,601	−0.18	−0.19	[−.29, .07]	−3.15**	405.00**	1,130	−0.11
Shame-proneness	14	10,345	0.05	0.04	[−.004, .10]	1.80	64.82**	55	0.06
Contempt	5	5,233	0.32	0.32	[.11, .51]	2.87**	246.02**	545	0.29
Benign envy	3	877	0.12	0.13	[.05, .18]	3.49**	0.21	7	0.11
Malicious envy	3	877	0.21	0.20	[−.01, .40]	1.91	17.95**		0.21
Envy (undifferentiated)	2	1,019	0.27	0.27	[.21, .33]	8.76**	0.12		
Mental health									
Depression	17	19,179	0.17	0.17	[.13, .22]	7.44**	148.92**	2,306	0.17
Trait anxiety	24	27,862	0.22	0.23	[.20, .24]	22.53**	56.58**	7,864	0.22
Social anxiety	12	14,839	0.11	0.11	[.07, .15]	5.36**	63.70**	490	0.10
Social phobia	11	16,349	0.10	0.10	[.07, .13]	6.4**	34.62**	381	0.09
Loneliness	10	11,228	0.24	0.24	[.19, .28]	9.24**	60.20**	1,487	0.25
Self-perceptions									
Self-esteem	57	47,866	−0.12	−0.12	[−.14, −.11]	−13.22**	192.20**	8,892	−0.12
Narcissism	46	44,258	0.35	0.35	[.34, .37]	43.97**	118.28**	60,861	0.35
Independent self-construal	20	20,798	−0.01	0.001	[−.05, .02]	−.67	114.15**		−0.01
Interdependent self-construal	20	20,798	−0.12	−0.11	[−.17, −.08]	−5.29**	195.20**	1,241	−0.12
Self-enhancement	10	11,962	0.01	0.01	[−.02, −.04]	0.26	40.27**		0.0003
Collective self-esteem	5	7,680	−0.03	−0.03	[−.07, .02]	−1.12	14.11**		−0.02
Implicit self-esteem	3	2,702	−0.12	−0.13	[−.18, −.07]	−4.31**	2.43	17	−0.14
Self-efficacy	4	1,324	−0.06	−0.06	[−.14, .02]	−1.55	6.04		−0.04
Public self-consciousness	3	1,976	0.05	0.05	[−.15, .25]	0.46	28.78**		0.05
Private self-consciousness	2	1,976	0.05	−0.01	[−.15, .25]	0.46	28.78**		
Genuineness	2	220	−0.65	−0.66	[−.77, −.49]	−6.32**	2.64		
Self-regulatory variables									
Patience	8	10,337	−0.34	−0.34	[−.37, −.30]	−17.30**	27.45**	2,430	−0.34
Aggression	8	4,105	0.33	0.35	[.26, .40]	8.74**	36.53**	822	0.33
Proactive coping	6	9,681	−0.07	−0.07	[−.11, −.04]	−0.38**	16.05*	69	−0.07
Self-control	2	1,086	−0.19	−0.17	[−.32, −.04]	−2.53*	2.95		
Motives									
Need to belong	24	28,032	−0.01	−0.01	[−.04, 0.01]	−1.22	78.51**		−0.04
BIS	9	11,305	−0.20	−0.20	[−.22, −.17]	−14.52**	15.26	948	−0.30
BAS: Drive	9	11,304	0.07	0.06	[.032, .11]	3.52**	33.55**	115	0.10
BAS: Reward	9	11,305	−0.25	−0.25	[−.31, −.19]	−8.01**	87.73**	1,645	−0.22
BAS: Fun	9	11,305	−0.04	−0.04	[−.08, .002]	−1.85	38.36		−0.03
Fear of negative evaluation	2	603	0.17	0.18	[.09, .24]	4.07**	0.43		

Note. BIS/BAS = Behavioral Inhibition and Activation Scales; *k* = number of effect sizes in the analysis. *N* = total sample size across all studies included. *r_w* indicates the weighted random mean effect size; *r_{uw}* indicates the unweighted random mean effect size. 95% CI indicates the 95% confidence interval based on weighted random mean *r*s. Combined *Z* values reflect weighted random effects. *Q* provides a measure of the homogeneity of effect sizes. File drawer indicates the number of null findings it would take in order to bring the observed effect to non-significance. T-and-F *r_w* indicates the trim-and-fill analysis, another measure of publication bias, which gives an adjusted effect size.

* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.

and significant: the positive relationship of both AP and HP with narcissism (.37/.37 for AP, and .35/.35 for HP), and benign envy (.16/.14 and .12/.13, respectively).

AP and HP and Their Social Ranking Correlates

Social ranking variables are presented in Table 3, with more detailed statistics shown in Table 6. We found positive rela-

tionships between AP and perceived social status, status merit, dominance, prestige, pride display, and sense of power. A nonsignificant relationship was found between AP and social dominance orientation (which measures one's mindset about the rights of certain groups over others, rather than one's social rank at the individual level). For HP, we found small, positive relationships with perceived social status, pride display, and social dominance orientation, and a medium effect with domi-

Table 6

Weighted and Unweighted Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, Combined Z, Tests of Heterogeneity, and Measures of Publication Bias for Authentic and Hubristic Pride Meta-Analyses Regarding Social Rank Variables and Attributions

Outcome	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r_w</i>	<i>r_{uw}</i>	[95% CI]	<i>Z</i>	<i>Q</i>	Publication bias	
								File drawer	T-and-F <i>r_w</i>
Authentic pride									
Social rank variables									
Dominance	9	5,787	0.20	0.19	[.11, .27]	4.70**	48.17**	310	0.25
Prestige	6	4,841	0.50	0.52	[.48, .53]	38.52**	4.66	1,527	0.50
Status merit	6	1,255	0.58	0.58	[.55, .62]	23.50**	4.17	817	0.58
Perceived social status	5	1,444	0.35	0.35	[.25, .43]	6.91**	14.59**	223	0.35
Social dominance orientation	4	3,713	0.01	0.02	[−.04, .06]	0.47	6.03		0.005
Pride display	3	639	0.22	0.22	[.11, .32]	3.86**	3.91	21	0.22
Sense of power	3	828	0.46	0.44	[.10, .71]	2.48*	54.80**	108	0.46
Attributions									
Effort attribution	7	2,026	0.36	0.37	[.25, .45]	6.44**	37.07**	420	0.36
Ability attribution	7	2,026	0.29	0.29	[.14, .42]	3.77**	68.60**	218	0.39
External causes	3	713	−0.13	−0.14	[−.20, −.06]	−3.50**	0.09	6	−0.12
Stable causes	2	800	0.25	0.25	[.19, .32]	7.24**	0.09		
Hubristic pride									
Social rank variables									
Dominance	9	5,787	0.42	0.41	[.34, .48]	10.18**	51.8**	1,860	0.42
Prestige	6	4,841	−0.12	−0.13	[−.22, −.02]	−2.33*	31.08**	27	−0.12
Status merit	6	1,255	−0.13	−0.13	[−.19, −.08]	−4.71**	3.85	27	−0.16
Perceived social status	5	1,444	0.11	0.10	[.05, .16]	3.97**	1.22	14	0.12
Social dominance orientation	4	3,713	0.30	0.29	[.23, .36]	8.41**	12.11**	324	0.27
Pride display	3	639	0.19	0.18	[.11, .26]	4.74**	0.35	14	0.21
Sense of power	3	828	0.10	0.09	[−.16, .34]	0.74	24.06**		0.10
Attributions									
Effort attribution	7	2,026	−0.14	−0.16	[−.22, −.05]	−3.02**	22.45**	53	−0.09
Ability attribution	7	2,026	−0.02	−0.05	[−.12, .09]	−0.33	31.61**		−0.02
External causes	3	713	0.19	0.22	[.11, .26]	4.96**	1.54	17	0.15
Stable causes	2	800	0.04	0.04	[−.06, .13]	0.74	1.96		

Note. *k* = number of effect sizes in the analysis. *N* = total sample size across all studies included. *r_w* indicates the weighted random mean effect size; *r_{uw}* indicates the unweighted random mean effect size. 95% CI indicates the 95% confidence interval based on weighted random mean *rs*. Combined *Z* values reflect weighted random effects. *Q* provides a measure of the homogeneity of effect sizes. File drawer indicates the number of null findings it would take in order to bring the observed effect to non-significance. T-and-F *r_w* indicates the trim-and-fill analysis, another measure of publication bias, which gives an adjusted effect size.

* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.

nance. However, we found no significant associations with sense of power, and negative associations with status merit and prestige.

AP and HP and Their Related Attributions

Attribution effect sizes are presented in Table 3, with more detailed statistics in Table 6. AP relates positively to effort attributions, ability attributions, and stable causes, while relating negatively to external cause attributions. For HP, there is no relationship to ability attributions or stable causes, and there are opposite effects as those seen for AP for effort and external causes. These findings are interesting, as they in some ways go against what one would expect based on the AP/HP model.

AP and HP and Other Pride Scales

AP and HP were also examined in relation to two other pride measures: the TOSCA trait Pride scale and the DPES trait Pride scale. Detailed statistics are offered in Table 7. AP showed somewhat small but significant effects with the TOSCA Pride scale (.19/.17); HP showed no significant relation (−.07/−.04). AP

showed a strong significant relationship with DPES pride (.74/.74), while HP's relationship was basically nonexistent (.001/.01).

Moderators

Moderator analyses were conducted for publication status, gender makeup of sample, age group, UCD subject pool data versus other data, and controlled variables. For categorical moderator analysis, meta-analyses were included if the number of samples and coding of samples allowed for at least five effect sizes per group analyzed. Unfortunately, this limited the number of analyses that could be conducted (a limitation addressed in the Discussion section). We did, however, conduct moderator analyses regardless of the heterogeneity of the effect sizes, as per the recommendations of Hall and Rosenthal (1991), who argue moderator effects are not necessarily limited by the degree of heterogeneity. Analyses were done for both weighted random and unweighted random effects, which are given in order in parentheses. It should be noted that moderator analyses for weighted random effects are more powerful than unweighted random effects; this is evident in the numerous discrepancies in *p* values. For the purposes of this paper, we will report effects as long as they were found to be significant with

Table 7

Weighted and Unweighted Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, Combined Z, Tests of Heterogeneity, and Measures of Publication Bias for Authentic and Hubristic Pride Meta-Analyses Regarding Other Pride Variables

Outcome	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r_w</i>	<i>r_{uw}</i>	[95% CI]	<i>Z</i>	<i>Q</i>	Publication bias	
								File drawer	T-and-F <i>r_w</i>
Authentic pride									
DPES Pride	4	981	0.74	0.74	[.71, .77]	29.67**	2.22	894	0.74
TOSCA Pride	3	4,314	0.19	0.17	[.16, .22]	10.95**	2.37	98	0.21
Hubristic pride									
DPES Pride	4	981	0.001	0.01	[−.06, .06]	.03	2.11		−0.01
TOSCA Pride	3	4,314	−0.07	−0.04	[−.15, .01]	−1.67	11.28		−0.07

Note. DPES = Dispositional Positive Emotions Scale; TOSCA = Test of Self-Conscious Affect; *k* = number of effect sizes in the analysis. *N* = total sample size across all studies included. *r_w* indicates the weighted random mean effect size; *r_{uw}* indicates the unweighted random mean effect size. 95% CI indicates the 95% confidence interval based on weighted random mean *r*s. Combined *Z* values reflect weighted random effects. *Q* provides a measure of the homogeneity of effect sizes. File drawer indicates the number of null findings it would take in order to bring the observed effect to non-significance. T-and-F *r_w* indicates the trim-and-fill analysis, another measure of publication bias, which gives an adjusted effect size.

** *p* < .01.

weighted tests. Categorical moderator analyses were conducted using CMA for weighted analyses, and as independent sample *t* tests for unweighted analyses. As gender makeup was coded as a continuous variable, we used meta-regression.

For the general relationship between AP and HP, in terms of publication status, there was a significant difference between published work (.10/.08) and unpublished work (.15/.15). No effect was seen for the gender makeup of the sample, as tested with both Hedges and Olkin's (1985) meta-analytic weighted multiple regression analyses (testing the relationship between the continuous variable—percent female—and effect sizes), as well as a simple correlation for an unweighted model, using the Fisher's *Z* values and percent female. Grouping by age, there was no significant difference in either the weighted or unweighted random effects model, when comparing college students (.14/.14) to a general adult population (.11/.11). However, given that many of these adult samples included college-age participants, it is possible comparing groups that did not overlap would result in a larger difference. There was a significant effect for the UCD subject pool data versus other data moderator, with subject pool data showing a larger effect (.14/.16) than other data (.10/.10).

For AP, the only significant difference between published and unpublished work was found for agreeableness, with published studies having weaker effects (.17/.17) than unpublished work (.23/.23). No differences were found for HP.

In terms of gender makeup, for AP, only trait anxiety (only with weighted analysis) and positive affect showed significant effects. Findings indicated that when more men were present in the sample, there were weaker relationships between AP and trait anxiety and positive affect. For HP, only self-esteem, trait anxiety, interdependent self-construal (only weighted), and depression showed an effect for gender. These findings indicated that the more men in the sample, the stronger the link between HP and depression, and the weaker the links between HP and self-esteem, trait anxiety, and interdependent self-construal. Narcissism had a marginal effect for gender makeup indicating the more men in the sample, the stronger the link between HP and narcissism.

In terms of age, weighted and unweighted analyses found significant differences between age groups for AP for self-esteem. The models indicate that AP showed a stronger relationship to

self-esteem in adult samples (.69/.69) compared to college-age samples (.61/.60). For HP, neither model found a significant difference between age groups for self-esteem. For narcissism, although neither model showed differences for age groups for AP, both models were significant for HP. There was a significantly weaker relationship between narcissism and HP in college students (.34/.33) as compared to adults (.44/.44).

In terms of UCD subject pool data versus other data, only a few significant differences were found. For AP, both models were significant for narcissism, showing larger effects for the subject pool data (.40/.40) versus other data (.30/.31). They were also significant for AP and agreeableness, showing a larger effect for subject pool data (.23/.23) compared to other data (.18/.18). Guilt showed a weaker effect with AP for subject pool data (−.05/−.05) compared to other data (.14/.16), significant in both models. Finally, both models were significant for AP and positive affect, showing a smaller effect for subject pool data (.60/.60) compared to other data (.80/.79). The only difference for HP was using the weighted analysis for positive affect, indicating a smaller effect for subject pool data (.01) as compared to other data (.14).

Given the limited number of studies measuring one variable while controlling for another, moderator analyses were only possible when self-esteem was the outcome and narcissism was the control variable. As expected, the association between pride and self-esteem was weaker when narcissism was controlled for (*r* = .63/.64 for AP; *r* = −.20/−.17 for HP) compared to when it was not (*r* = .48/.47 for AP; *r* = −.12/−.11 for HP). Both weighted and unweighted analyses were significant for AP, but weighted was significant and unweighted marginally significant for HP.

Discussion

Overall, this meta-analytic project provides insight into whether AP and HP should be construed as two facets of the same emotion, and whether or not they should be measured with the AHPS. The results suggest that AP (as measured with Tracy and Robins' (2007) scale) reflects the "genuine" pride experience. It correlates strongly with self-esteem, status, and power, indicating its relevance in these domains. Perhaps it is an emotion that makes a person feel good about themselves and where they stand in the

social hierarchy, or perhaps (going the other direction) confidence and power make a person feel proud. AP appears to correlate with arguably adaptive personality constructs, status constructs, and attributions. Someone high in AP has many other positive features, which may add to the person's self-esteem and status. Additionally, the measurement of AP using the AHPS correlates significantly with other pride scales, lending more support to its authenticity and validity as a measure of pride.

In contrast, HP—at least as measured by the current scale—appears to negatively correlate with self-esteem and shows no relation to attributions of ability, suggesting that it is not about feelings of excessive pride or grandiose views of ability (either of which might lead to higher reported self-esteem). It is linked with higher levels of anxiety, higher depression, and higher contempt. According to this work, someone high in HP likely has many negative qualities, and unfortunately lacks many positive ones. These correlations may be more in line with the idea that someone high in HP has a fragile self-esteem—that perhaps they puff themselves up to try to exude confidence they do not possess. Additionally, HP, as measured by the AHPS, does not correlate with other pride measures, indicating it is not in line with how many other researchers have conceptualized pride. That is, for those researchers who have not defined pride as a dichotomous variable, their definitions of what they refer to as “pride” are in line with what the Tracy and Robins’ (2007) model would call AP and bear no relation to HP.

In terms of prestige and dominance, the current work helps to elucidate the picture. There is clear evidence that AP correlates positively with prestige, whereas HP correlates negatively. This supports the idea that AP might be functional in terms of helping people gain social rank via prestige. For dominance, both scales show significant positive correlations, with HP showing twice as strong a relationship (.42/.41) as AP (.20/.20). The overall pattern of associations suggests that HP functions to achieve social rank via dominance but not prestige, whereas AP facilitates gaining social status primarily through prestige but also to a lesser extent through dominance.

Although this research attempts to give a comprehensive picture of the state of the literature, certain limitations should be considered when interpreting the results. First, all meta-analyses have limitations, such as the fact that unpublished work is often not comprehensively included, and that the strength of the research area impacts the strength of the analyses (e.g., Gurevitch, Koricheva, Nakagawa, & Stewart, 2018). Fortunately, the present study included a significant amount of unpublished data. However, some of our meta-analytic results were based on small numbers of effect sizes (range $k = 2$ –92, mean $k = 14$, median $k = 9$), suggesting that these findings should be interpreted with caution.

Second, our literature search would have benefited from a more systematic approach. For PsycINFO, the search terms *pride* and *proud*—and their related wildcard extensions—were limited to the title of the work, which yielded about 800 articles that were all reviewed by research assistants. However, the use of Google Scholar and Google was less systematic, which may have produced a less representative sample of effect sizes.

Third, we were limited in the number of moderator analyses we were able to perform with current data. It is possible different relationships might be seen in different samples (for instance, in

different cultures). Future work on AP and HP should broaden the types of samples studied.

Fourth, although some findings were significant, they still had low file drawer N s, indicating less robust effects. For example, AP showed a significant negative effect for external attributions, suggesting higher rates of AP relate to lower rates of external attributions. However, this only had a file drawer N of 6, which indicates only six studies with null effects would have to exist for the finding to turn nonsignificant. Given this small value, one should view the finding with some caution. It should also be mentioned that the file drawer N assumes there is no p -hacking in the literature (e.g., Simonsohn, Nelson, & Simmons, 2014), which might not be an appropriate assumption. Because of this limitation, we also included the trim-and-fill method of assessing publication bias, as well as the publication status moderator analyses. Overall, there do not appear to be large differences between published and unpublished work, indicating the meta-analytic findings do reflect the true associations of AP and HP with the studied variables.

Lastly, this whole literature is based on self-report measures, which themselves have limitations. Claims about people's personality—and how AP and HP fit in—must be interpreted with the understanding that individuals are introspecting. We cannot say how AP and HP might impact actual behaviors, emotional reactions, attributions, and social status.

This research adds to ongoing debates about how exactly to conceptualize pride. The findings generally support the idea that AP is a positive and HP a negative construct, in line with how lay people might think of achievement-based pride versus hubris. AP is what we think of when we think of pride in an achievement, or in one's lifetime of achievements—a positive emotion or tendency to experience a positive emotion of success. HP, on the other hand, appears to be the negative side of pride. However, given the current findings, it is not excessive pride, nor is it pride due to grandiose views of one's ability. These findings show it relates negatively to a number of positive personality correlates and relates positively with negative. That is, people who report higher levels of HP also tend to report less positive personality attributes, status constructs, and attributions. At the same time, however, HP is not always negative, as it relates strongly to dominance, which may be beneficial to people's pursuit of higher social rank. In human societies where the social hierarchy determines who has power and resources, it is useful to find oneself at the top.

Given the state of the available data in the field, our understanding of the nature of pride, and how we are measuring pride, should be carefully considered. We agree with past researchers who say AP and HP are distinct constructs. As measured by the AHPS, they have distinctly different patterns of correlations with personality, status, and attribution variables. In fact, we calculated a vector correlation using the full dataset. This entails analyzing the correlation between AP's pattern of correlations with outcome variables, as related to HP's pattern. A vector correlation allows us to see if both facets show related patterns across all 53 outcome variables (as would be indicated by a positive correlation), or if they show different patterns, as would be indicated by a negative correlation. This type of analysis calculates across the number of variables (53), rather than across the number of studies or participants. We calculated $r(51) = -.42/-.45$ ($p = .002/.001$), indicating a significantly opposite pattern of correlations between the two facets.

This meta-analysis work, in sum, suggests that AP and HP are quite disparate constructs, accessing different experiences and showing differential relations with various personality and status variables. The present findings do not allow us to determine whether AP and HP are two facets of the same emotion or entirely distinct psychological constructs. Our findings do, however, support the model's portrayal of AP as a genuine pride experience (or dispositional tendency to experience genuine pride) that has positive outcomes. However, HP, at least in the way it is currently measured with the AHPS, is more complicated. It should be noted that the analyses for attributions were only conducted on small numbers of studies ($k = 2-7$), and thus caution is warranted when interpreting the findings. That said, given that HP correlates positively with external attributions and negatively with effort attributions, this suggests two possible things: (a) that people endorsing HP might simply perceive their successes as due to outside forces (rather than themselves), and (b) that their successes (or the credit they are receiving for the successes) are disproportionate with the amount of effort they have put forth. This understanding may, in turn, lead people to feel that their pride is disproportionate with their effort, as well, and might be coming across to others as arrogance. That said, HP does not correlate with public self-consciousness—a measure accessing one's tendency to care about what others think—and only shows a weak positive effect for fear of negative evaluation. Taken together, these findings suggest that people high in HP may not be overly aware of how others are perceiving them, but they may have some fear of being negatively judged by others. This fear, together with their endorsements of words like *snobbish* or *stuck-up*, may indicate some level of understanding that their excessive pride elicits negative responses from others (see Holbrook et al. 2014a, 2014b for a similar point). Perhaps the scale is measuring a combination of actual feelings of HP and an awareness that this feeling—and the verbal and non-verbal displays associated with it—elicits condemnation and disapproval from others. This possibility merits investigation in future research.

On the whole, the present analyses show that pride—genuine pride—can have many positive benefits for individuals, whereas hubris shows a more dysfunctional set of associations. It is important that researchers consider both the merits and limitations of the AHPS as a measure of pride. Further discussion would strengthen our field's understanding of such an important and complicated emotion.

References

- References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.
- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy white women. *Health Psychology, 19*, 586–592. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 440–450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002>
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., & Keltner, D. (2012). The personal sense of power. *Journal of Personality, 80*, 313–344. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00734.x>
- Baccus, J. R., Baldwin, M. W., & Packer, D. J. (2004). Increasing implicit self-esteem through classical conditioning. *Psychological Science, 15*, 498–502. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00708.x>
- Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*, 1013–1037. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034431>
- Beck, A. T., & Steer, R. A. (1993). *Beck Anxiety Inventory manual*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.
- Belk, R. W. (1985). Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world. *Journal of Consumer Research, 12*, 265–280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/208515>
- Bolló, H., Bóthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Orosz, G. (2018). Pride and social status. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1979. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01979>
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J., & Rothstein, H. (2013). *Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (Version 3)* [Computer software]. Englewood, NJ: Biostat.
- Bryant, F. B., & Smith, B. D. (2001). Refining the architecture of aggression: A measurement model for the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 138–167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2000.2302>
- *Bureau, J. S., Vallerand, R. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Lafrenière, M.-A. K. (2013). On passion and moral behavior in achievement settings: The mediating role of pride. *Motivation and Emotion, 37*, 121–133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9292-7>
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 452–459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452>
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 319–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.319>
- Casillas, A., & Clark, L. A. (2000, May). *The Mini Mood and Anxiety Symptom Questionnaire (Mini-MASQ)*. Poster presented at the 72nd Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 62–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 103–125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030398>
- *Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 31*, 334–347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004>
- Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (rev. ed.)*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, L., & Huppert, J. D. (2018). Positive emotions and social anxiety: The unique role of pride. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 42*, 524–538. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10608-018-9900-2>
- Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2011). Introducing the GASP scale: A new measure of guilt and shame proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 947–966. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022641>
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Depue, R. A., Slater, J. F., Wolfstetter-Kausch, H., Klein, D., Goplerud, E., & Farr, D. (1981). A behavioral paradigm for identifying persons at risk for bipolar depressive disorder: A conceptual framework and five validation studies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90*, 381–437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.90.5.381>
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 880–896. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.880>
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 522–527. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0076760>
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 504–528. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(03\)00046-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1)
- Greenglass, E. R., Schwarzer, R., & Taubert, S. (1999). The Proactive Coping Inventory (PCI): A multidimensional research instrument. Retrieved from <http://www.psych.yorku.ca/greenglass/>
- Gurevitch, J., Koricheva, J., Nakagawa, S., & Stewart, G. (2018). Meta-analysis and the science of research synthesis. *Nature, 555*, 175–182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature25753>
- Hall, J. A., & Rosenthal, R. (1991). Testing for moderator variables in meta-analysis: Issues and methods. *Communication Monographs, 58*, 437–448. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637759109376240>
- Hall, J. A., & Rosenthal, R. (2018). Choosing between random effects models in meta-analysis: Units of analysis and the generalizability of obtained results. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 12*, e12414. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12414>
- Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hedges, L. V., & Vevea, J. (1998). Fixed- and random-effects models in meta-analysis. *Psychological Methods, 3*, 486–504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.486>
- Herrald, M. M., & Tomaka, J. (2002). Patterns of emotion-specific appraisal, coping, and cardiovascular reactivity during an ongoing emotional episode. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 434–450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.434>
- *Holbrook, C., Piazza, J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2014a). Conceptual and empirical challenges to the “authentic” versus “hubristic” model of pride. *Emotion, 14*, 17–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031711>
- *Holbrook, C., Piazza, J. R., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2014b). Further challenges to the “authentic”/“hubristic” model of pride: Conceptual clarifications and new evidence. *Emotion, 14*, 38–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035457>
- Jackson, D. N. (1984). *Personality Research Form manual* (3rd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 17–34.
- Lange, J., & Crusius, J. (2015). Dispositional envy revisited: Unraveling the motivational dynamics of benign and malicious envy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*, 284–294. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167214564959>
- Leary, M. R. (1983). A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 371–375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167283093007>
- Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. M., & Schreindorfer, L. S. (2013). Construct validity of the Need to Belong Scale: Mapping the nomological network. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 95*, 610–624.
- Leckelt, M., Wetzel, E., Gerlach, T. M., Ackerman, R. A., Miller, J. D., Chopik, W. J., . . . Back, M. D. (2018). Validation of the Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire Short Scale (NARQ-S) in convenience and representative samples. *Psychological Assessment, 30*, 86–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pas0000433>
- Lefcourt, H. M., von Baeyer, C. L., Ware, E. E., & Cox, D. J. (1979). The multidimensional-multiattributational causality scale: The development of a goal specific locus of control scale. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 11*, 286–304.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one’s social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302–318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167292183006>
- Mattick, R. P., & Clarke, J. C. (1998). Development and validation of measures of social phobia scrutiny fear and social interaction anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 36*, 455–470. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967\(97\)10031-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(97)10031-6)
- *Mosewich, A. D., Kowalski, K. C., Sabiston, C. M., Sedgwick, W. A., & Tracy, J. L. (2011). Self-compassion: A potential resource for young women athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 33*, 103–123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.33.1.103>
- *Orth, U., Robins, R. W., & Soto, C. J. (2010). Tracking the trajectory of shame, guilt, and pride across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 1061–1071. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021342>
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17–59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-590241-0.50006-X>
- Paulhus, D. L., Harms, P. D., Bruce, M. N., & Lysy, D. C. (2003). The over-claiming technique: Measuring self-enhancement independent of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 890–904. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.890>
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2009). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: Testing a model of their joint relations with academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 115–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013383>
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741–763. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014662167700100306>
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 890–902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890>
- Robins, R. W., Hendin, H. M., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: Construct validation of a single-item measure and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 151–161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272002>
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9781400876136>
- Rosenthal, R. (1979). The “file-drawer problem” and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 638–641. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.638>
- Rosenthal, R. (1991). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research* (Vol. 6). Newbury Park, CA: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412984997>
- Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1986). Meta-analytic procedures for combining studies with multiple effect sizes. *Psychological Bulletin, 99*, 400–406. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.3.400>
- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Jour-*

- nal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 472–480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.3.472>
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Self-Consciousness Scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 687–699. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1985.tb02268.x>
- Schnitker, S. A., & Emmons, R. A. (2007). Patience as a virtue: Religious and psychological perspectives. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 18, 177–208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004158511.i-301.69>
- Schriber, R. A., Chung, J. M., Sorensen, K. S., & Robins, R. W. (2017). Dispositional contempt: A first look at the contemptuous person. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113, 280–309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000101>
- *Shi, Y., Chung, J. M., Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., Chen, X., & Zheng, Y. (2015). Cross-cultural evidence for the two-facet structure of pride. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 55, 61–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2015.01.004>
- Shiota, M. N., Keltner, D., & John, O. P. (2006). Positive emotion dispositions differentially associated with Big Five personality and attachment style. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1, 61–71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760500510833>
- Simonsohn, U., Nelson, L. D., & Simmons, J. P. (2014). P-curve and effect size: Correcting for publication bias using only significant results. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9, 666–681. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691614553988>
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580–591. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205014>
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 271–324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x>
- Tangney, J. P., Dearing, R. L., Wagner, P. E., & Gramzow, R. (2000). *The test of self-conscious affect-3 (TOSCA-3)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Gavlas, J., & Gramzow, R. (1991). *The test of self-conscious affect for adolescents (TOSCA-A)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 506–525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.506>
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2014). Conceptual and empirical strengths of the authentic/hubristic model of pride. *Emotion*, 14, 33–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034490>
- Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M. B., & Robins, R. W. (2008). Do today's young people really think they are so extraordinary? An examination of secular trends in narcissism and self-enhancement. *Psychological Science*, 19, 181–188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02065.x>
- Van Laar, C., Levin, S., Sinclair, S., & Sidanius, J. (2005). The effect of university roommate contact on ethnic attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 329–345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2004.08.002>
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1991). *The mood and anxiety symptom questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of Iowa, IA.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Expanded Form*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063–1070. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Williams, L. A., & DeSteno, D. (2008). Pride and perseverance: The motivational role of pride. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 1007–1017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.6.1007>
- Williams, L. A., & DeSteno, D. (2009). Pride. *Psychological Science*, 20, 284–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02292.x>

Received October 12, 2019

Revision received June 20, 2020

Accepted July 7, 2020 ■