

Running Head: WHITE PRIDE PENALTY

Show your Pride?

The Surprising Effect of Ethnicity on how People Perceive a Pride Display

Toni Schmader Jason Martens

University of British Columbia

Jason Lawrence

University of Massachusetts Lowell

Please address correspondence to:

Toni Schmader, Ph.D.
Canada Research Chair in Social Psychology
2136 West Mall
Department of Psychology
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z4
CANADA
email: tschmader@psych.ubc.ca

This work was partially supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council under Grant 435-2013-1587 awarded to Toni Schmader.

Abstract

Non-verbal expressions of pride convey status. But pride displays can be interpreted as either authentic or hubristic. Given negative stereotypes about Blacks, we hypothesized that when displaying pride, Blacks would be rated higher in hubristic and lower in authentic pride compared to Whites. Contrary to predictions, three experiments found consistent evidence that Whites are judged to be more hubristic than Blacks when displaying pride. This effect occurred when pride was displayed in an unspecified (Study 1), academic (Study 2), or work-related context (Study 3). Effects were largely specific to pride displays and not a function of a general ethnicity-based response bias. We speculate that these counterintuitive findings might reflect a negative reaction to those with high status flaunting their success.

Keywords: Pride, Racial Prejudice, Self-Promotion, Status, Impression Formation

Word Count: 9353

Show your Pride?

The Surprising Effect of Ethnicity on how People Perceive a Pride Display

Positive feelings about the self are thought to be important markers of psychological health, well-being, and social inclusion (Leary, 2007; Taylor & Brown, 1988). It also behooves people to communicate their positive self-views to others to help those social perceivers gain an accurate but positive impression (Gilbert, 1997; Human, Biesanz, Parisotto, & Dunn, 2012; Martens, Tracy, & Shariff, 2012). Standing up straight, with an expansive posture, an upturned chin, and a slight smile is universally recognized by others as a signal of personal pride and status within the group (Tracy & Robins, 2008; Tracy & Robins, 2007a; Tracy, Shariff, Zhao, & Henrich, 2013). But for Blacks in North America, who typically have lower status in society and are stereotyped to be less competent and more aggressive on average, assuming a pride posture might be seen as an inauthentic overclaiming of status or a hubristic show of dominance to non-Black perceivers. Three experiments sought to test the hypothesis that as compared to Whites, Blacks displaying a pride posture would be perceived as showing more hubristic and less authentic pride. None of the experiments showed support for this hypothesis. Instead, all three experiments showed the reverse effects with Whites, not Blacks, being perceived more negatively for displaying pride.

Pride as a Display of Social Status

Research on self-conscious emotion has traditionally focused on negative emotions like shame and guilt. More recently, there has been extensive research demonstrating that pride is a distinct self-conscious emotional state with a universally recognizable non-verbal display (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008). People experience pride for positive achievements they attribute to

themselves (or to close others), and thus displays of pride are a social signal of one's positive self-views and competencies in either a global respect or specific to some event (Tracy & Robins, 2007b; Tracy, Weidman, Cheng, & Martens, 2014; Carney, Cuddy, & Yap, 2010, cf Ranehill et al., 2015). Perhaps because the pride display is thought to have evolved as a signal of one's competence, and thus status within a group (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999), expressions of pride are often automatically associated with status (Tracy et al., 2013; Shariff, Tracy, & Markusoff, 2012; Martens et al., 2012).

Research on pride has pointed to two different subjective experiences or perceptions of pride displays (Tracy & Robins, 2007a, 2007b). In their original theory, Tracy and Robins defined authentic pride as derived from an internal but effort-based attribution for a success, and hubristic pride as derived from making an internal but ability-based attribution for success (Tracy and Robins, 2007b). More recently, Holbrook, Piazza, and Fessler (2014) have offered a different interpretation suggesting that people feel authentic pride when they truly have the competence to justify the status they have achieved; but feel hubristic pride when their status is not backed by actual competence or abilities and is instead overclaimed. According to theory, those who feel and display authentic pride are more likely to have acquired higher status based on prestige for their competence and respect from others, whereas those who feel hubristic pride are more likely to have acquired higher status more by dominance and coercion (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010).

Regardless of the true source of one's pride, researchers have suggested that people might be advised to adopt a pride display to create a more positive impression and achieve better outcomes (Cuddy, Wilmuth, Yap, & Carney, 2015). For example, although initial reported effects on hormonal changes have been controversial (Ranehill et al., 2015), evidence suggests

that when people adopt a pride posture (or power pose), it can boost their subjective feelings of confidence and power and predict better performance (Carney, et al., 2010, Cuddy et al., 2015). Importantly, however, when perceived by others, the same pride display can convey either authentic or hubristic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007a; Shi et al., 2015). Because perceivers typically form positive rather than negative impressions of people (Human et al., 2012), one might expect that in the absence of other information, pride would generally be perceived as being more authentic than hubristic (Tracy & Prehn, 2012). However, we reasoned that one's ethnicity (either Black or White) might provide an important visible cue that could influence the degree to which a display of pride would be interpreted by non-Black perceivers as the authentic or hubristic variety. When members of disadvantaged minority groups are perceived as showing authentic pride as a group (e.g., in the context of a political protest), perceivers are generally more supportive of their cause (Ratcliff, Miller, & Krolkowski, 2013). Thus, it would be important to know if there are biases against perceiving authentic pride among minority group members in the first place.

How we Thought Ethnicity would Affect Perceptions of Pride

We sought to understand how a target's ethnicity affects the impressions people form of individuals who display pride. The *a priori* prediction was that when displaying a prototypical expression of pride, Blacks would be rated by non-Blacks (and perhaps especially by Whites) as showing more hubristic and/or less authentic pride compared to their White counterparts. A great deal of contemporary theory on racial prejudice supports these hypotheses. For example, we might expect members of the White majority group in North America to perceive Blacks who display pride as being too boastful. Given persistent racial gaps in income, educational attainment, and occupational advancement (Lin & Harris, 2009), Black Americans continue to be

associated with having lower status compared to Whites (and Asians) and being less competent in academic and professional domains (Plous & Williams, 1995; Steele, 1999). Juxtaposed against these stereotypes of lower competence in academic and professional pursuits, a display of pride might be viewed by non-Blacks as less authentically tied to actual competence or status.

Furthermore, stigmatized targets stereotyped to be less competent are sometimes penalized, in the form of negative social evaluations, for being assertive or self-promoting. Researchers have documented these backlash effects for White women (Rudman & Glick, 2001; Williams & Tiedens, 2016), Black men (Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012), and gay men who self-promote (Schmader, Croft, Whitehead, & Stone, 2013). In fact, high performing Black Americans shy away from publicizing their academic successes to the degree they fear such backlash (Phelan & Rudman, 2010). In perhaps the most relevant past research to our question, Hall and Livingston (2012) demonstrated that both Black and White football players who celebrated touchdowns were viewed as being arrogant, but Blacks were penalized more for this behavior compared to Whites. Given this theory and evidence in support of backlash, we expected Black targets to be rated lower in authentic pride compared to White targets displaying the same pride posture. Although we first tested this effect in a context-free setting (Study 1), we reasoned that such backlash might be particularly likely when pride is displayed for academic (Study 2) or professional success (Study 3). Our rationale was that if Blacks are presumed to be less competent in these domains relative to their White peers, then overt displays of pride would seem to be undeserved and therefore as less authentic and/or overclaimed.

In addition to the above reasoning for why Blacks might be denied authentic pride compared to Whites, we also predicted that Blacks would be seen as more hubristic compared to their White peers displaying pride. In addition to stereotypes of incompetence, Blacks (especially

Black men) contend with quite strong stereotypes of being angry, violent, and aggressive (Eberhardt et al., 2006, Correll et al., 2002; Devine, 1989; Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004, Payne, 2001). Because the pride display is so closely associated to status, power, and aggression (Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010) and because hubristic pride shows a particularly strong link to dominance (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010), a display of pride might be viewed as more threatening and thus as a sign of hubris when the target is Black (and male). For this reason, we expected Black targets to be rated higher in hubristic pride compared to White targets displaying the same pride posture. We suspected that this particular reaction was at the heart of the backlash against Black football players who celebrate their touchdowns in Hall and Livingston (2012).

The Current Studies

We describe three experiments designed to test the hypotheses that when displaying a pride expression, Blacks would be perceived to show less authentic and more hubristic pride compared to Whites by non-Black perceivers. In contrast to past research using archival sports footage as stimuli (Hall & Livingston, 2012) or group protest videos (Ratcliff et al., 2013), neither of which focused on the nonverbal emotional expression of pride *per se*, our goal was to use more controlled stimuli of individual emotional expressions and distinguish between the two forms of pride. In each study, perceivers were asked to rate the emotional expressions of targets on a measure of hubristic and authentic pride.

Study 1 compared responses to pride displays relative to other emotions (happy, neutral, and shame); Study 2 focused only on pride displays but added an ethnicity unspecified silhouette as a comparison condition and employed a between-subjects design; Study 3 compared perceptions of pride and happy (in contrast to neutral) since these two positive emotions are

often highly related, and their expressions share some aspects in common (e.g., a smile). Studies 1 and 2 used the emotion stimuli created and validated by Tracy, Robins, and Schriber (2009) in their foundational research on pride as a basic and universal emotion; Study 3 used more ecologically valid photographs of people in business attire displaying pride. Ratings were made with no contextual information in Study 1, a context of academic success in Study 2, and a context of hiring in Study 3. Studies 1 and 3 focused on perceptions of male targets and Study 2 manipulated target gender. Although our original predictions were specific to ratings of hubristic and authentic pride, we also summarize data on liking in Studies 1 and 2, and positivity of impressions, rated quality, and ranked preference for job candidates in Study 3. Finally, across two or more studies, we examined modern racism and social dominance orientation as potential moderators of effects, similar to other research that has examined beliefs in the legitimacy of ethnic status differences as a moderator of people's tendency to prefer Whites to Blacks when targets convey higher status (Weisbuch, Slepian, Eccleston, & Ambady, 2013).

As will become clear, these three studies actually revealed patterns that clearly contradicted our original hypotheses. When displaying pride (and often not when displaying other emotions), Whites were generally perceived to be more hubristic and sometimes to be less authentic compared to Blacks. This effect was found across different contexts, stimulus sets, target gender, sample type (college student, MTurk), and study design (within, between). The effect does not reflect a general tendency to avoid rating Blacks negatively. The samples (especially those using within-subjects designs) provided adequate power to test hypotheses. In the general discussion we will offer some speculation as to what these findings might suggest and articulate what future studies might examine to further refine theory surrounding these effects.

Study 1

Study 1 was designed to test our general hypothesis that pride displays would be seen differently depending on the target's ethnicity. We had a secondary hypothesis that this effect might be most apparent when White American perceivers feel that their racial superiority is threatened (i.e., by policies that could be seen as advantaging Blacks). To test this idea, Study 1 also included a manipulation of threat that is described below, but because this manipulation had no effect in this rather small sample and was not included in the follow-up studies, we describe it only briefly and the results will largely collapse across this factor in the design.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Forty-six White American participants (59% female; age $M=36$) were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk and completed a 3-part online questionnaire on accuracy in person perception in exchange for \$0.50.¹ The design of the study was a 2 (threat) x 2 (target ethnicity) x 5 (target emotion) mixed design with the second two factors varying within-subjects.

In Part 1 of the survey, participants completed a reading comprehension test that included three passages designed to manipulate racial threat, along with a single comprehension question after each. The first and third passages were filler passages on nuclear fusion and Wuthering Heights. The second passage was varied between participants to describe the success of affirmative action policies in employment rates among minorities, but to the disadvantage of Whites (195 words, threat condition), or the success of the disabilities act in employment rates

¹ Because our original hypothesis was specific to White Americans, we excluded data from 6 Asian, 4 Black, 1 Hispanic, and 2 multi-ethnic respondents.

among the disabled (215 words, control condition). The passages were designed to be as parallel to each other in sentence structure and content as possible. For instance, "Affirmative action [or "The Americans with Disabilities Act" in the control condition] has been a resounding success... Before affirmative action [disabilities act] programs were implemented, it was unheard of for Blacks [those with mobility issues] to compete with Whites [others without disabilities] for any job."

In Part 2 of the survey, participants completed a person perception task where they were specifically asked to make ratings of how "other people" would have rated ten images of male targets posing different emotional expressions (an instruction aimed at reducing self-response biases). These stimuli, which included equal numbers of Black and White targets displaying pride, happiness, shame, anger, or a neutral expression, were taken from the previously validated UCDSEE set of basic emotions (Tracy, Robins, & Schriber, 2009). Finally, in Part 3, participants filled out the Social Dominance Orientation scale (SDO; Sidanius, Levin, & Pratto, 1996), Modern Racism Scale (MRS, McConahay, 1986) and basic demographic information (occupation, education, socioeconomic status, political conservatism, and religion).

Measures

Emotion Ratings. As a check on the manipulation of emotional expression, participants were asked to rate how each target would be seen by others on single-item measures of *happy*, *ashamed*, *proud*, and *angry* using a 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much) Likert scale.

Hubristic and Authentic Pride. Participants indicated the extent to which the individual in each image would be rated as showing authentic and hubristic pride, each defined by a single item that listed the 7 adjectives used in the authentic and hubristic pride scales (Tracy & Robins,

2007b). Thus the following two items were rated from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Very much): "showed authentic pride (i.e., accomplished, like they are achieving, confident, fulfilled, productive, like they have self-worth, successful)" and "showed hubristic pride (i.e., arrogant, conceited, egotistical, pompous, smug, snobbish, stuck-up)".

Other impression ratings. Single item ratings of prestige, dominance, liking, intelligence, and attractiveness were included as exploratory items. Of these, only the effects on liking will be presented in detail as none of the other measures revealed significant effects of target ethnicity in response to pride – our focal emotion, all $ps > .10$. In other words, there was no evidence that the Black and White target stimuli displaying pride differed significantly in how dominant, prestigious, attractive, or intelligent they seemed.²

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). SDO ($\alpha=.95$, Sidanius, et al., 1996) is a previously validated measure of general positive orientation toward group dominance. It consists of 16 dominance-related phrases which are rated on the extent they are agreed with from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). For instance, "Superior groups should dominate inferior groups", and "It would be good if all groups could be equal" (reverse scored).

Modern Racism Scale (MRS). Participants completed the 6 item modern racism scale (McConahay, 1986). Items such as, "Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States," and "Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights," were rated

² Ratings on these other measures did, however, reveal a more typical tendency to perceive Blacks more negatively than Whites when emotions other than pride were displayed. Compared to the White target, the Black target was judged to be significantly less prestigious, intelligent, and attractive when displaying anger or happiness, all $ps < .05$. He was also seen as significantly more dominant and less intelligent when his expression was neutral, and less intelligent and attractive when displaying shame, all $ps < .05$. These patterns suggest that participants were not generally inclined to provide invariably more positive ratings to Blacks.

from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) and responses were averaged to yield a measure of racial bias ($\alpha = .91$).

Results & Discussion

Manipulation checks

A series of within-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVA) of the four target types on each emotion rating confirmed that images conveyed the intended emotions, $F_s(4, 180) = 296.53$ (happy), 131.56 (proud), 234.33 (angry), 166.86 (ashamed), $ps < .05$.³ Pairwise comparisons indicated that compared to each of the other conditions, happy images were rated as significantly *happier* ($M_s = 6.09, 5.47, 1.51, 1.38, \& 3.05$ for happy, pride, anger, shame, & neutral, respectively), pride images were rated as significantly more *proud* ($M_s = 5.85, 4.69, 2.54, 1.67, \& 2.94$ for pride, happy, anger, shame, & neutral, respectively), anger images were rated as significantly more *angry* ($M_s = 6.03, 1.44, 1.25, 2.35, \& 2.33$ for anger, pride, happy, shame, & neutral, respectively), and shame images were rated as significantly more *ashamed* ($M_s = 5.63, 1.35, 1.45, 2.32, \& 2.05$ for shame, pride, happy, anger, & neutral, respectively), $ps < .05$.

In the threat condition, all participants indicated a sufficient level of understanding of the threat passage: Of the 22 participants in this condition, 20 (91%) indicated that the affirmative action passage described how affirmative action programs are considered a success, while 2 (9%) indicated it was to defend the programs as necessary. No one chose the other decoy responses (to correct misconceptions, to encourage debate within government, to criticize such programs).

³ Here and throughout the paper, when the assumption of sphericity was violated, we confirmed that any significant effects remained significant when applying the Greenhouse-Geisser correction to degrees of freedom.

Tests of Primary Hypotheses

Hubristic pride. Despite comprehension of the threat article, an initial 3-way mixed-model ANOVA revealed that the threat manipulation had no main or interactive effects on hubristic pride, all F s < 1 , thus it was dropped from the model to maximize power for the focal hypothesis. We reported generalized eta squared as the effect size in all omnibus analyses (Bakeman, 2005) and partial eta as the effect size in all simple effects analyses. Mean differences across condition on all variables are summarized in Table 1.

An Emotion X Ethnicity within-subjects ANOVA yielded an emotion main effect, $F(4, 180) = 42.18, p < .05$, generalized $\eta^2 = .36$. There was also a marginal main effect of ethnicity, $F(1, 45) = 3.77, p = .06$, generalized $\eta^2 = .006$, that was qualified by a significant interaction, $F(4, 180) = 4.05, p = .004$, generalized $\eta^2 = .02$. When displaying a neutral expression, Black targets were rated higher ($M = 2.72, SD = 1.46$) than White targets ($M = 2.30, SD = 1.21$) on hubristic pride, $F(1, 45) = 4.25, p = .045$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$, but when displaying a pride expression, White targets were rated significantly higher on hubristic pride ($M = 4.59, SD = 1.63$) than were Black targets ($M = 3.87, SD = 1.93$), $F(1, 45) = 10.73, p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .19$. There were no ethnicity differences for angry or happy, F s < 1 . Not surprisingly, hubristic pride ratings were quite low for the targets displaying shame, but they were significantly lower for the Black target ($M = 1.37, SD = .57$) compared to the White target ($M = 1.76, SD = .82$), $F(1, 45) = 9.07, p = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$. Because the later studies were not designed to replicate this last effect, we do not try to offer an interpretation of it.

Authentic pride. Similar to hubristic pride ratings, an initial 3-way mixed-model ANOVA revealed that our threat manipulation had no main or interactive effects on authentic

pride, all $F_s < 1$, thus it was dropped from the model. The Emotion x Ethnicity within-subjects ANOVA on authentic pride yielded only an unsurprising main effect of emotion, $F(4, 180) = 121.24, p < .05$, generalized $\eta^2 = .62$, but no main or interactive effects of ethnicity, $F_s < 2, p_s > .10$.

Exploratory Analyses

Likeability. In exploratory analyses, we examined the effect of condition on participants' ratings of the likeability of the targets. The same Emotion x Ethnicity within-subjects ANOVA analysis on likeability of the targets revealed a significant ethnicity by emotion interaction on liking, $F(4, 180) = 4.48, p = .002$, generalized $\eta^2 = .02$, that qualified a main effect of emotion, $F(4, 180) = 70.42, p < .001$, generalized $\eta^2 = .45$. The interaction was driven by a tendency to like the Black target ($M = 4.50, SD = 1.53$) more than the White target ($M = 3.85, SD = 1.21$) when pride was displayed, $F(1, 45) = 8.43, p = .006$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$. In fact, the Black target was liked to a similar extent when displaying pride or happiness ($M = 4.74, SD = 1.40$), $t(45) = 1.34, p = .19$; but the White target was liked significantly less when displaying pride compared to happiness ($M = 4.98, SD = 1.20$), $t(45) = 5.44, p < .001$.

Social Dominance Orientation and Modern Racism. In another exploratory analysis, we examined whether either SDO or MRS predicted the degree to which participants exhibited ethnic biases in perceptions of hubristic or authentic pride or likeability when targets posed pride. Using Judd, Kenny, and McClelland (2001) as a guide, we computed bivariate correlations relating these two individual difference measures (which themselves were correlated, $r = .65, p < .001$) to the difference scores created by subtracting hubristic pride (or authentic or likeability) ratings for the Black target from ratings for the White target. This analysis then asks whether the

gap in these pride ratings due to target ethnicity is correlated with either modern racism or social dominance? Correlations are summarized in Table 2 and reveal a negative correlation between modern racism and target ethnicity effects on hubristic pride, $r = -.29, p = .047$. Specifically, although those high in modern racism (with scores above the median = 2.17) showed no ethnicity bias in hubristic pride ratings, $t(21) = -.09, p = .932$; those lower in modern racism rated pride expressions as more hubristic when displayed by a White than by a Black target, $t(23) = -2.35, p = .028$.

In contrast, those who scored higher in SDO rated pride expressions as more authentic when displayed by White than Black targets, $r = .30, p = .042$. Among participants high in SDO (with scores above the median = 2.28), pride expressions were seen as more authentic for White than for Black targets, $t(20) = 2.10, p = .049$, whereas these means did not differ among those low in SDO, $t(23) = -.60, p = .550$. Only this last finding might provide some suggestion that those who favor social hierarchy penalize Blacks for displaying pride. Neither variable was related to the size of the ethnicity gap in likeability ratings.

Discussion

The results from Study 1 revealed almost no support for our hypothesis that pride would be perceived by White Americans as more hubristic and less authentic when expressed by Black as compared with White targets. Although Blacks were rated as more hubristic than Whites when their expression was neutral, Whites were actually rated as more hubristic than Blacks when either pride or shame was expressed. Whites displaying pride were also liked less than Blacks displaying pride or than Whites displaying happiness, suggesting that the White target might pay a social penalty for pride. In this study, no effects were found for ratings of authentic pride,

although there was some tendency for those high in social dominance orientation to see Whites expressing pride as displaying a more authentic type of pride compared to Blacks. This last finding is somewhat in line with original predictions and past research (Weisbuch et al., 2013), but most evidence in this study points more to an overall social penalty for pride to Whites than to Blacks.

Although we recognize that social desirability concerns could influence perceivers' ratings, the strong desire for many White Americans to appear non-prejudiced (Shelton, Richeson, & Vorauer, 2006) should have led to an overall pattern of more positive ratings of Black as compared to White targets. This is not what the results consistently show across all emotions posed; in fact, Blacks were often perceived more negatively than Whites when displaying emotions other than pride. We also tried to minimize social desirability effects by asking participants to rate how they thought other people would judge the targets and by conducting the study online so that responses would be completely anonymous.

With these surprising effects in hand, we designed a second study in an attempt to test our original hypothesis. There were several changes in the design of Study 2. First, whereas the first study provided no context for targets' emotional displays, the second study focused specifically on pride and used an academic context as a backdrop for the pride displays targets displayed. We reasoned that perhaps the effect we hypothesized would only occur when Blacks (and Whites) were displaying pride in a context where Blacks are stereotyped to be less competent and thus pride for academic accomplishment might be seen as less deserved. Furthermore, whereas Study 1 used only male targets in a within-subjects design (where comparison across ethnicity might become salient), in Study 2 we used both male and female targets to test the generalizability of any effects across gender and employed a between-subjects

design. We also included a third silhouette condition in an attempt to provide an ethnicity-unknown control condition for ratings of the Black targets. Finally, since we did not try to manipulate racial threat in Study 2, we did not *a priori* restrict our sample to only White Americans, and finally we asked participants in Study 2 to provide their own impressions.

Study 2

Method

Participants and Procedures

One-hundred and fifty-seven students from a large Canadian university (68% female; age $M=21.6$, $SD=3.80$) were recruited on campus to complete a personality judgment study. Forty-nine percent of participants were White, 34% Asian, 4% Middle-Eastern, 2% Native, 1% Hispanic, 5% indicated more than one ethnicity, and 5% indicated "other". No one was Black.

Participants were approached on campus to participate in a quick study. They were asked to form an impression of a single target photo and caption presumably from another student. The target always displayed pride (photos taken from UCDSEE, Tracy et al., 2009) and the caption conveyed academic success: "In the last class I've taken, I got an A. I found it pretty easy to get a good grade in the class." Participants were randomly assigned to view one of eight targets: a Black female, a Black male, a White female, a White male, or one of four ethnicity-unidentified silhouettes made from the outline of these 4 photos. We averaged responses to the two male and to the two female silhouettes to create an ethnicity variable with three levels (Black, White, silhouette) that was crossed with target gender. Participants rated their own impressions of the target on authentic ($\alpha = .79$) and hubristic pride ($\alpha = .94$, Tracy & Robins, 2007b). They also

rated the targets for how much they appeared to be proud, happy, or ashamed on a 7-point Likert scale from not at all to very much.

A second page of the survey also included more exploratory items assessing other aspects of person impression (e.g., target's prestige, dominance, likeability, attractiveness, status, and intelligence) that were not of primary relevance to the core hypothesis. As in Study 1, we only report results on likeability but will footnote other patterns.

Finally, participants filled out the SDO scale ($\alpha = .88$, Sidanius, et al., 1996) and basic demographic information. Modern racism was not included in this study, but was included in Study 3.

Results & Discussion

Manipulation Checks

As expected, targets were generally rated as appearing more proud ($M = 5.98$, $SD = 1.18$) than happy ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.71$), or ashamed ($M = 1.57$, $SD = 1.11$), all $ps < .001$. A target gender (male, female) by target ethnicity (Black, White, Silhouette) between-subjects ANOVA revealed no evidence that these perceived emotions were affected by the ethnicity or gender of the target, all $ps > .10$. Thus, the stimuli were equated on the extent to which they displayed pride.

Tests of Primary Hypotheses

Hubristic pride. A target gender (male, female) X target ethnicity (Black, White, Silhouette) between-subjects ANOVA revealed only a main effect of target ethnicity, $F(2, 151) = 12.91$, $p < .05$, generalized $\eta^2 = .15$ (see Table 2). There was no main or interactive effect of

target gender, $F_s < 1$. Pairwise comparisons of the ethnicity condition (with Bonferroni adjustments) indicated that the White targets ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 1.56$) were rated significantly higher in hubristic pride than the Black ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.52$), $p < .001$, $d = 1.06$, or Silhouette targets ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 1.32$), $p = .002$, $d = .69$, which did not differ significantly from one another, $p = .08$, $d = -.44$ (see Table 3).

Authentic pride. Similarly, an analysis of authentic pride also revealed a main effect of target ethnicity, $F(2,151) = 5.87$, $p = .004$, generalized $\eta^2 = .07$, that was not moderated by target gender, $F < 1$. Participants did, however, rate female targets significantly higher on authentic pride than male targets ($M_{\text{female}} = 5.16$, $SD = .87$; $M_{\text{male}} = 4.92$, $SD = 1.03$), $F(1,151) = 4.72$, $p = .03$, $d = .25$, which might stem from a general tendency to perceive women more positively than men (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004). Pairwise comparisons of the target ethnicity effect (with Bonferroni correction) this time revealed that the Black targets were rated significantly higher on authentic pride ($M = 5.49$, $SD = .65$) than either White targets ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 1.20$), $p < .001$, $d = .63$, or the Silhouette targets ($M = 4.96$, $SD = .84$), $p = .009$, $d = .71$, which were not significantly different from each other, $p = 1.00$.

Exploratory Analyses

Likeability. An exploratory analysis on likeability yielded only a main effect of target ethnicity, $F(2, 148) = 11.30$, $p < .001$, generalized $\eta^2 = .13$, that was not moderated by target gender, $F < 1.5$. Participants liked the Black targets displaying pride ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.27$) more

than the White targets ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.25$), $d = 1.08$, or the silhouettes displaying pride ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.34$), $d = .73$, $ps = .001$, which did not differ from one another, $p > .30$.⁴

SDO. Because this study employed a between-subjects design, we used PROCESS (Hayes, 2013) to test whether SDO moderated the effects of target ethnicity on pride ratings. SDO scores were standardized and entered as a predictor along with a dummy coded variable (0 = White, 1 = Black) and the interaction of these two predicting first hubristic and then authentic pride. These analyses yielded no evidence of significant main or interactive effects of SDO on either form of pride or liking, all $ps > .25$. Also, SDO was not significantly correlated with hubristic or authentic pride ratings (or liking) either overall or in any of the target ethnicity conditions, all $ps > .05$.

Moderation by Participant Ethnicity. In a final exploratory analysis, we also tested participant ethnicity (White participants, $n = 74$, vs non-White participants, $n = 77$) as a potential moderator of the target ethnicity effects. This 2 (participant ethnicity) x 3 (target ethnicity) ANOVA yielded no significant interaction on authentic pride, $F(2, 144) = 1.54$, $p = .22$, or likeability, $F(2, 144) = 1.84$, $p = .162$, but did yield a significant interaction on hubristic pride, $F(2, 144) = 5.95$, $p = .003$, generalized $\eta^2 = .07$, that qualified a marginal main effect of participant ethnicity, $F(2, 144) = 3.30$, $p = .07$, generalized $\eta^2 = .02$.

⁴ On other exploratory measures the only main or interactive effect of gender was a significant tendency to rate female targets as more intelligent than male targets, $p = .012$. There were no differences by gender or condition on perceptions of targets' attractiveness, prestige, or status, all $ps > .10$. There was, however, a significant main effect of ethnicity condition on ratings of dominance, $F(2, 145) = 5.31$, $p = .006$. The White target was rated as significantly more dominant ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.21$) than the Black target ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.26$), $p = .005$, and marginally more dominant the silhouette ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.19$) which did not differ from each other, $p = .618$. A marginal interaction with target gender suggested that this pattern tended to be stronger for ratings of male than female targets, $F(2, 145) = 2.90$, $p = .058$.

Pairwise comparisons (with Bonferroni correction) suggested both Whites and non-Whites perceived the White target ($M_{white}=4.20$, $SD = 1.90$; $M_{non-white} 5.54$, $SD = 1.02$) as more hubristic than the Black target ($M_{white}=2.98$, $SD = 1.50$; $M_{non-white} 3.45$, $SD = 1.43$). However, the size of this effect was much larger for non-Whites, $t(144) = 5.02$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.68$, than for Whites, $t(144) = 2.49$, $p = .014$, $d = .71$. Also, Whites' ratings of hubristic pride for the silhouette ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.33$) were similar to their ratings of the White target, $t(144) = .14$, $p = .88$, $d = .04$, but higher than for the Black target, $t(144) = -2.85$, $p = .005$, $d = -.82$. In contrast, non-Whites' ratings of the silhouette ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.15$) were more similar to their ratings of the Black target, $t(144) = -.46$, $p = .64$, $d = -.13$, but lower than their hubristic ratings of the White target, $t(144) = 5.03$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.78$. Because this moderating effect of participant ethnicity does not replicate in Study 3, we hesitate to draw strong conclusions from it.

Discussion

The results of Study 2 were somewhat consistent with findings from the first study and again provided no support for our original hypothesis. Instead, we again found evidence that it was White, not Black, targets who were perceived as more hubristic (and in this study as less authentic) in their pride displays compared to the Black targets. The inclusion of the silhouette for an ethnicity-unspecified comparison suggested that Whites were especially perceived to be more hubristic when displaying pride in comparison to an ethnicity-unspecified target, and little evidence of an overall tendency to simply rate Blacks more positively, which could suggest self-report biases. Gender of target did not moderate effects and in this study, and we replicated a similar pattern as seen in Study 1 with a more diverse sample of non-Black participants and using a between-subjects design where direct comparisons across targets of different ethnicities were not made salient.

Finally, it is notable we still found no evidence of a pride penalty for Blacks even though this study more directly manipulated an expression of pride for academic success, a domain where Blacks are routinely stereotyped to be less competent and thus pride might be seen as overclaiming success. Instead, these results start to suggest that perhaps Whites are penalized for an overt display of pride. Exploratory analyses suggesting that these effects are somewhat stronger among non-White participants (who were predominantly Asian in this sample) could imply that minority groups view an overt display of pride after success in a more negative, hubristic light when enacted by the dominant group in society.

A methodological strength of these first two studies was the use of standardized images that were created specifically to represent prototypical pride displays. However, the use of these images also means that they depict somewhat unnatural expressions and they were rated in a context with little to no experimental realism. In an attempt to test our original hypothesis (or replicate the emerging effects), Study 3 was designed to have participants rate targets in another setting where Blacks are typically disadvantaged – a job hiring context (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000). To provide more experimental realism, participants viewed and made ratings of a series of brief resumes with an attached photo depicting a more natural expression of pride, happiness, or neutral emotion by Black and White men. We returned to a within-subjects design to increase the power of the study and to allow for comparison of pride to happy displays. Because both pride and happy expressions include a smile, it is important to test that any effects observed due to target ethnicity are specific to the pride display.

Study 3

Method

Participants and Procedures

Ninety-nine American participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk and completed an online study of how resumes are reviewed in exchange for \$0.50. Seventy-eight percent of participants were White, 10% Asian, 7% Hispanic, 1% Middle-Eastern, 1% Native, 2% indicated more than one ethnicity, and 1% indicated "other". No one was Black. Participants viewed the resumes and pictures of 11 candidates for the position of "Director of Human Resources in a large corporation." Six of these resumes were the targets of study; five additional were included as filler resumes to obscure our primary interest. The target images were photos taken from the internet of Black or White men wearing business suits and displaying either pride, happy, or neutral expressions. In some cases, the photos were photo-shopped to ensure they conveyed the correct emotion. The photos and resumes were separately pre-tested to ensure they were equivalent on a number of different factors.⁵ Both the resume and image pairings and the order of presentation were randomized.

Given evidence that racial biases are particularly likely to appear when judgments are made under time pressure (Cunningham et al., 2004), participants were asked to read the resumes quickly and rate the "quality of the candidate as a potential hire" for each candidate on a 1 (poor quality) to 7 (excellent quality) scale, with the midpoint 4 (acceptable quality). Given the number of resumes that needed to be reviewed, participants rated authentic and hubristic pride using only two items from each scale (*achieving/accomplished* and *arrogant/snobbish*). They also rated four

⁵ We pilot tested 20 photos of varying ethnicity (i.e., Black, White, Asian) and gender (i.e., male and female) with 12 MTurk participants in order to select stimuli photos for the study that differed in the emotion conveyed (pride, happy, neutral), all $ps < .05$, but were of similar attractiveness using a 7-point scale (1-not at all, 7-extremely), all $ps > .05$. An additional sample of 13 participants rated 11 resumes to select 6 to use as the primary stimuli that (without a photo attached) did not vary on rated quality, authentic pride, or hubristic pride, all $ps > .05$. Details available upon request.

other items (competent, warm, friendly, capable) that, given the high correlation among them, were combined to form a general positive impression index (α range from .66 - .86). After viewing all of the candidates, participants saw all 11 candidates together on the screen and were asked to rank ordered them from 1 to 11 (1 = Best, 11 = Worst), and then filled out SDO ($\alpha=.96$, Sidanius, et al., 1996), Modern Racism (McConahay, 1986), and basic demographic information.

Results & Discussion

Test of Primary Hypotheses

Hubristic pride. A 2-way within-subjects ANOVA on hubristic pride yielded main effects of both target ethnicity and emotion, $F(1, 196) = 21.85, p < .001$, generalized $\eta^2 = .02$, and $F(2, 196)=6.33, p = .002$, generalized $\eta^2 = .01$. More importantly, there was a significant target ethnicity x target emotion interaction, $F(2, 196) = 4.04, p = .02$, generalized $\eta^2 = .007$ (See Table 4). When displaying pride, White candidates were rated higher on hubristic pride ($M = 2.54, SD = 1.06$) than were Black candidates ($M = 2.01, SD = .96$), $F(1, 98) = 21.91, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$. When displaying a neutral expression, the same pattern was evident ($M = 2.41, SD = 1.05$ vs. $M = 2.18, SD = .98$) but the size of the effect was much weaker, $F(1, 98) = 4.63, p = .034$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Note that this effect for neutral expressions is the reverse of Study 1, where the Black job candidate was rated as more hubristic than the White candidate with a neutral expression. When displaying happy, there was no significant difference between Black and White targets on hubristic pride, $F(1, 98) = 2.11, p = .15$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$.

Authentic pride. The same analysis on authentic pride yielded no significant effects, $F_s < 2$.

Exploratory Analyses

Positive impression. The 2-way within-subjects ANOVA on positive impressions of the candidates yielded main effects of both emotion, $F(2, 196) = 10.55, p < .001$, and ethnicity, $F(1, 196) = 11.96, p < .001$, but the interaction was not significant, $F(2, 196) = 2.08, p = .131$. In an effort to replicate patterns from Study 1, more focal comparisons were conducted. These suggested that perceivers generally formed a less positive impression of the White ($M = 3.69, SD = .85$) than the Black candidate ($M = 3.99, SD = .74$) when he displayed pride, $F(1, 98) = 9.21, p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$, but not when he displayed a happy, $F(1, 98) = 2.61, p = .11$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$; or neutral expression, $F(1, 98) = 1.90, p = .17$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. In fact, the Black candidate received equally favorable impressions when he displayed happiness ($M = 4.04, SD = .70$) or pride, $p = .43$; whereas the White male candidate was seen significantly less favorably when displaying pride than when displaying happiness ($M = 3.92, SD = .72$), $p = .006$.

Candidate quality and ranking. The same analysis on the perceived quality of the candidates yielded no main effect of emotion, $F(2, 196) = 1.45, p = .24$, generalized $\eta^2 = .003$. However, there was a main effect of ethnicity suggesting that Black candidates were generally rated as being of higher quality ($M = 5.47, SD = 1.07$) than White candidates ($M = 5.28, SD = .99$), $F(1, 98) = 5.56, p = .02$, generalized $\eta^2 = .005$. Although the interaction with target emotion was not significant, $F(2, 196) = .74, p = .48$, more focused simple effect analyses suggested that this ethnicity difference was of larger magnitude and only significant when candidates were displaying pride ($M_{Black} = 5.45, SD = 1.30$ vs. $M_{White} = 5.14, SD = 1.35$), $F(1, 98) = 5.69, p = .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$, but not when displaying happy ($M_{Black} = 5.42, SD = 1.25$ vs. $M_{White} = 5.31, SD = 1.35$), $F(1, 98) = .61, p = .44$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$, or neutral expressions ($M_{Black} = 5.54, SD = 1.28$ vs. $M_{White} = 5.39, SD = 1.15$), $F(1, 98) = 1.43, p = .24$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ (see *Figure 2*).

We also analyzed the ranked preferences people gave to the six target candidates (among the full set of 11 candidates they evaluated). The same 2(target ethnicity) x 3 (target emotion) within-subjects ANOVA yielded two significant main effects that were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(2, 196) = 3.63, p = .028$, generalized $\eta^2 = .012$.⁶ Participants ranked the White target lower (i.e., farther from 1) than the Black target when the targets displayed pride ($M_{White} = 6.67, SD = 2.84; M_{Black} = 5.22, SD = 2.78$), $F(1, 98) = 10.42, p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .10$, or were neutral ($M_{White} = 6.53, SD = 2.89; M_{Black} = 5.50, SD = 2.71$), $F(1, 98) = 6.30, p = .014$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$, but not when they were happy ($M_{White} = 5.21, SD = 2.81; M_{Black} = 5.21, SD = 2.75$), $F(1, 98) = 0.00, p = 1.00$.

MRS and SDO. As in Study 1, we again computed difference scores to represent the ethnic bias in pride ratings and candidate quality by subtracting the ratings for Black targets from ratings for White targets for each variable when pride was displayed. We examined bivariate correlations of these racial biases with both modern racism and social dominance orientation (see Table 2). We did not replicate the relationship in Study 1 between modern racism and ethnicity differences in hubristic pride. The only significant relationship with modern racism was with the ethnicity gap in candidate ratings. The tendency to rank the White candidate lower than the Black candidate when both display pride was stronger among those low in modern racism ($Md = 2.33$), $t(46) = -3.87, p < .001$, and was weaker and not significant among those above the median in modern racism, $t(46) = -1.39, p = .17$.

⁶ We analyzed the data with ANOVA given that scores were normally distributed and our focus was on only 6 of the 11 candidates ranked. Values for skewness ranged between -.24 and .66, values for kurtosis ranged between -1.20 and -.62. However, a related samples Friedman's test on all six scores confirm significant differences in rank scores, $\chi^2(5) = 28.18, p < .001$. More focal non-parametric comparisons again reveal significant differences between the pride, $\chi^2(1) = 11.00, p = .001$, and neutral displays, $\chi^2(1) = 6.31, p = .012$, and not for happy displays, $\chi^2(1) = .82, p = .366$.

We did replicate the relationship between SDO and ethnicity differences in authentic pride observed in Study 1, although the more focal comparisons were a bit different. In this study, among the half of the sample above the median in social dominance orientation ($Md = 2.25$), there was no difference in authentic pride ratings for the Black and White candidate, $t(48) = -.60, p = .550$, but among those below the median and thus low in SDO, the White target was rated significantly lower in authentic pride than the Black target, $t(49) = 2.06, p = .045$. Significant correlations between SDO and the ethnicity gap in overall impressions and candidate ranks revealed a similar pattern.

Moderation by Participant Ethnicity. Finally, we again conducted an exploratory analysis including participant ethnicity (White $n = 77$, non-White $n = 22$) as a between-subjects factor in a mixed ANOVA. Unlike in Study 2, this analysis yielded no three-way interaction with participant ethnicity on hubristic pride, $F(2, 194) = .55, p = .58$, authentic pride, $F(2, 194) = .57, p = .57$, overall impression, $F(2, 194) = 1.04, p = .355$, candidate quality effects, $F(2, 194) = .61, p = .55$, or candidate rankings, $F(2, 194) = .32, p = .73$.

Discussion

As in Studies 1 and 2, we found a significant effect of ethnicity on hubristic pride ratings but one opposite to our original hypothesis. White and not Black male targets were rated as more hubristic when displaying pride in the context of a job application; they also received lower rankings among all of the job candidates compared to a Black male target displaying pride. Although White men were also rated as somewhat more hubristic even when exhibiting a neutral expression, the ethnicity penalty was larger for the pride expression. Importantly, this ethnicity effect was not present in the happy condition, the emotional expression most similar to pride. In

this study, as in Study 1, we did not observe effects on ratings of authentic pride, suggesting that these effects are likely specific to perceptions of hubristic pride. Although the interaction was not always significant for ratings of candidate quality, candidate rankings, or overall impression, patterns of means and more focused comparisons suggest that the White male target displaying pride was consistently rated less positively than the Black target displaying pride. There was also some evidence that the pride penalty to the White male target on final rankings for the job was stronger for participants lower in modern racism or social dominance orientation.

General Discussion

Pride is a basic human emotion used to spontaneously express a sense of self-confidence, status, and success. But perceivers might not always grant that this expression is an authentic reflection of one's competence or achievement. A better understanding of how pride displays are interpreted as a function of target's group membership gives clearer theoretical insight into the social dynamics of emotional expressions. Given prior evidence that authentic and hubristic pride are differentially related to status based on dominance or prestige, distinguishing unique effects on these different facets of pride can highlight how displays of status are perceived by others. Practically speaking, this research can then inform how people might strategically express or suppress their feelings of pride in the service of impression management.

In these three studies, we originally set out to test the hypothesis that because of racial stereotypes associating Black Americans with incompetence and/or aggression, Blacks would be judged more harshly than Whites when displaying pride as a social signal of status. More specifically, our reasoning was that pride as a display is somewhat ambiguous and can be interpreted as either status acquired through dominance (which should be associated with

hubristic pride) or status acquired through true competence (which should be associated with authentic pride). If Blacks are stereotyped to be high in dominance and low in competence, we thus hypothesized that Blacks' pride displays would be perceived as highly hubristic and less authentic compared to their White peers. In other words, because pride displays can be viewed in different ways, we expected prevalent negative stereotypes about Blacks to systematically color how their expression of pride is perceived.

Instead, the results of these three studies revealed quite consistent evidence for an effect opposite to this prediction. That is, Whites displaying pride were rated as seeming more hubristic than Blacks displaying the same emotion. In Study 2 (but not in Studies 1 or 3), Whites displaying pride were also rated as less authentic than Blacks displaying pride, though they were not rated as less authentic than the ethnicity unspecified silhouette. Overall, the pride penalty to Whites was found regardless of whether a context for the expression was given, across both male and female targets, both when rating what others or they themselves perceive, and in studies using both within- and between-subjects designs. These effects were not seen in response to all emotion displays, importantly were not found to happy displays – the expression most similar to pride— and consistently were largest in size for pride displays. In Study 3, using more ecologically valid stimuli and measures, we found some suggestive evidence that White job candidates displaying pride might even be seen as lower quality hires compared to their Black peers. This last finding, however, should be considered tentative given the method still lacks the realism of an actual hiring context and the limited number of target stimuli used.

Note, that we initially had no predictions about overall likeability (or general positivity in Study 3) of the targets, but analysis of these measures across the studies yielded a pattern of results that also pointed to a general pride penalty for Whites. White targets were rated as less

likeable or positive than Black targets in all three studies, but only when displaying pride.

Evidence that this is actually a penalty to Whites is seen in Studies 1 and 3 where the White male target displaying pride was viewed more negatively than the White target displaying happiness, the emotion most similar to pride. Only in Study 2 with a between-subjects design and a college student sample, did it appear that the effect might be driven more by a pride bonus to Blacks who were liked more than either the White or the ethnicity unspecified target.

Are Perceivers Just Avoiding any Appearance of Bias against Blacks?

As we designed and carried out each of these studies, and especially as these patterns emerged, our first thought was that they might simply reflect a tendency among progressive, egalitarian-minded Whites to avoid any appearance of racial bias by being overly positive in their ratings of the Black targets. Some of the correlations showing stronger effects with those who score lower in modern racism and/or social dominance might seem at first glance to support this interpretation. However, the studies as a whole do not provide strong evidence that what we have captured merely reflects self-presentational biases. First, an overall bias avoidance pattern would predict more positive ratings of Black targets across the board regardless of the emotion targets express. More often than not, the ethnicity differences observed were specific to ratings of targets who display pride. In Study 1, Black targets displaying anger, neutral, or even happy emotions were often rated more negatively than Whites. Second, as mentioned above, in Studies 1 and 3, the difference in overall positivity of how Whites and Blacks are perceived when expressing pride seems to be driven more by lower ratings given to Whites rather than higher ratings given to Blacks, if ratings to a happy target are used for comparison. Only in Study 2 is there more of a pattern of positivity ratings for Black as compared to the ethnicity-unspecified silhouette or the White targets. Admittedly, however, these faceless silhouettes might not be an

ideal control group for baseline data on likeability or hubris ratings; without any facial expression, participants have less information to guide their impression.

Third, if the patterns summarized here largely reflect a tendency to avoid the appearance of racial bias, then we might expect effects to be driven by White participants, the group stereotyped to be racially biased (Vorauer, Main, & O'Connell, 1998). Although the White penalty effect was found in Study 1, where only White participants were used, exploratory analyses using participant ethnicity (White vs. non-White) as a factor found no evidence that effects were stronger for White participants in Study 3 and some suggestion of stronger effects among non-White participants in Study 2.

What Might this Mean and What to do Next?

If it is not the case that North American perceivers penalize Blacks for displaying pride, how are we to interpret these effects? We believe that there is enough consistency to the patterns we have observed to conclude that Whites and not Blacks are perceived more harshly for overt expressions of pride. Here we offer some speculation for why this might be the case, although admittedly any emerging theoretical explanation merits clearer tests in future research.

There is considerable evidence that Whites are the dominant high status group in North American society (Lin & Harris, 2009). Although pride is used as a signal of status, those who are known to have high status by dint of some category membership, might generally confer little benefit to overtly celebrating their success. Perhaps such signals to success are generally expressed more (and thus perceived as more appropriate) when that success is less assured. One can easily imagine that a spontaneous pride display seems both more likely and appropriate after the victory of equal competitors or even by an underdog than when an expert bests a novice.

Similarly, a group's level of status is likely to change in different contexts (e.g., Asians are higher status in mathematics, but lower status in North American society), so perceptions of hubristic pride might also vary given the context in question. This might explain why Hall and Livingston (2012) found that Blacks were penalized more for their arrogance than Whites in a sporting context, where Black men are stereotyped to have greater natural ability. As pointed out by an astute reviewer, Blacks who display pride for an accomplishment in a domain where they are often disadvantaged (i.e., acing an exam, as in Study 2) might actually be viewed as more deserving of high status and thus as more authentic in their pride compared to their advantaged White peers. Follow-up research is needed to generalize the patterns observed here with other groups or even individuals where existing status differences are known. Such evidence would confirm that these effects have more to do with existing status differences between targets, either in general or in specific domains, and are not specific to ethnicity per se.

Research is also needed to understand the mechanism for these effects, as the goal with these studies was merely to establish a reliable pattern. As suggested above, one possibility is that those whose status is assured in a hierarchy have no need to overtly communicate their status to others. Indeed, doing so risks drawing attention to and criticism of the status differences that exist. For example, Horberg, Kraus, and Keltner (2013) have found that people displaying pride are assumed to be less egalitarian in their ideology. Having and maintaining high status might often call for more modesty, which could explain why Whites are penalized for displaying pride across these studies (and why men displaying pride were seen as less authentic than women in Study 2). In both cases, these targets might be viewed as breaking norms for modesty and humility among those who already enjoy higher status. Such norms might develop to serve a

system justifying function, similar to recent arguments that norms for gratitude might develop to maintain the status quo (Eiback, Wilmot, & Libby, 2015).

But is there a strong norm for modesty and humility among those with high status, at least in North American society? We could find very little research on the topic. Although people are generally seen as less likeable when they self-promote (Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986), we do not know of research that has looked at this by pre-existing status differences between groups or individuals. In fact, evidence suggests that the norm for men *is* to be self-promotional, which speaks against a stronger norm for modesty among those presumed to have status (Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Rudman, 2010). Nonetheless, if a tendency to penalize Whites who display pride stems from a perceived violation of a modesty norm that serves a system justifying function, then one testable prediction is that those who are most motivated to maintain the current racial hierarchy should show the strongest tendency to penalize Whites who display pride. However, at least using social dominance orientation as a measure of preference for hierarchy, we observed little support for this idea.

Alternatively, we might imagine that Whites who display pride could be seen as overclaiming their success. That is, if the higher status that Whites enjoy is viewed to be illegitimate, then the individual successes they enjoy might be viewed by others (and perhaps especially by non-Whites) as stemming from an unfair social privilege. This account could explain why Whites displaying pride were more likely to be rated as more hubristic but not as less authentic compared to Blacks. Whites displaying pride seem arrogant, and this arrogance might be associated with an overclaiming of success that has not been earned (Holbrook et al., 2015). Interestingly, this prediction might lead to an opposite prediction than the one presented

above: those who reject the legitimacy of the current racial hierarchy might show the strongest tendency to penalize Whites who display pride.

Consistent with this idea, there is some prior evidence that people who believe racial differences are fair have more positive automatic associations with White more than Black targets when both convey status with a slight up-tilt of the head (Weisbuch et al., 2013). In contrast, this pro-White bias is mitigated for those who believe racial differences are unfair. This set of studies by Weisbuch and colleagues is interesting since the head tilt they manipulated as a nonverbal cue to status is one aspect of the pride display. Thus, the studies reported here serve to extend their findings by comparing emotional expressions (e.g., pride and happy) and providing clearer evidence not just of a reduced pro-White bias, but an actual penalty to Whites who show their pride.

That said, the studies we have summarized were conducted prior to Weisbuch et al.'s paper, and thus it did not occur us to measure perceived legitimacy of ethnic status differences. Future research is needed to further develop and test an emerging theoretical framework for why status legitimacy might moderate how status/pride displays are perceived. In our studies, tests of social dominance orientation and modern racism as potential moderators yielded inconsistent effects across the studies, precluding any strong conclusion. In Studies 1 and 3, those who rejected the need for group hierarchy (i.e., are lower in SDO) tended to see pride as less authentic coming from Whites than Blacks and were even less interested in hiring a White vs. Black job candidate who displayed pride. Although somewhat suggestive of the second hypothesis, the fact that we did not observe evidence of moderation by social dominance orientation on hubristic pride ratings across studies or in Study 2 with a between-subjects design means that more research is clearly needed to test these questions.

Conclusion

In sum, we began this line of research with a clear, theoretically derived hypothesis that Blacks in North America might be penalized compared to Whites for overt displays of pride, a self-conscious emotion that signals status and success. Across three studies, we instead found just the opposite: Whites displaying pride were consistently rated as more hubristic than Blacks expressing the same emotion. Although these findings were not predicted, we believe they have the potential to inspire new research on the perils and pitfalls of self-promotion for those who are already presumed to have higher status. It appears that displaying the positive emotion of pride might not have the same effect for all displayers. For some people it might be beneficial, but for others, it could have unintended negative outcomes.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Gua Khee Chong for her help collecting data.

References

- Bakeman, R. (2005). Recommended effect size statistics for repeated measures designs. *Behavior Research Methods, 37*(3), 379-384.
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*(1), 72-97. doi:10.1006/obhd.1999.2867
- Carney, D. R., Cuddy, A. C., & Yap, A. J. (2010). Power posing: Brief nonverbal displays affect neuroendocrine levels and risk tolerance. *Psychological Science, 21*(10), 1363-1368. doi:10.1177/0956797610383437
- Carver, C. S., Sinclair, S., & Johnson, S. L. (2010). Authentic and hubristic pride: Differential relations to aspects of goal regulation, affect, and self-control. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*(6), 698-703. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.09.004
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 31*(5), 334-347. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(6), 1314-1329. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1314

- Cuddy, A. C., Wilmuth, C. A., Yap, A. J., & Carney, D. R. (2015). Preparatory power posing affects nonverbal presence and job interview performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(4), 1286-1295. doi:10.1037/a0038543
- Cunningham, W. A., Johnson, M. K., Raye, C. L., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Separable neural components in the processing of black and white faces. *Psychological Science, 15*(12), 806-813. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00760.x
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking Deathworthy: Perceived Stereotypicality of Black Defendants Predicts Capital-Sentencing Outcomes. *Psychological Science, 17*(5), 383-386. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01716.x
- Eibach, R. P., Wilmot, M. O., & Libby, L. K. (2015). The system-justifying function of gratitude norms. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9*(7), 348-358. doi:10.1111/spc3.12184
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 473-489. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00128
- Gilbert, D.T. (1997). Ordinary personology. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.) *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol II, pp. 89-150). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G., (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 106-115.
- Hall, E.V., & Livingston, R.W. (2012). The hubris penalty: Biased responses to “Celebration” displays of black football players. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 899-904.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Holbrook, C., Piazza, J. R., & Fessler, D. T. (2014). Further challenges to the 'authentic'/'hubristic' model of pride: Conceptual clarifications and new evidence. *Emotion*, *14*(1), 38-42. doi:10.1037/a0035457
- Horberg, E. J., Kraus, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2013). Pride displays communicate self-interest and support for meritocracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*(1), 24-37. doi:10.1037/a0032849
- Hugenberg, K., & Bodenhausen G. V. (2004). Ambiguity in social categorization. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 342-345.
- Human, L. J., Biesanz, J. C., Parisotto, K. L., & Dunn, E. W. (2012). Your best self helps reveal your true self: Positive self-presentation leads to more accurate personality impressions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *3*(1), 23-30. doi:10.1177/1948550611407689

- Judd, C.M., Kenny, D.A., & McClelland, G.H. (2001). Estimating and testing mediation and moderation in within-subject designs. *Psychological Methods, 6*, 115-134.
- Leary, M. R. (2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 317-344.
- Lin, A.C., Harris, D.R. (Eds.). (2009). *The Colors of Poverty: Why racial and ethnic disparities exist*. National Poverty Center, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an agentic Black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science, 23*(4), 354-358. doi:10.1177/0956797611428079
- Martens, J. P., Tracy, J. L., & Shariff, A. F. (2012). Status signals: Adaptive benefits of displaying and observing the nonverbal expressions of pride and shame. *Cognition and Emotion, 26*(3), 390-406. doi:10.1080/02699931.2011.645281
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-126). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). When men break the gender rules: Status incongruity and backlash against modest men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*(2), 140-151. doi:10.1037/a0018093
- Payne, B. K. (2001). Prejudice and perception: The role of automatic and controlled processes in misperceiving a weapon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 181-192.

- Phelan, J. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). Reactions to ethnic deviance: The role of backlash in racial stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(2), 265-281. doi:10.1037/a0018304
- Plous, S., & Williams, T. (1995). Racial stereotypes from the days of American slavery: A continuing legacy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 795-817.
- Ranehill, E., Dreber, A., Johannesson, M., Leiberg, S., Sul, S., & Weber, R. A. (2015). Assessing the robustness of power posing: No effect on hormones and risk tolerance in a large sample of men and women. *Psychological Science, 26*(5), 653-656.
doi:10.1177/0956797614553946
- Ratcliff, J. J., Miller, A. K., & Krokowski, A. M. (2013). Why pride displays elicit support from majority group members: The mediational role of perceived deservingness. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 16*(4), 462-475.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743-762. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00239
- Rudman, L. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2004). Gender differences in automatic in-group bias: Why do women like women more than men like men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 494-509.
- Schmader, T., Croft, A., Whitehead, J., & Stone, J. (2013). A peek inside the targets' toolbox: How stigmatized targets deflect discrimination by invoking a common identity. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 35*(1), 141-149. doi:10.1080/01973533.2012.746615

Shariff, A. F., Tracy, J. L., & Markusoff, J. L. (2012). (Implicitly) judging a book by its cover: The power of pride and shame expressions in shaping judgments of social status.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38(9), 1178-1193.

doi:10.1177/0146167212446834

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., & Vorauer, J. D. (2006). Threatened identities and interethnic interactions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 321-358.

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*, 5561-74. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2015.01.004

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (1996). Consensual social dominance orientation and its correlates within the hierarchical structure of American society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 385-408.

Steele, C. M. (1999, August). Thin ice: Stereotype threat and black college students. *Atlantic Monthly*, 284, 44-47, 50-54.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 193-210.

Tracy, J. L., & Matsumoto, D. (2008). The spontaneous expression of pride and shame: Evidence for biologically innate nonverbal displays. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 11655-11660. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0802686105

- Tracy, J. L., & Prehn, C. (2012). Arrogant or self-confident? The use of contextual knowledge to differentiate hubristic and authentic pride from a single nonverbal expression. *Cognition and Emotion*, *26*(1), 14-24. doi:10.1080/02699931.2011.561298
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2008). The nonverbal expression of pride: Evidence for cross-cultural recognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(3), 526-530. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.3.516
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007a). The prototypical pride expression: Development of a nonverbal behavior coding system. *Emotion*, *7*(4), 789-801. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.789
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007b). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(3), 506-525. doi: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*(1), 33-37. doi:10.1037/a0034490
- Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., & Schriber, R. A. (2009). Development of a FACS-verified set of basic and self-conscious emotion expressions. *Emotion*, *9*, 554-559.
- Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., Zhao, W., & Henrich, J. (2013). Cross-cultural evidence that the nonverbal expression of pride is an automatic status signal. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *142*(1), 163-180. doi:10.1037/a0028412

- Tracy, J. L., Weidman, A. C., Cheng, J. T., & Martens, J. P. (2014). Pride: The fundamental emotion of success, power, and status. In M. Tugade, M. Shiota, & L. Kirby (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Emotion*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(4), 917-937.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.917
- Weisbuch, M., Slepian, M. L., Eccleston, C. P., & Ambady, N. (2013). Nonverbal expressions of status and system legitimacy: An interactive influence on race bias. *Psychological Science, 24*, 2315-2321. doi: 10.1177/0956797613490745
- Williams, M. J., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2016). The subtle suspension of backlash: A meta-analysis of penalties for women's implicit and explicit dominance behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 142*(2), 165-197. doi:10.1037/bul0000039

Table 1. Study 1: Means and Standard Deviations for Target Ratings as a Function of Target Ethnicity and Displayed Emotion

Ethnicity/Display	Emotion Ratings		
	Hubristic Pride	Authentic Pride	Likeability
White Pride	4.59 (1.63) _a	5.20 (1.17)	3.85 (1.21) _a
Black Pride	3.87 (1.93) _b	5.37 (1.08)	4.50 (1.53) _b
White Happy	2.67 (1.35)	4.91 (1.41)	4.98 (1.20)
Black Happy	2.52 (1.31)	4.67 (1.45)	4.74 (1.41)
White Anger	3.26 (1.53)	2.54 (1.26)	2.15 (1.01)
Black Anger	3.22 (1.90)	2.37 (1.36)	2.20 (1.13)
White Shame	1.76 (.82) _a	1.89 (.90)	3.13 (1.00)
Black Shame	1.37 (.57) _b	1.59 (.88)	3.02 (1.15)
White Neutral	2.30 (1.21) _a	2.85 (1.23)	3.63 (1.12)
Black Neutral	2.72 (1.46) _b	3.07 (1.27)	3.46 (1.24)

Note. Within each emotion display, means for targets of different ethnicity not sharing the same subscript differ significantly in simple effects testing, $p < .05$. $N = 46$.

Table 2. Studies 1 and 3: Bivariate Correlations of Modern Racism and Social Dominance Orientation with the tendency to Rate Whites more Negatively than Blacks when Displaying Pride

	Modern Racism	Social Dominance
Study 1 (N = 46)		
Hubristic Pride	-.29*	-.15
Authentic Pride	.18	.30*
Likeability	.18	.04
Study 3 (N = 99)		
Hubristic Pride	-.08	-.07
Authentic Pride	.13	.23*
Positive Impression	.18 ⁺	.21*
Candidate Quality	.07	.14
Candidate Ranking	-.26**	-.28**

Note. Variable ratings are difference scores subtracting ratings for Black targets from ratings for White targets displaying pride.

⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3. Study 2: Means and Standard Deviations for Target Ratings as a Function of Target Ethnicity when Displaying Pride

Target Ethnicity	Target Ratings		
	Hubristic Pride	Authentic Pride	Likeability
White (n = 39)	4.91 (1.56) _a	4.88 (1.20) _b	2.53 (1.25) _b
Black (n = 39)	3.27 (1.52) _b	5.49 (.65) _a	3.89 (1.27) _a
Silhouette (n = 79)	3.91 (1.32) _b	4.96 (.84) _b	2.94 (1.34) _b

Note. For each outcome, means not sharing the same subscript differ significantly in pairwise comparisons, $p < .05$. N = 157

Table 4. Study 3: Means and Standard Deviations for Target Ratings as a Function of Target Ethnicity and Displayed Emotion

Ethnicity/Display	Target Ratings				
	Hubristic Pride	Authentic Pride	Positive Impression	Candidate Quality	Candidate Rankings ¹
White Pride	2.54 (1.06) _a	3.70 (.83)	3.69 (.85) _a	5.14 (1.35) _a	6.67 (2.84) _a
Black Pride	2.01 (.96) _b	3.79 (.80)	3.99 (.74) _b	5.45 (1.30) _b	5.22 (2.78) _b
White Happy	2.12 (1.17)	3.74 (.92)	3.92 (.72)	5.31 (1.35)	5.21 (2.81)
Black Happy	1.98 (.93)	3.87 (.75)	4.05 (.70)	5.42 (1.25)	5.21 (2.75)
White Neutral	2.41 (1.05) _a	3.77 (.82)	3.68 (.63)	5.39 (1.15)	6.53 (2.89) _a
Black Neutral	2.18 (.98) _b	3.07 (1.27)	3.77 (.68)	5.53 (1.24)	5.50 (2.71) _b

Note. Within each target emotion, means not sharing the same subscript differ significantly in simple effects testing for that outcome, $p < .05$. $N = 99$

¹ For candidate rankings, higher rank values indicate a poorer evaluation of the candidate.

