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Chapter 4: The Role of Honor-Related Values in the Elicitation, Experience, and Communication of Pride, Shame, and Anger*

Although it is clear that cultures vary with respect to emotions (Kitayama, Markus & Matsumoto, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1994; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992; Mesquita, Frijda, & Scherer, 1997), the nature and extent of this variability remain unclear. Mesquita and Frijda's (1992) review noted that there is evidence of both similarities and differences in emotion across cultures, and that the conclusions reached depend on the level of analysis adopted by the researcher. Analyzing the extent to which cultures vary at the level of emotion components such as appraisals or action tendencies (Frijda, 1986; Scherer, 1984) is more likely to reveal differences than is analyzing cultural variation at the level of emotions. This is due partly to the greater specificity entailed in measuring emotions at the component level, and partly to the fact that emotion components relate to each other in flexible ways. Thus, evidence for cultural variation in one emotion component does not necessarily imply similar variation in other components of the same emotion (Mesquita & Frijda, 1992). Despite a broad consensus on these issues among social psychologists studying emotion, there is to date little research examining cultural variations in emotion at the level of emotion components (for examples of exceptions, see Scherer & Wallbott, 1994; Scherer, Wallbott, & Summerfield, 1986).

Another problem with existing research is that it is often unclear what it is about culture that could account for the observed differences. Any differences that are found between two or more countries tend to be described as cultural differences. However, because measures of potential cultural determinants are rarely taken it is unclear whether any observed variations are due to differences in, say, climate, socio-economic conditions, or cultural norms or values.

The present study addresses the question of how culture influences our emotional experiences and expressions by comparing emotions at the level of emotion components in countries that differ with respect to specific values. The countries compared are Spain and the Netherlands. Spain, like certain other societies in the Mediterranean area, has been described as an “honor culture” (Caro Baroja, 1965; Gilmore, 1987a, 1990a; Murphy, 1983; Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1977). A distinctive feature of honor cultures is the extent to which one’s personal worth is determined interpersonally. As Pitt-Rivers (1965, 1977) observed, honor refers to a person’s value both in his or her own eyes and in the eyes of others (see also Miller, 1993; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Stewart, 1994). Moreover, it is not only personal and social evaluations that are potential sources of honor and dishonor, but also the attributes and

* This chapter is adapted from Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer (in press).
behaviors of others. As Pitt-Rivers (1977, p. 78) puts it: "There is a near paradox in the fact
that while honour is a collective attribute shared by the nuclear family it is also personal and
dependent upon the will of the individual; individual honour derives from individual conduct
but produces consequences for others who share collective honour with this individual.” Thus
two aspects of honor -- the role played by the evaluations of others, and the role played by the
actions of others -- point to the collective aspect of honor. While an individual’s personal
worth and respect are important in both honor and individualistic cultures, the role of social
esteem in determining one’s personal worth and respect is more important in honor cultures
than in individualistic cultures. Honor cultures can therefore be characterized as having an
interdependent (rather than an independent) notion of self (Kitayama et al., 1995; Markus &

In the studies reported in Chapters 2 and 3 in which we compared social values in Spain
and the Netherlands, we found evidence in support of these anthropological observations (see
also Fischer, Manstead, & Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999, Study 1). Spanish participants attached
more importance than did their Dutch counterparts to honor, the maintenance of one’s own
good reputation and family honor (e.g., marrying somebody with a good reputation, protecting
one’s family reputation), social interdependence (e.g., humility, generosity), and family-
related values (e.g., family security, respect for parents and elderly). Dutch participants, by
contrast, rated individualism-related values (e.g., ambition, capability, and independence) as
more important than did Spanish respondents. These results indicate the greater focality of
honor and honor values in Spain than in the Netherlands.

A central objective of the present study was to investigate whether the significance of
honor values is reflected in descriptions of events that elicit emotions, and in emotion
components such as thoughts, feelings and tendencies, actions, and social sharing. We
assumed that cultural differences in the importance of honor and individualistic values would
give rise to differences in emotion antecedents and components, especially in relation to self-
conscious emotions such as pride, shame, or embarrassment, in which thoughts and feelings
about oneself are the focus of the emotional experience (Kitayama et al., 1995; Lewis, 1993;
Taylor, 1985). We therefore focused on two self-conscious emotions that are closely related to
honor, pride and shame, and on a third, non self-conscious emotion, anger.

Pride and shame relate to honor in the following ways. In honor cultures, the
enhancement and loss of one’s own honor or of those with whom one shares a common honor
(e.g., one’s family) are assumed to be common antecedents of pride and shame, respectively
(Peristiany, 1965a). Moreover, shame is not only an emotional reaction associated with loss of
honor, but is also a core value in honor cultures (see e.g., Gilmore, 1987a; Peristiany, 1965a;
Pitt-Rivers, 1977): Shamelessness is equated with lack of individual honor, and “having
shame” is a highly valued individual characteristic that signals one’s concern about one’s honor and one’s consideration of social judgments (for more information about the importance of shame as a value in honor cultures, see Chapter 1). Further, because one’s own honor and that of others in a social group are interdependent, one’s experience of pride and shame may also provoke emotional reactions in others. Which emotions are felt or expressed by others will depend upon their relation with the person experiencing the pride- or shame-eliciting situation. For instance, if someone loses his or her honor, this can elicit feelings of shame in members of his or her family. In other words, pride and shame in honor cultures are assumed to be elicited in response to a broad array of social events, that is, events in which social judgments, actions of others, or relationships with others are salient. In addition, these differences between honor and individualistic cultures in the importance of social recognition and social interdependence should be reflected in the emotional experience itself, resulting in more other-related appraisals in honor cultures, and more self-related appraisals in individualistic cultures.

Since the ramifications of pride and shame experiences in honor cultures extend beyond the individual, the elicitation and experience of pride and shame may also have different social implications in honor and individualistic cultures, leading to cultural differences in the expression and sharing of these emotions. Our previous research suggests that pride carries more negative implications in honor cultures, whereas shame carries more negative implications in individualistic cultures (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 2). This may reflect the fact that the expression of one’s pride potentially has both positive and negative social consequences in honor cultures. The sharing or expression of one’s pride may reinforce one’s status within the social group, but at the same time it may create a separation between oneself and others, jeopardizing one’s relationships with others. As a consequence, pride should not be openly expressed and may even be negatively sanctioned. By contrast, the expression or sharing of one’s shame signals one’s acceptance of others’ judgments and social norms, and thereby strengthens one’s social connectedness or interdependence. Shame should therefore be accepted more and shared more readily with others in honor cultures. In individualistic cultures, on the other hand, where individualistic values such as independence and ambition are emphasized, feelings of pride should be accepted and expressed, because they affirm one’s autonomy as an individual. Expressing shame, by contrast, should be regarded as a sign of weakness, because it signals one’s dependence on social approval. These differences are similar to what Markus and Kitayama have called social engagement versus social disengagement (Kitayama et al., 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Anger is also closely related to honor. It typically arises from the perception that others have behaved without good cause in a way that conflicts with one’s interests (see e.g., Frijda, Kuipers & ter Schure, 1989; Kitayama et al., 1995; Manstead & Tetlock, 1989). In honor
cultures attacks on one's honor, as in the case of insults, appear to be a common anger-eliciting event. Moreover, the elicitation of anger in attacks on one's honor usually leads to retaliation against the perpetrator as a way of restoring one's honor (see e.g., Cohen & Nisbett, 1994, 1997; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965a; Stewart, 1994). We suggest, in line with our reasoning about self-conscious emotions and social-psychological and ethnographic research on honor, that the influence of honor values on anger will be restricted to events in which there is a focus on the self, as is the case with offenses to the self.

**Present Study**

We used two methods in the present research. First we asked participants to recall a situation in which they themselves had felt pride, shame or anger (autobiographically-recalled experiences). Next, participants were asked questions about the emotional episode that were designed to assess the following emotion components: phenomenological experience (appraisals, feelings, and action tendencies), emotional action, emotional expression, and social sharing.

Second, we presented the participants with vignettes designed to elicit pride, shame, or anger (experimenter-provided vignettes). Because evaluations of others are assumed to carry more weight in honor cultures than in individualistic cultures, we took the opportunity to explore this issue more directly by creating two types of vignettes: Events in which social approval or disapproval (evaluative vignettes) was present, and events in which social evaluation was absent (non-evaluative vignettes). Participants were asked to imagine themselves being the protagonist in each situation, and to report what they would feel.

The role of honor values in participants' responses can be inferred in the following ways. First, the number of references to others in the situation descriptions and in answers to open questions concerning the emotions can be seen as reflecting the significance of honor. Second, pride has more negative social implications and shame has more positive social implications in honor cultures than in individualistic cultures, which should be reflected in the extent to which these emotions are overtly expressed or shared with others. Finally, the role of honor values can also be inferred from the participants' concern about the social evaluation of their behavior, as reflected in the emotions elicited by the evaluative versus non-evaluative contexts.

We had five hypotheses. First, we expected the role of the self to be more salient in Dutch than in Spanish descriptions of the antecedents of pride and shame, and of the phenomenological contents of pride and shame. Dutch participants should refer more often to the self as the protagonist, or as the person whose thoughts and feelings are affected by the
episode. By contrast, we expected the role of others to be more salient in the Spanish descriptions of pride and shame antecedents, and thoughts and feelings about others to be more prominent in Spanish descriptions of phenomenological contents of pride and shame experiences.

Second, we expected Dutch and Spanish participants' descriptions of emotional actions, expression and social sharing of pride and shame experiences to differ. Spanish participants should be more inclined than Dutch participants to conceal the experience of pride. Shame, by contrast, should be more openly expressed and communicated in Spain than in the Netherlands.

Third, we expected differences in Spanish and Dutch descriptions of anger experiences to be most apparent in relation to events in which the self is at stake. Specifically, we expected Spanish participants to refer more often than Dutch participants to offenses by others as an anger-evoking event. Because one's honor is affected by such events and retaliation that is directed against the offender is an effective way to restore one's honor, we also expected Spanish participants to be more likely than their Dutch counterparts to report actions that were directed against the offender, such as expressing criticism or aggressive behavior.

Fourth, the assumption that Spanish participants attach more importance to social evaluation of their own behavior than do Dutch participants led us to predict larger differences between Spanish and Dutch emotional responses to the evaluative versions of the pride, shame and anger vignettes than to the non-evaluative versions. Our expectations with regard to emotional reactions to the evaluative versions were also based on the assumed social implications of pride and shame in Spain and the Netherlands. More specifically, we expected Spanish participants to be especially less likely than Dutch participants to report feelings of pride in response to the evaluative version of the pride vignette, more likely to report feelings of shame in response to the evaluative version of the shame vignette, and more likely to report feelings of anger in response to the evaluative version of the anger vignette.

Finally, these cultural differences are assumed to be present from a young age. Emotional elicitors, experiences, and expressions are often the targets of socialization practices (Lewis & Saarni, 1985; Saarni, 1993). Cultural beliefs about emotions and their social implications are presumably transmitted to children via socialization practices. According to Russell (1989), children acquire knowledge about emotion through emotion scripts. These are knowledge structures that describe features of emotions, and are influenced by a culture's view of emotions. However, cultural determinants of emotion may play a different role at different developmental stages (Stipek, 1983). In line with research on sex-typing and the development of sex-stereotypes (Golombok & Fivush, 1994), we assume that at younger ages children's knowledge of emotions conforms reasonably closely to cultural scripts, but that this
knowledge becomes more flexible and idiosyncratic as they become older. This implies that cultural differences in emotional components should be larger in younger age groups than in adolescents or adults. To test this hypothesis, we recruited Spanish and Dutch participants belonging to four different age groups.

Method

Participants

One hundred and sixty-nine Spanish participants (87 females, 82 males) and 158 Dutch participants (85 females, 72 males) belonging to one of four age groups (6-7 years; 11-12 years; 15-16 years; 22-23 years) participated in this study. The four age groups will be referred to below as 7-, 12-, 16- and 23-year-old participants, respectively. The numbers of males and females and the mean ages of the participants were approximately equal in the different subgroups formed by crossing culture and age-group. Seven- and 12-year-old Spanish participants were randomly selected from classes in two elementary schools, one in Madrid and the other in Mora (Toledo). Seven- and 12-year-old Dutch participants were randomly selected from classes in two elementary schools, one in Amsterdam and the other one in Groningen. Sixteen-year-old Spanish participants were recruited from a high school located in Madrid. Sixteen-year-old Dutch participants were recruited from two high schools in Amsterdam. All schools and high-schools were located in middle-class neighborhoods. Twenty-three year-old Spanish participants were psychology and history students at the Autónoma University of Madrid. Twenty-three year-old Dutch participants were also psychology and history students attending one of two universities in Amsterdam, the University of Amsterdam and the Free University. It was established that the nationalities of both parents of all Spanish and Dutch participants were also Spanish or Dutch, respectively.

Questionnaires

We prepared interview schedules for the 7- and 12-year-old participants, and written questionnaires for the 16- and 23-year-old participants. The interview schedules and questionnaires were based on pilot studies conducted with Spanish and Dutch children, adolescents and adults. The interview schedules and questionnaires were identical in structure and almost identical in content. They were divided into two parts. Part 1 assessed reactions to

---

1 One respondent did not report his or her sex. These Spanish and Dutch respondents participated also in Study 2 reported in Chapter 2.

2 The exact gender distribution and number of participants per age group in each country are shown in Table 2.4 in Chapter 2 (p. 31).
autobiographically-recalled experiences. Participants were asked to remember a situation in which they had felt pride, shame or anger. They then described the situation and reported what they had thought and felt (phenomenological experience), what they had done (emotional action), whether they had expressed their feelings (expression), and whether they had talked to others about the emotional situation at the time (social sharing).

The emotion words used were trots (Dutch) and orgullo (Spanish) for pride; schaamte (Dutch) and vergüenza (Spanish) for shame; and boosheid (Dutch) and enfado (Spanish) for anger. It is obviously of considerable importance to try to insure that the emotion words chosen for use in this type of research carry an equivalent meaning in each language. In practice it is almost impossible to find emotion words that share precisely the same denotative and connotative meanings in two different languages: Even if the words have the same denotative meaning, they may have different connotations, they may be used in different contexts, they may emphasize slightly different components of the emotion, and so on (Russell, Fernández-Dols, Manstead, and Wellenkamp, 1995). However, it is also evident that at least some emotions have core meanings (Smith & Lazarus, 1993) that are largely invariant across cultures. A similar claim is made by linguists, namely that emotion words in all languages share certain basic components (Wierzbicka, 1995). Thus an important requirement in cross-cultural emotion research is to identify emotion words that have similar core meanings. Then if differences are found in the way that a given emotion is experienced or expressed, they cannot simply be attributed to the use of a specific emotion label. We used three different strategies to establish whether the pairs of emotion words used in the present study had similar meanings in the two languages. First, we checked the dictionary definitions of the words in standard works of reference (Dutch: Van Dale’s Groot woordenboek van hedendaags Nederlands, 1991; and Spanish: Gran diccionario de la lengua española. Diccionario de uso, 1991). Careful comparison of the definitions showed that they have very similar core meanings. Trots and orgullo both refer to a positive feeling due to performing well or to having something valuable, and to an attitude of feeling superior to others. Schaamte and vergüenza both signify negative feelings because someone’s dignity or honor is affected or because of humiliation. Boosheid and enfado refer to negative feelings caused by the actions of others. Our second strategy was to examine the results of our previous study on cultural prototypes of emotion (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 2). In that study we used the same emotion words for pride and shame as used in the present research and we asked people to describe the antecedents, thoughts and feelings, bodily changes, actions, consequences, and normative

---

3 In our previous study we used different Spanish equivalents for anger: Ira instead of enfado. However, we assume that the core meaning of these emotion terms is similar since ira is considered as “a more intense enfado” (Gran diccionario de la lengua española: Diccionario de uso, 1991).
beliefs that they thought to be most prototypical for these emotion words. The results show quite clearly that the most prototypical or core meanings of all three emotions were mentioned most often by both Spanish and Dutch respondents. Our final strategy was to ask a small number of bilinguals; they agreed that the words chosen are the closest equivalents in the two languages.

In Part 2 of the questionnaires and interviews participants were presented with six vignettes designed to elicit pride, shame or anger. There were two vignettes per emotion, one describing a situation involving social evaluation (i.e., social approval of one’s academic achievements in the case of pride, social disapproval of one’s inappropriate behavior in an academic context in the case of shame, unfair public accusation in the case of anger), the other describing a situation in which there was no social evaluation and thus the protagonist was alone (i.e., self-achievement in a academic context in the case of pride, self-failure in an academic context in the case of shame, being robbed in the case of anger). These will be referred to as evaluative vignettes and non-evaluative vignettes, respectively. The content of the vignettes was conceptually equivalent across age groups, the only variations being those needed to make the vignettes appropriate to each age group. By way of illustration, the contents of the vignettes for the 23-year-old participants (translated into English) are shown in Appendix 4A. Participants were asked to imagine as vividly as possible that they were the protagonist in the situation described, and to answer one open-ended question about what emotion(s) they would feel in such a situation.

The interview schedules for the 7- and 12-year-old participants contained open-ended questions. The questionnaires for the 16- and 23-year-old participants also consisted mainly of open-ended questions, except for questions about the expression of one’s feelings and the social sharing of the emotional situation, which were answered on 7-point scales ranging from not at all (1) to very much (7). In response to these questions about the communication of emotion, 7- and 12-year-old participants were simply asked to report whether or not (yes/no) they expressed their feelings and shared the emotional situation with others. Order of presentation of emotions and of vignettes was counterbalanced across participants. Questionnaires and interview schedules were prepared in Dutch and then translated into Spanish by a native speaker, and independently backtranslated into Dutch.

**Procedure**

Seven- and 12-year-old Dutch and Spanish participants were individually interviewed by a Dutch and a Spanish female interviewer, respectively. The interviews were tape-recorded with the consent of the child. Each interview lasted between 20 and 30 minutes. The interviewers
were trained to follow the interview protocol and never to give children any hints or directions with regard to how to respond. The interviews were transcribed verbatim by native speakers. Sixteen- and 23-year-old Dutch and Spanish participants completed the questionnaire individually.

Content Analysis

A category system was constructed in order to code descriptions of autobiographically-recalled emotion-eliciting situations and responses to the open-ended questions. The categories were developed following inspection of a randomly selected 35% of the Spanish and Dutch questionnaires and interviews. Separate category systems were devised for each component of the pride, shame and anger experiences, and for each the three basic types of vignette (i.e., pride, shame, and anger). By way of illustration, the category system and coding criteria for the autobiographically-recalled pride experiences, and for the vignettes can be found in Appendix 4B and Appendix 4C, respectively. Dutch participants’ responses were coded by a native speaker of Dutch, and Spanish participants’ responses were coded by a native speaker of Spanish. After the categories had been created, a sample of interviews and questionnaires was coded independently by the two coders in order to identify difficulties in coding and possible differences in interpretation of the participants’ responses and categories. Disagreements were resolved through discussion. Next, the Dutch coder coded all the remaining Dutch participants’ responses and the Spanish coder coded all the remaining Spanish participants’ responses.

Participants’ responses were coded as follows. Each participant reported only one autobiographically-recalled emotion-eliciting situation, which was coded in the most appropriate of the categories relating to the antecedents of the specific emotion. Responses to the other open-ended questions (e.g., what participants had done during the anger episode) were coded in the following way. An answer was first divided into statements, and each statement was then allocated to the category in which it best fitted. Take the following example: If a participant reported that during her recalled anger episode she “shouted, broke some glasses and left the room,” her answer would have been divided into the statements “shout,” “broke some glasses” and “left the room.” The first and the second statements would both be coded as “undirected expression of anger.” This participant would be given a score of 2 in this category. The statement “left the room” would be coded as “retreating.” This participant would receive a score of 1 in this category. A given answer could in principle contain more than one statement, and could therefore attract more than one score across categories or a score of more than one in any given category.
Responses to the vignettes were coded in the same way: Responses to the question about which emotion respondents would feel were content analyzed. Answers were given either in terms of specific emotion labels, or in terms of appraisals (negative or positive thoughts about the situation), and categories were constructed accordingly.

A randomly selected 10% of the Spanish and 10% of the Dutch interviews and questionnaires were independently coded by an additional native speaker judge. The extent of agreement between the codings of the original and additional coders was computed separately for the Dutch and Spanish coders and for the three emotions, including the autobiographically-recalled experiences and the vignettes. The percentages of agreement were as follows: Spain: pride, 74%; shame, 80%; anger, 68%; the Netherlands: pride, 80%; shame: 77%; anger: 72%. These agreements were considered to be satisfactory.

Results

Overview

The categories created on the basis of the content analysis served as our dependent variables. The categories corresponding to antecedents of the autobiographically-recalled emotion-eliciting situations were dichotomous, i.e., a category was either not mentioned at all or it was mentioned just once. With regard to the remaining categories (i.e., those relating to the other emotion components and to the vignettes), preliminary inspection of the data revealed that it was unusual for a participant to have a score higher than 1 in any of these categories. Moreover, it was virtually never the case that a respondent had a score higher than 3 in any given category. Scores on these variables were therefore also dichotomized into “never mentioned” or “once or more than once.”

Logit analyses were performed in order to study the effects of country, gender, and age group on each dichotomous category. In logit analysis a set of models that define different effects of the independent variable(s) on the dependent variable are evaluated in terms of how well each model fits the data when compared to other models. The tested models need to be hierarchically related, i.e., one model is a subset of the other model, to enable comparisons among models. The extent to which a given model fits the data is given by the probability associated to the likelihood ratio chi square statistic. This statistic will be referred to below as LR. In logit analysis, a non-significant LR shows that the model concerned has a good fit with the data. Models can be compared to test for improvement in fit in the following way (Stevens, 1996): The difference between the LR for two models gives a new LR with degrees of freedom equal to the difference between the two models’ degrees of freedom. This difference in LRs represents the improvement in goodness-of-fit resulting from the inclusion of a factor in the
model. Thus in this case a significant LR here indicates that the inclusion of the extra factor improves goodness-of-fit.

In the present research a set of logit analyses were performed for each category in order to find the best fitting model. The set of logit analyses compared all possible models (i.e., main effects and interactions) in the manner explained above. However, given that the focus of the present study is on differences between cultures, we limit ourselves to presenting and discussing those models that (a) included the country effect and (b) were found to be the best fitting models. These models are for the main effect of country only (i.e., a model that only includes the main effect of country on the dependent variable); models that include interactions with country, and the main effects model that includes the main effect of country.

Results of logit analyses will be presented in the following way. For some categories it was found that the main effects model or a model including an interaction with country was the best fitting model. In these cases, information about the best fitting model and the results of the comparison test will be reported in the text. Also, information about the country main effect model is reported for all categories in the tables, along with results of the comparison test between this model and one that does not include the main effect of country (i.e., the independence model). We also applied the Bonferroni-Holm (Holland & Di Ponzio Copenhaver, 1988) correction to the set of comparison tests for the country main effect model corresponding to a given emotion component (e.g., pride actions) in order to control for alpha inflation resulting from multiple comparisons. This correction is applied to a "family" of tests; we defined a family of tests as those involved in the country main effect model, because the key prediction is that concerning country differences. The application of the Bonferroni-Holm correction provides an adjusted critical value of alpha for each individual comparison test. These adjusted alpha values are also shown in the tables. We will only discuss in the text those results that were significant in relation to these adjusted alphas.

A MacNemar transformation (McNemar, 1975) was performed on each category relating to the vignettes in order to be able to perform logit analyses on these data. For each category, a value of 0 was applied to cases in which a given category was only reported in response to the non-evaluative version of a vignette, and a value of 1 was applied to cases in which the category was only reported in reaction to the evaluative version of the vignette. Cases in which the category was either never mentioned or was mentioned in reaction to both versions of the vignette were not entered into the analyses. The scores on the transformed variable are

---

4 The expected frequencies for all categories conform to the criteria for the minimum recommended expected frequencies in logit analyses (Wickens, 1989).

5 In the main effects model the effect of country is independent of the other main effects, so we will only focus on the main effect of country in discussing the results.
therefore independent and can be analyzed using standard logit analysis. The procedures for performing and reporting the logit analyses were in all other respects the same as those followed for the autobiographically-recalled experiences.

Finally, responses to questions about expressing one’s feelings of pride, shame and anger and social sharing were analyzed in one of two ways, depending on age group. The dichotomous (yes/no) responses of the 7- and 12-year-old participants were analyzed using chi-square tests. The 16- and 23-year-old participants’ answers to these questions (ratings on 7-point scales) were analyzed using 2 (country) x 2 (gender) x 2 (age group) ANOVAs.

**Autobiographically-Recalled Experiences**

**Pride**

Preliminary inspection of responses revealed that some participants did not know the meaning of the word pride. This applied to 35 (79.5%) 7-year-old Spanish and 3 (6.7%) 7-year-old Dutch participants. For this reason the responses of the 7-year-old Spanish and Dutch participants were excluded from further analyses. With regard to the other age groups, only one 12-year-old Spanish participant reported not knowing the meaning of pride. This participant’s responses were also excluded from further analyses. Frequencies as a function of country, the country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category of pride antecedents, phenomenological contents, and actions are shown in Table 4.1.

**Antecedents and phenomenological contents.** Neither the country main effect model nor any other models including country provided a good fit for any of the categories.

**Actions.** The country main effect model provided the best fit for the category “expressing positive feelings” (see Table 4.1). Consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in this category than Spanish participants did.

---

5 Preliminary analyses also indicated that 6 out of 169 of the Spanish participants’ pride stories focused on “offenses by intimate others to the self.” Pride in this context refers to damaged honor or wounded pride (“orgullo herido”) rather than to a positive feeling of pride. Dutch respondents never mentioned this type of situation as one that elicits pride. Since all other pride situations reported by Spanish and Dutch participants centered on pride as a positive affective experience, responses centering on wounded pride were not included in further analyses.
Table 4.1
Results of Logit Analyses for Autobiographically-Recalled Pride Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CME</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antecedents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-achievement</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially appropriate</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive or new event</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with others' achievements</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts about the situation's effects on self</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feelings</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing positive feelings</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sharing of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to control oneself or the situation</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SP = Spain (n = 124). NL = the Netherlands (n = 113). CME = Country main effect model. CT = Comparison test of model. Alpha = adjusted critical value of alpha for each individual comparison test after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.

Expression and social sharing. Significant effects were only found for the 16- and 23-year-old participants, but here the differences were in line with predictions: 16- and 23-year-old Dutch participants (M = 4.84) scored higher on talking to others about the pride-eliciting situation than did their Spanish counterparts (M = 4.10), F (1, 126) = 5.99, p < .02. None of the multivariate interactions with country was significant.

Shame

Preliminary inspection of responses revealed that some participants did not know the meaning of the word shame. This applied to 14 (31.1%) 7-year-old Dutch and 3 (6.8%) 7-year-old Spanish participants. For this reason the responses of the 7-year-old Spanish and Dutch participants were excluded from further analyses. All other participants reported autobiographical shame experiences. Frequencies as a function of country, the country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category of shame antecedents, phenomenological contents, and actions are shown in Table 4.2.
Antecedents. The main effects model that included the main effect of country provided the best fit for the category “self-failure,” \( LR = 11.46, \text{ df} = 9, p = .245 \). This model provided a marginally significant improvement in fit when compared to the model that did not include the country’s main effect, \( LR = 3.67, \text{ df} = 1, p = .058 \). Consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in “self-failure” than Spanish participants did (see Table 4.2).

Phenomenological contents. The country main effect model provided the best fit for the categories “negative thoughts about the situation’s effects on self,” “escaping; negative feelings,” and “thoughts about oneself” (see Table 4.2). Consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in the categories “negative thoughts about the situation’s effects on self,” and “thoughts about oneself” than Spanish participants did. In contrast, Spanish participants scored higher in the category “escaping; negative feelings” than Dutch participants did.

Actions. Neither the country main effect model nor any other models including country provided a good fit for any of the categories.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Phenomenological contents</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living up to social norms</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative behavior by others</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to gain control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SP = Spain (n =124). NL = the Netherlands (n =113). CME = Country main effect model. CT = Comparison test of model. Alpha = adjusted critical value of alpha for each individual comparison test after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.
Expression and social sharing. In line with predictions, more 12-year-old Spanish participants (80.4%) reported expressing their feelings of shame than did their Dutch counterparts (47.5%), $\chi^2 (1, n = 86) = 8.82, p < .01$. Similarly, there was a tendency for 16- and 23-year-old Spanish participants ($M = 4.18$) to report that they expressed their feelings of shame to a greater extent than did their Dutch counterparts ($M = 3.65$), $F (1, 121) = 3.65, p < .06$. None of the multivariate interactions with country was significant.

Anger

All participants reported autobiographical anger experiences. Frequencies as a function of country, the country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category of anger antecedents, phenomenological contents, and actions are shown in Table 4.3.

Antecedents. The country main effect model provided the best fit for the category “offenses to self by intimates” (see Table 4.3). Spanish participants scored higher in this category than Dutch participants did.

Phenomenological contents. The model that included the interaction between country and age group provided the best fit for the category “rationalizing the situation,” $LR = 14.25, df = 8, p = .075$. This model was a significant improvement on the model without the interaction effect, $LR = 8.04, df = 3, p = .045$. Inspection of the parameters associated with the interaction and frequency tables reveals that the country differences are most salient for the 23-year-old participants: Dutch participants ($f = 15$) scored higher in this category than their Spanish counterparts did ($f = 7$).

Actions. The main effects model including the main effect of country provided the best fit for the categories “criticizing or ending relationship with the offender,” and “undirected expression of anger,” $LR = 14.81, df = 10, p = .235$, and $LR = 12.82, df = 11, p = .305$, respectively. These models yielded a significant improvement in fit when compared to models

---

Seven-year-old children had difficulty understanding the question about showing one's feelings of anger. Their answers to this question were therefore not included in the analyses.
that did not include the main effect of country, \( LR = 19.19, \text{ df } = 1, \text{ p } = < .001, \) and \( LR = 34.99, \text{ df } = 1, \text{ p } = < .001, \) respectively. Consistent with predictions, Spanish participants scored higher in the category “criticizing or ending relationship with the offender” than Dutch participants did, whereas Dutch participants scored higher in the category “undirected expression of anger” than Spanish participants did (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3  
Results of Logit Analyses for Autobiographically-Recalled Anger Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CME</th>
<th>CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antecedents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses to self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by intimates</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by non-intimates</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative behavior by others</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalizing the situation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaping; negative feelings</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative thoughts about others</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative thoughts about the situation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undirected expression of anger</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticizing or ending relationship with the offender</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sharing of experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreating</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to make it up</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to control the offender</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SP = Spain (n =169). NL = the Netherlands (n =158). CME = Country main effect model. CT = Comparison test of model. Alpha = adjusted critical value of alpha for each individual comparison test after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.

**Expression and social sharing.** There were no significant effects involving country.

**Vignettes**

Frequencies as a function of country, the country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category are shown in Table 4.4.
**Pride and Shame**

Neither the country main effect model nor any other models including country provided a good fit for any of the categories.

**Anger**

The main effects model that included the country main effect provided the best fit for the category “negative emotions (especially shame),” $LR = 16.03$, $df = 10$, $p = .099$. This provided a significantly better fit than the model that did not include the main effect of country, $LR = 7.36$, $df = 1$, $p = .008$. Inspection of the parameter associated with the country main effect and frequency tables reveals that country differences were most pronounced in reaction to the evaluative vignette: Spanish participants scored higher in this category than Dutch participants did (see Table 4.4).

**Table 4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>CME</th>
<th>CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pride Vignettes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive appraisals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling happy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shame Vignettes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sad about,</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid of the situation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative appraisals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame, embarrassment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions (especially shame)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** SP = Spain ($n = 169$). NL = the Netherlands ($n = 158$). NE = Non-evaluative version. E = Evaluative version. CME = Country main effect model. CT = Comparison test of model. Alpha = adjusted critical value of alpha for each individual comparison test after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.
Discussion

The general objective of this study was to investigate whether the greater salience of honor values in Spain, as compared with the Netherlands, is reflected in differences in the elicitation, experience, and communication of pride, shame, and anger. Our predictions with regard to shame antecedents and phenomenological contents were confirmed: Dutch participants more often referred to self-failure in their descriptions of shame antecedents than did Spanish participants. Similarly, Dutch participants' phenomenological experiences of shame were more often self-centered than were those of Spanish participants. By contrast, Spanish participants more often reported wanting to escape or having negative feelings in their descriptions of shame experiences than did Dutch participants. This finding is probably related to the type of shame antecedents Spanish participants reported. There is some suggestion in the data that Spanish participants more often reported situations in which public performances or social judgments took place than did Dutch participants. The country main effect model was the best fitting model for the category “public evaluations;” however, the p-value of the comparison LR test did not reach significance after applying the Bonferroni-Holm correction (see Table 4.2). In these types of situations the self is the focus of social attention, which could lead to more negative feelings or to a greater tendency of wanting to escape by the part of Spanish participants. Furthermore, we expected that shame would be less overtly expressed in the Netherlands than in Spain. In line with our reasoning, Spanish participants reported expressing their feelings of shame to a greater extent than did Dutch participants.

Although our predictions with regard to pride antecedents and phenomenological contents were not confirmed, cultural differences consistent with our expectations were evident in the actions related to the pride experience, and in the expression and social sharing of pride: Dutch participants more often reported expressing positive feelings in their descriptions of pride actions than did Spanish participants in their descriptions. Dutch participants also reported talking to others about the pride-eliciting situation to a greater extent than did Spanish participants.

Turning now to the descriptions of recalled anger experiences, our predictions were again confirmed. In relation to anger antecedents, Spanish participants were more likely than their Dutch counterparts to report situations in which intimate others offended the self. The degree of intimacy of the relationship with the offender therefore seems to be a dimension worth taking into account in future research in which honor and non-honor cultures are compared with respect to insults and other offenses. Although Spanish and Dutch participants did not differ in the extent to which anger was expressed or shared with others, they did, as expected, differ in the specific actions undertaken during the anger episode: Spanish participants were
more likely than their Dutch counterparts to report criticizing and ending relationship with the offender (i.e., the source of their anger) in their descriptions of anger actions. This greater inclination to undertake actions against the offender can be seen as consistent with the notion that Spanish participants were more likely to regard their honor as having been offended. By contrast, Dutch participants referred more often than Spanish participants to actions that were not specifically directed to others, such as shouting or breaking things.

With regard to the experimenter-provided vignettes, we expected the evaluative versions of the vignettes to provoke stronger cultural differences in emotional responses than the non-evaluative versions. However, this prediction was only supported in the case of the anger vignettes: Here the evaluative version elicited more negative feelings from Spanish than from Dutch participants. Closer inspection of the types of emotion reported by respondents revealed that answers focused mostly on shame, and to a lesser extent on sadness and fear. This finding probably reflects the specific content of the evaluative version of the anger vignette: It described an unjust public accusation of the self in front of intimate others, whereas the evaluative versions of the other vignettes did not entail intimate others being present. Once again we see signs that intimate others play a crucial role in offense situations. We suggest that this relates to the strong interdependence between one’s own honor and the honor of intimate others in honor cultures. This has two important consequences. First, one’s own honor is more vulnerable to humiliations and insults by intimates than by non-intimates, leading to angrier feelings and a stronger need to restore one’s honor. Second, being offended by others in front of intimates may lead to more negative feelings, especially of shame, in honor than in non-honor cultures, because one’s own honor has implications for the honor of intimate others: If the self is offended and one’s honor is thereby diminished, the honor of one’s intimates will also be diminished.

In the case of the pride and shame vignettes the context variation did not result in any significant differences between the two countries. A possible explanation for this lack of difference arises from the way in which the evaluative context was manipulated. Although the evaluative and non-evaluative vignettes differed with respect to social evaluation, this was not the only respect in which they differed. Varying the contents of the two types of vignette was felt to be necessary because evaluative context was a within-subjects manipulation. However, it is clearly possible that theoretically irrelevant content variations may have added to the error variance in participants’ responses, thereby restricting our chances of finding the expected interaction between country and evaluative context.

In relation to our fifth and final hypothesis concerning cultural differences in the different age groups, we expected these differences to be most apparent among the youngest group of participants. However, there was only one significant interaction between country and age
group — for the category “rationalizing the situation” in phenomenological contents of recalled anger episodes — and the cultural differences in this case were most apparent for 23-year-old participants. Our prediction was therefore not supported. However, the finding that a majority of 7-year-old Spanish children reported not knowing what pride was, whereas a majority of 7-year-old Dutch children reported not knowing what shame was, merits further comment. This might reflect the fact that Spanish children acquire knowledge about pride at a later age than Dutch children, and that Dutch children acquire knowledge about shame at a later age than their Spanish counterparts. Although it is not possible on the basis of the present research to determine whether such an explanation is correct, or whether these children did have a concept of shame and pride but did not know the meaning of the words “shame” and “pride,” the fact that children in one culture do not know a particular emotion word whereas children in another culture do know it suggests at least that such feelings are less often explicitly verbalized in the former culture. These findings can be interpreted in terms of the social implications of pride and shame in honor and individualistic cultures: The expression of pride threatens social connectedness, and is therefore more likely to create social problems in Spain, whereas the expression of shame signals a lack of independence from others, and is therefore more likely to be taboo in the Netherlands. This issue certainly merits further research.

In conclusion, we regard the present research as advancing the study of self-related values and emotion in three important ways. First, the observed differences between Spain and the Netherlands with respect to pride, shame, and anger are consistent with predictions derived from the observation that honor values are relatively more important in Spain, whereas individualistic values are relatively more important in the Netherlands. Second, the findings show that cultural differences in these self-related values have an impact on emotions that are closely tied to the self, as in “self-conscious emotions,” and on emotion antecedents in which there is a focus on the self, as in the case of affronts. Third, comparing emotions across cultures at the level of emotional components provides an insight into the way in which differences in the importance of self-related values affect the emotion process.

Finally, our findings indicate that not all types of offenses lead to angry feelings in honor cultures. In particular, offenses committed by non-intimates were common anger-eliciting situations for both Spanish and Dutch participants, whereas offenses committed by intimates were more often reported as anger elicitors by Spanish than by Dutch participants. This raises the question of which factors involved in an offense situation are determinants of the elicitation of anger in honor cultures and in individualistic cultures. The results of the present study show that the closeness of one’s relationship with the offender is an important factor. In the next chapter we report a study that aimed to investigate the factors involved in the elicitation of anger, hurt pride, and shame in response to offenses in Spain and the Netherlands.
Appendix 4A
Vignettes Presented to the 23-year-old Participants

**Pride vignette with a non-evaluative context:** “Imagine you have obtained a good mark in an exam.”

**Pride vignette with an evaluative context:** “Imagine you have won an important prize and you are publicly congratulated during a university meeting.”

**Shame vignette with a non-evaluative context:** “Imagine you have obtained a low mark in an exam, while your classmates have obtained good marks.”

**Shame vignette with an evaluative context:** “Imagine you are cheating during an exam. The teacher sees you and asks you in a loud voice what you are doing.”

**Anger vignette with a non-evaluative context:** “Imagine somebody has stolen some of your books in the university library.”

**Anger vignette with an evaluative context:** “Imagine you are unjustly accused by a friend of yours of stealing money from close friends in front of them.”
Appendix 4B
Description and Coding Criteria of the Category System for the Autobiographically-Recalled Pride Experiences

Antecedents

"Self-achievement:" Participant’s success at work, in social life, etc. (e.g., getting a very good mark in an exam).

"Socially appropriate behavior:" Participant’s appropriate actions according to social norms (e.g., rescuing a girl who was drowning).

"A positive or new event:" Participant’s experiencing nice, happy situations (e.g., playing with friends).

"Identification with others’ achievements:" Feeling good about others’ achievements (e.g., feeling proud of being Dutch).

Phenomenological contents

"Thoughts about the situation’s effects on self:" Thoughts about the consequences of the situation that provoked pride on oneself. It usually involved positive evaluations about the situation (e.g., “I thought that all my effort was rewarded”).

"Positive feelings:" Having positive generic feelings (e.g., “I was very happy”).

"Positive thoughts about oneself:" For instance, “I was very proud of myself,” or “I feel I am better than other people”.

Actions

"Expressing positive feelings:" Verbal and non-verbal expression of participants’ positive feelings. These expressions were not directed to others (e.g., “I jumped from joy”).

"Social sharing of the experience:" Telling others about the pride experience (e.g., “I called my parents to tell them what had happened”).

"Trying to control oneself or the situation:" Behaviors that aimed at controlling one’s behavior, the situation, or at rationalizing what had happened (e.g., “I started joking about it”).
Appendix 4C
Description and Coding Criteria of the Category System for the Vignettes

Pride Vignettes

“Pride:” Only those responses that referred to feeling pride, or being proud of oneself were coded into this category.

“Positive appraisals:” Positive evaluations about the situation depicted in the vignette, or its positive consequences for oneself were coded into this category (e.g., “I would think how good this is for my future”).

“Feeling happy:” Positive feelings about the situation described in the vignette were coded into this category, such as feeling happy.

Shame Vignettes

“Feeling sad about, afraid of the situation:” Only those responses that referred to feelings of sadness or fear in relation to the situation depicted in the vignette were coded into this category (“I would feel sadness”).

“Negative appraisals:” Negative evaluations about the situation depicted in the vignette, or its negative consequences for oneself were coded into this category (e.g., “I would think that now I have to work very hard because I did not pass the exam”).

“Shame, embarrassment:” Only those responses that referred to feeling shame, embarrassment, or shyness were coded into this category.

Anger Vignettes

“Negative emotions (especially shame):” Only those responses that referred to feelings of sadness, fear, or shame in relation to the situation depicted in the vignette were coded in this category. Most of the responses referred to feelings of shame.

“Negative appraisals:” Negative evaluations about the situation depicted in the vignette, its negative consequences for oneself, or negative thoughts about others were coded into this category (e.g., “I would think that what this person has done is not right”).

“Anger:” Only those responses that referred to feeling anger, rage, or irritation were coded into this category.