

Antecedents and Appraisals of Triumph across Four Countries

Cross-Cultural Research

1–21

© 2021 SAGE Publications

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/10693971211008159

journals.sagepub.com/home/ccr

Hyisung C. Hwang¹, David Matsumoto¹,
Hiroshi Yamada², Aleksandra Kostic³,
and Juliana Granskaya⁴

Abstract

This study examined cross-cultural similarities and differences in antecedents and appraisals of triumph. Participants in the U.S., Serbia, Russia, and Japan provided open-ended descriptions of previous antecedent events that elicited experiences of triumph, and completed a standard appraisal questionnaire about those events. Events that elicited pride were also included for comparison. The open-ended responses were coded using a framework that delineated theoretical characteristics of triumph based on previous research. Findings indicated cross-cultural similarities in the antecedents and appraisals of triumph-eliciting events. Cultural variations were also found, especially between Japan and the other cultural groups and with regard to self-evaluations, which suggested the role of culture in triggering and appraising emotion-eliciting events. These findings extended empirical evidence about these important components of triumph, further contributing to its possibility as a discrete emotion.

¹San Francisco State University, USA

²Nihon University, Japan

³University of Nis, Serbia

⁴St. Petersburg State University, Russia

Corresponding Author:

Hyisung C. Hwang, San Francisco State University, USA.

Email: hshwang@humintell.com

Keywords

triumph, culture, appraisals, dominance, power, nonverbal signals

Emotions are crucial for our well-being, survival, and social bonds. Much research to date has focused on mainstream emotions such as anger, fear, or happiness, and to a lesser extent others such as pride, shame, or embarrassment (Matsumoto et al., 2008; Shiota et al., 2004; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Building on this literature, recent studies have provided evidence for the possibility of triumph to be considered an emotion by documenting its uniqueness across several components typically considered as parts of emotion (reviewed below).

In this paper we extend knowledge about the nature and function of triumph as a potential emotion by examining two important components of discrete emotions—its antecedents and appraisals across cultures. The current study is in the genre of a larger literature documenting various components of discrete emotions and addresses this research question: if triumph is an emotion, it should have unique event antecedent characteristics and psychological appraisals associated with those antecedent events.

Previous Literature

In documenting that an emotion may be discrete, understanding its existence and importance in social interactions and human life and investigating whether it is recognizable is essential. Thus, one major component of discrete emotions is their signal value, which has been demonstrated through cross-cultural judgment studies of expressions. Evidence to date has indicated that certain bodily configurations that may be associated with triumph have been labeled a signal of threat, winning, dominance, or victory (Darwin, 1872; Friedman & Miller-Herringer, 1991; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2012; Mazur, 1985).¹ For example, in their study in the U.S. and Korea, Matsumoto and Hwang (2012) examined judgments of behavioral reactions of winners immediately after intense agonistic encounters at the final judo matches in the Olympic Games. Those behavioral reactions were identified as triumph and not other positive emotions such as happiness, contentment, or pride, including some reactions previously considered as pride. The display of victory, labeled, and recognized as triumph and produced by winners only, suggested that triumph potentially serves specific evolutionary functions, providing winners with authority or power in a community, at least in the two cultural groups studied.

Another important component of a discrete emotion is the production of a nonverbal signal across cultures, a question that was addressed by Hwang and Matsumoto (2014a, 2014b). In these studies, naïve coders coded the first, immediate behavioral reactions of judo athletes immediately after winning or losing a match for an Olympic medal. Factor analysis of the codes indicated that the primary components of the expressions were expansion, aggression, and attention. These behaviors differentiated winners and losers, and expressors came from diverse cultural backgrounds. These features have also been reported in non-human primates (i.e., de Waal, 1989; Mouterde et al., 2012); their expanded body sizes and grimacing facial and vocal signals occurred in antagonistic situations characterized by tension involving hierarchical group structures or in which power and social standing might be challenged. Not only did these findings add empirical evidence concerning a possible expression of triumph; they also clarified potential differences between triumph expressions and other positive emotions, such as pride or happiness. Descriptions of pride and happiness previously well documented (i.e., Frank & Ekman, 1993; Gunnery et al., 2013; Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008; Tracy & Robins, 2008, 2014) were different from those of triumph, including reaction times (Hwang & Matsumoto, 2014a, 2014b), with expressions of triumph occurring more quickly than expressions of pride.

Another component of a discrete emotion is cross-cultural similarities (and variations) in self-reported experience and reactions. Thus, a recent study reported findings across four nation cultures and confirmed that expansion and aggression were part of self-reported bodily expressions in reaction to triumphant events (Hwang et al., 2016). Overall, the studies above provided evidence for the possible existence of triumph as an emotion by documenting its characteristics across several components traditionally considered part of emotions. Other components of discrete emotions is cross-cultural similarity (and variations) in its antecedent, eliciting events and their appraisals. Thus, this study addressed this gap in the literature.

Potential Characteristics of Triumph-Eliciting Antecedent Events

Regarding antecedent characteristics, Matsumoto and Hwang (2012) proposed that triumph is elicited by intense events involving agonistic, achievement-related competition against others that have consequences to social ranking, status and dominance, and are quick, immediate reactions to such events. In their framework, achievement in competitive contexts that has implications to dominance and hierarchy are keys to the elicitation of triumph. In this manner, triumph may be conceptually different from other positive emotions such as pride, the former a reaction to winning or achievement,

the latter involving a positive evaluation of oneself and more complicated cognitive processes. Once elicited, triumph expressions may serve to signal victory, augmenting results of the individual's achievement, intimidating and asserting dominance over others and achieving status, enhancing the victor's feelings of power, and preparing for future confrontations beyond the initial contest. In this framework, events that elicit triumph are associated with intense competitive contexts, strong motivations for winning and achievement, unpredictability, risks in outcomes, and an underlying anxiety and tension to control psychological instability, which can contribute to strong motivations for power and dominance.

One way to establish dominance or authority is the use of intimidation to attain social status through effective induction of fear (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Although the encounters and situations to overcome can be against others or within ourselves, an interpersonal function of establishing dominance and social rank is crucial in understanding the nature of triumph. For example, Bellocchi and Ritchie (2015) tested expressions in class settings in which students had to solve challenging quizzes with their classmates. Students who provided correct answers were more likely to produce bodily reactions that were similar to what Matsumoto and Hwang (2012) reported—displays of tension and aggression by one-armed, fist-pump gestures, grimacing facial expressions, and the vocalization “Yess.” Sport- and non-sport contexts that have shared characteristics (tension, competition, so on) possibly predisposed the elicitation of triumph.

The need for dominance to establish hierarchies exists not only in human societies, but also in non-human primates. de Waal (1982), a pioneer in research on non-human primates and their social mechanisms, reported that dominant group members in chimpanzee communities regularly adopt postures that make them appear as large as possible to other group members. Expressing dominance behaviorally can be functional in social interactions, particularly in a hierarchical group; such displays often impact other parties and can elicit submissive reactions by others (Mast et al., 2008). If these taunting signals serve to stabilize dominant members' positions in their hierarchical societies, and the behavioral signals are similar to those of triumph reported previously (e.g., Matsumoto & Hwang, 2012), then there is more likely a meaningful connection between dominance and triumph.

Understanding the nature and the function of triumph vis-à-vis dominance, therefore, which involves pursuing social standing, is necessary given previous literature that has suggested overlapping characteristics among dominance, authority, hierarchy and triumph. Given a communicative function of dominance, the display of dominance is more likely to be necessary for group stability and control, as hierarchies are necessary for societal stability.

Conceptually, triumph is different from other emotions such as pride (as mentioned above). Pride is a well-known positive emotion that has been thoroughly investigated by Tracy and colleagues and that was previously confused with triumph (Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008; Tracy & Robins, 2014). Triumph should be the initial, immediate reaction to winning or achievement; pride would occur as a result of positive evaluations of the self. The same context may elicit both; but on closer inspection, the antecedent of triumph should be the event outcome; the antecedent of pride should be a positive outcome from evaluative processes about the self vis-à-vis an outcome. Triumph should be a reaction to winning or achievement, whereas pride should be a reaction to a positive evaluation of the self having won (or even lost).

Appraisals of Proposed Triumph-Eliciting Antecedent Events

Another important component of discrete emotions is their appraisals (cognitive evaluations of antecedent events); different emotions are associated with different appraisal processes (Matsumoto et al., 1988; Scherer et al., 1986). In Scherer's (2001) well-known appraisal theory, which is the basis of the methodology used in this study, emotions are associated with a process of stimulus evaluation checks, which involve dimensions such as general evaluations, event characteristics, event causation, event consequences, and reactions vis-à-vis event consequences. Methodologically, each dimension is assessed by items comprising each dimension.

Because we posit that triumph is rooted in winning in agonistic competition whereas pride is rooted in positive self-evaluations, these emotions should differ on three appraisal dimensions. Triumph-eliciting events should be associated with more internal, causal attributions because triumph should be perceived to result from one's direct actions.² Triumph should also be associated with more positive event outcomes and require more urgent action than pride.

Culture can influence the types of events available to elicit emotions, but previous research has found relatively few cultural differences in antecedent event types (Mauro et al., 1992; Scherer, 1997; Scherer & Ellgring, 2007), which is consistent with our analysis of triumph- and pride-eliciting events as the same achievement-related event may elicit both. Previous work has found relatively few cultural differences on appraisals concerning characteristics of events (consistent with the notion of cross-cultural similarities in event types), but relatively larger differences in appraisals requiring more cultural schemata and greater interpretation (Mauro et al., 1992; Scherer, 1997; Scherer & Ellgring, 2007). For example, Scherer (1997)

reported cultural differences on dimensions related to morality, fairness and external attribution (akin to cultural similarities and differences in emotion taxonomies and semantic profiles; see Fontaine et al., 2007, 2013). But these differences were largely differences in degree and not direction. To date, these possibilities have not been examined vis-a-vis triumph or pride. Based on these previous findings, we expect that cultures will differ in the degree of differences between the three triumph- and pride-eliciting event appraisals described above.

Overview of the Current Study and Hypotheses

The current study addressed the issues raised above concerning the characteristics of triumph-eliciting antecedents and their associated appraisals across cultures, which would contribute to a growing literature on triumph. We designed the study as a cross-cultural comparison of countries that are diverse geographically and culturally: Japan, Russia, Serbia, and the U.S. We also included a comparison emotion—pride—to ensure that the triumph-eliciting events obtained were different from those of an emotion often confused with triumph. Participants provided open-ended responses describing events that elicited triumph and pride and rated their appraisals of those events. We coded the open-ended responses based on the theoretical framework of triumph-eliciting events above and tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: That compared to pride, triumph-eliciting events involve greater competition; achievement, specifically achievement over others; social ranking; social recognition; and social standing; less positive evaluation of self; and faster reaction times.

Hypothesis 2: That triumph-eliciting events would be associated with greater internal, causal attributions; positive outcomes; and urgent reactions compared to pride. These differences should occur in the following sections of the appraisal questionnaire (described more fully below): Special Circumstances, Own Behavior, and You Caused (in the Event Causation section); Positive, Desirable Outcomes; Negative, Undesirable Outcomes; Self-Esteem; and Unfairness (in the Event Consequences section); and Urgent Action (in the Reactions section).

Hypothesis 3: That country moderated these effects. Specifically, we hypothesized that culture would produce differences in degree of difference, but not direction, in appraisal differences between triumph and pride in Hypothesis 2.

Methods

Participants

Participants were a convenience sample of U.S. Americans ($n_s=73$ females, 25 males, 1 Other; M age=21.81, $SD=6.14$, min/max=18/57), Japanese ($n_s=84$ females, 48 males; M age=19.64, $SD=1.46$, min/max=18/26), Russians ($n_s=96$ females, 15 males; M age=25.22, $SD=8.60$, min/max=16/55), and Serbians ($n_s=67$ females, 71 males; M age=28.26, $SD=11.43$, min/max=18/66). All were born and raised in their country, spoke their national language as a first language, and were university students participating voluntarily in partial fulfillment of class requirements.

Instruments

The questionnaire was adapted from an instrument used in seminal studies examining self-reported antecedents and reactions to emotion-eliciting events (Matsumoto et al., 1988; Scherer & Wallbott, 1994). It consisted of two parts, one for triumph and one for pride, each comprising three sections: (a) the antecedents and determinants of a triumph (pride)-eliciting event, (b) the reactions of the participants in that situation, and (c) the amount of control and coping attempts participants used to regulate their reactions. The antecedent section was the focus of this study and began with an open-ended question asking participants to describe freely a past event that elicited the target emotion in them. All obtained responses were of events that actually happened personally to the participant, and were not historical or sporting events related to the national history of each country. See Appendix A for verbatim samples of triumph and pride event descriptions.

The antecedent section also included an appraisal questionnaire based on the Geneva Appraisal Questionnaire (Matsumoto et al., 1988; Scherer, 1993, 2001), which included five sections; number of and sample items in quotes for each section were as follows: (1) General evaluations of the event that produced ____ (target emotion label inserted) (General Evaluations, four items): "To what extent did you feel shameful in the above situation because of yourself," "How would you evaluate this type of event in general: Pleasant" and ". . . Unpleasant." (2) Characteristics of the event that produced ____ (Event Characteristics, six items): "At the time the event occurred: did you think that the event happened very suddenly and abruptly?" and ". . .the event would have very important consequences for you?" (3) Causation of the event that produced ____ (Event Causation, six items): "What did you think caused the event: chance, special circumstances, or natural forces?," ". . .you own behavior?" and "If so, did you cause the event intentionally?"

(4) Consequences of the event that produced _____ (Event Consequences, 10 items): “At the moment the event occurred: did you think the event would: bring about positive, desirable outcomes for you?,” “. . . negative, undesirable outcomes,” “. . . affect feelings about yourself, self-esteem, or self-confidence?” (5) Reactions with respect to the real or expected consequences of the event that produced _____ (Reactions vis-à-vis Event Consequences, three items): “At the moment the event occurred, did you think that it was urgent to act immediately?” All items were rated using a scale labeled 1, not at all, 3, moderately, and 5, extremely; the scales also had an option for N/A.

Procedures

Questionnaires were placed in an online survey format, with emotion order counterbalanced across participants. All participants volunteered to participate in the survey or received research credit for their participation and were provided the URL with the survey. The survey for each country took place in their home country and participants were allowed to complete their surveys on their time. All non-English questionnaires were back-translated and reviewed by the co-authors.

Event Coding Procedures

Based on previous literature delineating the characteristics of triumph and pride (Hwang & Matsumoto, 2014a, 2014b; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2012; Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008), a set of coding categories was created to characterize the events participants reported. The coding involved the following eight categories: (1) Competition: the degree to which the event involved competition against others; (2) Personal Achievement: whether the event involved some kind of individual goal attainment; (3) Achievement over Others: the degree to which the personal achievement involved achievement over other people; that is, achieving one’s personal best at something may not necessarily involve others; (4) Ranking compared to Others: the degree to which any result that occurred because of an achievement produced a hierarchy or ranking of individuals; (5) Recognition by Others: the degree to which the event was valued or recognized by others or society; (6) Raising Social Status: the extent that the event raised the individual’s social status or standing; (7) Positive Self-Evaluation: the degree to which the emotional reaction involved a positive evaluation of the self; and (8) Perceived Reaction Time: how closely the emotional reaction was perceived to have occurred relative to the ending of the event. All eight categories were scaled from 0, Not at All to 4, Totally (for Perceived Reaction Time, the scale was anchored so that

lower numbers were relatively simultaneous to the event while larger numbers were farther away). To establish reliability, three coders independently coded 30 cases of each country's data, resulting in reliabilities that were high and acceptable for all categories (ICCs=0.82–0.98). The three coders then coded equal divisions of the remaining cases. Cases whose responses were irrelevant to the questions and coding schemes or uncodable (e.g., “not sure,” “anytime”) were eliminated from data analyses.

Results

Differences between Triumph- and Pride-Eliciting Antecedent Events

We computed two-way Emotion (2) by Country (4) mixed ANOVAs on the eight coded categories. As predicted, the main effects of Emotion were significant for all analyses except one (Table 1). On one hand triumph-eliciting events were associated with more Competition, Personal Achievement, Achievement over Others, Ranking compared to Others, Raising Social Status, and faster Perceived Reaction Times than pride-eliciting events. On the other hand, pride-eliciting events were associated with greater Positive Self-Evaluations. Therefore, the overall directions of the differences between triumph- and pride-eliciting events were consistent across the four countries on seven of eight coded categories, supporting Hypothesis 1.

Although we did not predict country moderation on the event characteristics, Emotion by Country interactions were significant on Personal Achievement, Positive Self-Evaluations, and Perceived Reaction Times, $F(3, 299)=3.30, p=.021, \eta_p^2=.032$; $F(3, 294)=4.52, p=.004, \eta_p^2=.044$; and $F(3, 294)=3.21, p=.023, \eta_p^2=.032$. Because the main focus of this paper was on emotion differences, we decomposed these interactions by computing simple effects of Emotion on these three categories using Bonferroni corrections (0.05/12 comparisons; Table 2). Triumph-eliciting events were higher than pride-eliciting events in the U.S. and Japan on Personal Achievement (the means trended in the same directions for Russia and Serbia). On Positive Self-Evaluations, pride-eliciting events had higher ratings than triumph-eliciting events in the U.S.; the means trended in the same direction for Russia and Serbia but not for Japan. On Perceived Reaction Time, no simple effect was significant (means for the U.S., Russia, and Serbia trended in the same direction as the significant main effect, but not Japan). Thus, the findings indicated that the Japanese contributed to the country interactions as their data were not in the intended direction on two categories (Positive Self-Evaluations and Perceived Reaction Time).³

Table 1. Main Effects of Emotion from Two-Way, Mixed ANOVAs on the Eight Coded Categories.

Coded category	Triumph M (SD)	Pride M (SD)	Emotion main effect	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Competition	2.05 (1.56)	1.38 (1.50)	$F(1, 298) = 30.78,$ $p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.094$	0.44
Personal achievement	3.14 (.95)	2.65 (1.26)	$F(1, 298) = 27.16,$ $p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.083$	0.44
Achievement over others	2.04 (1.59)	1.33 (1.52)	$F(1, 291) = 34.90,$ $p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.107$	0.46
Ranking compared to others	2.26 (1.55)	1.72 (1.59)	$F(1, 288) = 16.03,$ $p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.053$	0.34
Recognition by others	2.34 (1.06)	2.15 (1.15)	$F(1, 279) = 2.71,$ $p = .101, \eta_p^2 = 0.010$	0.17
Raising social status	2.21 (1.15)	1.96 (1.21)	$F(1, 270) = 7.04,$ $p = .008, \eta_p^2 = 0.025$	0.21
Positive self-evaluation	0.83 (1.45)	1.16 (1.60)	$F(1, 294) = 8.68,$ $p = .003, \eta_p^2 = 0.029$	-0.22
Perceived reaction time	0.44 (.92)	0.70 (1.17)	$F(1, 294) = 10.30,$ $p = .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.034$	-0.25

Differences between Appraisals of Triumph- and Pride-Eliciting Events

To examine differences between triumph- and pride-eliciting event appraisals, we computed doubly repeated MANOVAs using Country (4) and Emotion (2) as independent variables and the items in each section of the appraisal questionnaire as multiple dependents, and with planned, univariate *F*s using deviation contrasts. MANOVAs were preferred over item-by-item univariate tests to reduce experiment-wise error.

As predicted, the main effects of Emotion were significant for sections concerning Event Causation and Event Consequences (Table 3). Univariate *F*s indicated that, relative to pride-eliciting events, triumph-eliciting events were appraised to have occurred more because of special circumstances, one's own behavior, and one's own causality (Event Causation); to bring about positive, desirable outcomes and to have affected one's self-esteem (Event Consequences); and to have required urgent and immediate action (Reactions vis-à-vis Event Consequences). Compared to triumph-eliciting events, pride-eliciting events were perceived to be associated with relatively more negative, undesirable outcomes Event Consequences). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Table 2. Simple Effects Contrasts for Coded Categories that Produced Significant Country by Emotion Interactions in the Overall ANOVAs.

Coded category	Country	Triumph M (SD)	Pride M (SD)	Simple effect F	Cohen's d
Personal achievement	U.S.	3.07 (1.00)	2.36 (1.40)	$F(1, 105) = 21.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .168$	0.59
	Japan	3.02 (0.84)	2.25 (1.21)	$F(1, 56) = 18.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .256$	0.75
	Russia	3.28 (1.06)	3.15 (0.92)	$F(1, 40) = .36$, $p = .554$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.009$	0.13
	Serbia	3.23 (0.91)	2.97 (1.11)	$F(1, 102) = 3.61$, $p = .060$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.035$	0.26
Positive self-evaluation	U.S.	1.37 (1.69)	2.01 (1.72)	$F(1, 95) = 7.90$, $p = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .078$	-0.38
	Japan	0.88 (1.39)	0.55 (1.13)	$F(1, 60) = 2.47$, $p = .121$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.040$	0.26
	Russia	1.10 (1.72)	1.83 (1.74)	$F(1, 40) = 5.54$, $p = .024$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.124$	-0.42
	Serbia	0.20 (0.75)	0.47 (1.11)	$F(1, 103) = 4.95$, $p = .028$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.046$	-0.29
Perceived reaction time	U.S.	0.82 (1.23)	1.37 (1.54)	$F(1, 95) = 8.32$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.081$	-0.40
	Japan	0.38 (0.67)	0.37 (0.82)	$F(1, 60) = 0.02$, $p = .904$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.000$	0.01
	Russia	0.40 (0.74)	0.80 (0.97)	$F(1, 40) = 7.01$, $p = .012$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.152$	-0.47
	Serbia	0.15 (0.60)	0.24 (0.60)	$F(1, 103) = 1.57$, $p = .213$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.015$	-0.15

The MANOVA also produced significant main effects on General Evaluations and Event Characteristics (Table 3). Relative to pride-eliciting events, triumph-eliciting events were appraised as relatively more pleasant (within General Evaluations), to have happened very suddenly and to have very important consequences for oneself (Event Characteristics), and as relatively less shameful because of oneself and unpleasant (General Evaluations). These findings were not predicted, but suggested additional ways in which triumph- and pride-eliciting events were appraised across cultures.

The Emotion by Country interaction was significant for sections concerning General Evaluations, Event Consequences, and Reactions vis-à-vis Event Consequences, $\lambda = .92$, $F(12, 883.97) = 2.46$, $p = .004$; $\lambda = .85$, $F(30, 986.90) = 1.88$, $p = .003$; and $\lambda = .94$, $F(9, 888.46) = 2.64$, $p = .005$, respectively.

Table 3. Emotion Main Effects and Significant Deviation Contrasts from MANOVAs Computed separately each Appraisal Section.

Section	Emotion main effect	Items	Triumph <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Pride <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Significant univariate <i>F</i> s	Cohen's <i>d</i>
General evaluations	$\lambda = 0.91$, $F(4, 334) = 7.89$, $p < .001$	Shameful because of yourself	1.66 (1.35)	1.82 (1.48)	$F(1, 353) = 4.94$, $p = .027$	-0.11
		Shameful because of others	1.88 (1.57)	1.94 (1.56)		-0.04
		Pleasant	4.50 (.91)	4.08 (1.35)	$F(1, 353) = 29.65$, $p < .001$	0.37
Event characteristics	$\lambda = 0.96$, $F(6, 351) = 2.67$, $p = .015$	Unpleasant	1.68 (1.20)	1.98 (1.45)	$F(1, 353) = 9.75$, $p = .002$	-0.23
		Happen suddenly	2.69 (1.44)	2.57 (1.52)	$F(1, 353) = 3.85$, $p = .050$	0.08
		Predicted	3.07 (1.33)	3.18 (1.36)		-0.08
		Familiarity	3.01 (1.44)	2.94 (1.45)		0.05
		Importance	3.85 (1.36)	3.63 (1.41)	$F(1, 353) = 6.77$, $p = .010$	0.16
		Acceptableness	4.50 (.99)	4.39 (1.14)		0.10
Event causation	$\lambda = 0.93$, $F(6, 340) = 4.09$, $p = .001$	Social norm	1.44 (1.20)	1.47 (1.21)		-0.02
		Special circumstances	2.48 (1.45)	2.29 (1.51)	$F(1, 353) = 4.13$, $p = .043$	0.13
		Own behavior	4.11 (1.21)	3.84 (1.35)	$F(1, 353) = 8.64$, $p = .004$	0.21
		You caused	3.68 (1.63)	3.39 (1.75)	$F(1, 353) = 8.64$, $p = .003$	0.17
		Consistency	3.91 (1.28)	3.80 (1.45)		0.08
		One other person	3.20 (1.58)	3.37 (1.57)		-0.11
		Other caused	3.17 (1.86)	3.15 (1.81)		0.01
		Felt by you	2.92 (1.36)	2.92 (1.39)		0.00
		Expected	3.05 (1.38)	3.03 (1.44)		0.01
		Envisaged future	3.33 (1.39)	3.29 (1.37)		0.03
Event consequences	$\lambda = 0.91$, $F(10, 336) = 3.41$, $p < .001$	Unpredictable	2.73 (1.50)	2.63 (1.43)		0.07
		Positive, desirable outcomes	4.40 (1.01)	4.03 (1.28)	$F(1, 353) = 22.62$, $p < .001$	0.32
		Negative, undesirable outcomes	1.71 (1.22)	2.03 (1.40)	$F(1, 353) = 11.69$, $p = .001$	-0.24
		Unfair	1.76 (1.42)	1.83 (1.44)		-0.05
		Will modified	2.96 (1.82)	3.02 (1.77)		-0.03
		Affect self-esteem	4.33 (1.00)	4.19 (1.07)	$F(1, 353) = 4.76$, $p = .030$	0.14
		Relationship changed	2.97 (1.59)	3.05 (1.57)		-0.05
		Urgent action	3.23 (1.72)	3.06 (1.76)	$F(1, 353) = 4.18$, $p = .042$	0.10
		Avoid	3.28 (1.75)	3.31 (1.78)		-0.02
		Not avoid	3.78 (1.58)	3.73 (1.60)		0.03

Univariate F s indicated that these interactions were significant specifically on the items Pleasant and Unpleasant (General Evaluations), $F(3, 353)=6.99, p < .001$; and $F(3, 353)=4.77, p = .003$, respectively; Positive, desirable outcomes and Negative, undesirable outcomes (Event Consequences), $F(3, 353)=5.68, p = .001$; and $F(3, 353)=5.80, p = .001$; and Urgent action (Reactions vis-à-vis Event Consequences), $F(3, 353)=7.12, p < .001$.

We decomposed these significant interactions by computing simple effects of Emotion on each of these variables. Bonferroni corrections (0.05/20 comparisons; Table 4) indicated that the significant interactions were driven by the Japanese data. The Japanese rated triumph-eliciting events as more relatively pleasant and having more positive, desirable outcomes than pride-eliciting events, and pride-eliciting events as relatively more unpleasant and having more negative, undesirable outcomes than triumph-eliciting events. These differences reflected differences in the degree of difference with the main effects and not direction, partially supporting Hypothesis 3. There were no other significant effects after Bonferroni correction.

Post-Hoc Analyses

We examined if gender moderated the findings above by recomputing all overall analyses including gender as a factor. For the coded categories, the only significant gender effect was the gender main effect for Positive Self-Evaluation, $F(1, 270)=4.85, p = .028, \eta_p^2 = .018$; females ($M=1.11, SE=0.08$) had higher means than males ($M=0.62, SE=0.21$). Notably, gender did not interact with Emotion in any analysis and thus did not moderate the findings above.

For the appraisal data, there were no significant gender effects for General Evaluations, Event Causation, or Event Consequences. Event Characteristics did produce a significant Country by Gender interaction, $\lambda = .91, F(18, 979.12)=1.89, p = .014$, but the only significant univariate effect was on Familiarity, $F(3, 353)=3.08, p = .028$. Simple effects analyses indicated that males rated this appraisal item higher than females in the U.S., Japan, and Serbia, $F(1, 128)=0.47, p = .496, \eta_p^2 = .004, d=0.14$; $F(1, 109)=11.26, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .094, d=0.63$; and $F(1, 135)=3.33, p = .070, \eta_p^2 = .024, d=0.31$, respectively; but females rated this item higher than males in Russia, $F(1, 62)=6.14, p = .016, \eta_p^2 = .090, d=-1.16$.

Reactions vis-à-vis Event Consequences also produced a significant gender main effect, $\lambda = .98, F(3, 360)=2.71, p = .045$, indicating that males had an overall higher rating on these items compared to females, $d=0.27$.

Table 4. Simple Effects Contrasts for Appraisal Items that Produced Significant Country by Emotion Interactions in the Overall MANOVAs.

Items	Country	Triumph	Pride	Univariate Fs	Cohen's d
Pleasant	USA	4.59 (0.74)	4.50 (1.04)	$F(1, 117) = 0.54, p = .421, \eta_p^2 = 0.006$	0.10
	Japan	4.18 (1.06)	3.20 (1.54)	$F(1, 88) = 28.14, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.242$	0.75
	Serbia	4.63 (0.92)	4.24 (1.29)	$F(1, 122) = 8.28, p = .005, \eta_p^2 = 0.064$	0.35
	Russia	4.62 (0.81)	4.40 (0.92)	$F(1, 44) = 1.89, p = .176, \eta_p^2 = 0.041$	0.25
Unpleasant	USA	1.55 (0.95)	1.78 (1.32)	$F(1, 115) = 2.56, p = .113, \eta_p^2 = 0.022$	-0.20
	Japan	2.05 (1.41)	2.93 (1.65)	$F(1, 84) = 14.91, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.151$	-0.58
	Serbia	1.61 (1.34)	1.73 (1.30)	$F(1, 115) = .85, p = .421, \eta_p^2 = 0.006$	-0.09
	Russia	1.46 (0.81)	1.39 (0.86)	$F(1, 40) = .19, p = .667, \eta_p^2 = 0.005$	0.08
Positive, desirable outcomes	USA	4.44 (0.99)	4.23 (1.23)	$F(1, 114) = 2.80, p = .097, \eta_p^2 = 0.024$	0.19
	Japan	4.22 (1.04)	3.24 (1.43)	$F(1, 91) = 31.55, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.257$	0.79
	Serbia	4.44 (1.02)	4.28 (1.09)	$F(1, 121) = 1.90, p = .171, \eta_p^2 = 0.015$	0.15
	Russia	4.50 (0.95)	4.18 (1.04)	$F(1, 41) = 1.92, p = .173, \eta_p^2 = 0.043$	0.32
Negative, undesirable outcomes	USA	1.90 (1.30)	2.15 (1.41)	$F(1, 118) = 3.25, p = .074, \eta_p^2 = 0.027$	-0.18
	Japan	1.67 (1.13)	2.54 (1.43)	$F(1, 91) = 25.69, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.220$	-0.68
	Serbia	1.72 (1.42)	1.72 (1.41)	$F(1, 122) = .00, p = 1.00, \eta_p^2 = 0.000$	0.00
	Russia	1.68 (1.14)	1.66 (0.91)	$F(1, 43) = .01, p = .911, \eta_p^2 = .000$	0.02
Urgent, immediate action	USA	3.47 (1.64)	3.11 (1.72)	$F(1, 117) = 3.34, p = .070, \eta_p^2 = 0.028$	0.21
	Japan	2.79 (1.86)	3.37 (1.84)	$F(1, 91) = 27.97, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = 0.081$	-0.31
	Serbia	3.33 (1.69)	2.98 (1.69)	$F(1, 122) = 4.81, p = .030, \eta_p^2 = 0.038$	0.21
	Russia	3.05 (1.66)	2.32 (1.74)	$F(1, 43) = 4.12, p = .049, \eta_p^2 = 0.087$	0.43

Interpretation of this finding is clouded, however, because two of the three ratings in this section were polar opposites of each other. Importantly, none of the gender findings reported here interacted with Emotion, indicating that the main findings reported above were not moderated by gender.

Discussion

The current study tested unexplored aspects of triumph by examining antecedents and appraisals of triumph-eliciting events across four nation cultures, comparing them to pride. As predicted, across the four cultures, triumph-eliciting events were characterized as greater in competition, personal achievement, achievement over others, ranking compared to others, social standing, and quicker in reaction times. Pride-eliciting events were characterized as involving more positive evaluations of the self. In other words, triumph-eliciting events more often occurred in goal-oriented contexts (competition, achievement over others, social ranking, for example, “I won a competition;” “I felt achieved”) whereas pride-eliciting events were relatively more associated with self-evaluations (e.g., “I felt good about myself as a daughter”). Triumph-eliciting events also produced quicker reactions than pride (consistent with findings from previous studies, that is, Bellocchi & Ritchie, 2015; Hwang & Matsumoto, 2014a, 2014b; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2012), and were associated with different appraisal tendencies. The coded categories for triumph overlapped with characteristics of events in which behavioral reactions were produced in the previous literature (Hwang & Matsumoto, 2014a, 2014b; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2012). Antecedents of triumph were noticeably consistent, characterized by competitive contexts involving social ranking, anxiety and tension, perhaps because of unpredictability of and risk in outcomes, goal-relevant contexts with strong motivations to success or achieve, and immediacy. Presumably reactions to achievement or success in these contexts were associated with motivations for power and dominance.

These results provided further evidence suggesting consideration of triumph as a discrete emotion. Personal satisfaction based on mindsets including one’s personal intense efforts and motivation in goal-oriented contexts might be an essential element in eliciting and experiencing triumph. In contrast, the value and meaning of being recognized by others seemed uniquely vital in triggering pride. Differences among the coded categories on these dimensions were generally in the same directions across the four countries, suggesting cross-cultural similarities in these characteristics. To be sure, the findings did not imply that all winners in all competitive contexts must experience triumph; instead, other positive emotions can be and are aroused,

such as happiness or pride. However, triumph may be an initial reaction while pride may require different processes after and in addition to an initial reaction.

Cultural differences in the triumph-eliciting antecedent event categories provided a more nuanced interpretation of these findings, driven by the Japanese data. For example, there were no differences between triumph and pride in perceived reaction time for the Japanese, and triumph-eliciting events were rated higher than pride on positive self-evaluations. These findings suggested that cultural differences in self-other related processes were associated with triumph-eliciting event characteristics. Japanese culture may foster stronger other-consciousness compared to the other cultures, consistent with typical views of Japanese collectivism or interdependent self-concepts (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Matsumoto, 1999; Sato & Cameron, 1999; Takata, 1999). This cultural characteristic may have helped infuse triumph-eliciting events to facilitate greater positive self-evaluations in Japan (relative to pride) because such events would inherently be connected to consciousness of evaluations of the self by others. This characteristic may also have reduced perceived reaction times for pride, perhaps because pride is triggered in response to identifying oneself as part of society or reflecting about oneself vis-à-vis social norms. The non-difference on perceived reaction times in Japan appeared driven by a reduction of perceived reaction time for pride, which would be consistent with greater other-consciousness because of faster mental connections to others' evaluations. These interpretations, however, remain speculative until tested more formally in the future.

Our hypotheses concerning appraisal differences between triumph and pride were generally supported. As predicted, compared to pride-eliciting events, participants psychologically evaluated triumph-eliciting events as more pleasant, sudden, and abrupt; as having very important consequences for oneself; as having occurred because of special circumstances and one's own intentional behavior; as having brought about positive, desirable outcomes; and more urgent. Although not predicted, triumph-eliciting events were also appraised as less shameful, unpleasant, and as having less negative, undesirable outcomes than pride. In other words, triumph-eliciting events were appraised as goals were achieved through one's efforts and with greater positive consequences, relative to pride. These findings were consistent with our theoretical notions of triumph described above, especially vis-à-vis notions concerning achievement in agonistic competitions and implications for social ranking. These effects were similar across the four countries, suggesting cross-culturally similar appraisal processes for triumph-eliciting events, providing further evidence for this component of triumph as a potentially discrete emotion.

Cultural differences in appraisals qualified the interpretations of differences between triumph and pride, again driven by the Japanese data. Unlike findings from previous studies (Mauro et al., 1992; Scherer, 1997; Scherer & Ellgring, 2007), we did not find cultural differences on more complex, engaging appraisal dimensions, instead finding cultural differences on appraisal dimensions related to more basic evaluations. In our study, Japanese respondents reported that triumph-eliciting events tended to be appraised as relatively more pleasant and less unpleasant, and with relatively more positive, desirable outcomes and less negative, undesirable outcomes, compared to pride. These relative differences between the two emotions were in the same direction as those for the other countries and reflected differences in the degree of difference and not direction. Among many possible ways to understand these findings, one speculation might be that triumph-eliciting events may have greater personal valence-related meaning to the Japanese relative to pride, which may have been associated with greater other-consciousness fostered by Japanese culture mentioned above. These differences may also have occurred because pride was perceived relatively less positively in Japan compared to the other countries (although the data implied that both triumph and pride were perceived positively overall). These and other possibilities need to be followed in the future. Other differences were also observed but did not achieve the threshold of significance according to Bonferroni correction; thus we opt not to interpret those effects, but suggest them to be followed in the future.

The study had several limitations. The antecedents collected were mainly from pools of college students; thus, the range and variety of the events reported may have been even broader if different types of groups participated. Also, the current study did not focus on possible linguistic synonyms of triumph and labels of other positive emotions. Although multiple professional interpreters and our collaborators reviewed the terms and protocols, there was always a possibility for some participants to have had different interpretations of the emotion words used. We did not define these terms for the participants, and regarded possible semantic overlap between them a possible contributor to an acceptable Type II error (see work by Fontaine et al., 2007, 2013 on semantic differences among emotion terms). In addition, future studies examining gender effects on antecedents and appraisals more systematically than here might be worthwhile to clarify whether emotions associated with certain characteristics such as dominance or power would differ by gender. Lastly, the non-significant findings across cultures may have meant something valuable in understanding the nature of triumph (i.e., the findings reported from Japan, compared to other countries), or they might have been the result of the use of post-hoc corrections (for the interaction contrasts). Thus, future replications across cultures is necessary.

Appendix

Examples of Triumph and Pride Open-Ended Responses

Triumph. “The specific moment in which I experience triumph was when, after sitting through a 3 hour interview with the board of BSA, I officially attained my Eagle Scout Award, and the highest honored rank of the BSA, after 10 years of hard work. My family was there and my closest friends, all there for support and to offer congratulations. Honestly, there were no negative consequences that came from this, I learned a great deal and will never forget the times I experienced, both good and bad.”

Pride. “A moment where I experienced a notion of pride would have to be when my parents finally were proud of me and my career choice. I study stage management and lighting design for stage theatre at NAME OF UNIVERSITY and from the first day of high school theatre my parents were against that and the idea of that becoming a substantial career.”

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. Not all authors in this literature labeled the expressive behavior they reported or discussed as “triumph.” Mazur (1985) provided a theoretical model of status in face-to-face interactions in primate groups and described behaviors specifically related to triumph, for example, erect postures, glares, eye contact, strutting, and, in humans, assertive speech; the triumph label was used in describing the studies and evidence for their model. Friedman and Miller-Herringer (1991) studied “spontaneous expressions of happiness after winning in a competitive situation against peers” (p. 776) and reported that “spontaneous expressive behaviors in response to triumph were secretly videotaped. . .” (p. 776). Henrich and Gil-White (2001) described a theoretical account of the potential differences between dominance and prestige; although the authors did not use the term “triumph,” they discussed triumph-eliciting situations and the results of those situations in terms of prestige vs dominance.
2. Ritzenhöfer et al. (2019) examined appraisals of agency (causation) in relation to pride, and reported that self-referential pride was associated with more agency,

whereas this was not found for vicarious pride in others. In our study, however, we did not differentiate type of pride.

3. We opted not to decompose significant interactions using simple main effects analyses of Country because those analyses would be computed collapsing across emotion, which did not make sense given the focus was on the difference between emotions. Also, country differences in absolute means would be difficult to interpret because multiple methodological issues can contribute to such differences, including cultural response sets or non-equivalence across cultures in scale meanings. These methodological issues did not affect within-culture comparisons between triumph and pride. The same logic was used in decomposing significant interactions in the appraisal data below.

References

- Bellocchi, A., & Ritchie, S. M. (2015). "I was proud of myself that I didn't give up and I did it": Experiences of pride and triumph in learning science. *Science Education*, 99(4), 638–668. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sc.21159>
- Darwin, C. (1872). *The expression of emotions in animals and man*. Murray.
- de Waal, F. B. M. (1982). *Chimpanzee politics: Power and sex among apes*. Jonathan Cape.
- de Waal, F. B. M. (1989). *Peacemaking among primates*. Harvard University Press.
- Fontaine, J. R., Scherer, K. R., Roesch, E. B., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2007). The world of emotions is not two-dimensional. *Psychological Science*, 18(12), 1050–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02024.x>
- Fontaine, J. R., Scherer, K. R., & Soriano, C. (2013). Promises delivered, future opportunities, and challenges for the GRID paradigm. In J. J. R. Fontaine, K. R. Scherer, & C. Soriano (Eds.), *Series in affective science. Components of emotional meaning: A sourcebook* (pp. 542–559). Oxford University Press.
- Frank, M. G., & Ekman, P. (1993). Not all smiles are created equal: The differences between enjoyment and nonenjoyment smiles. *Humor-International Journal of Humor Research*, 6(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1993.6.1.9>
- Friedman, H. S., & Miller-Herringer, T. (1991). Nonverbal display of emotion in public and in private: Self-monitoring, personality, and expressive cues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(5), 766–775. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.5.766>
- Gunnery, S. D., Hall, J. A., & Ruben, M. A. (2013). The deliberate Duchenne smile: Individual differences in expressive control. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 37(1), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-012-0139-4>
- Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 22(3), 165–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(00\)00071-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(00)00071-4)
- Hwang, H. C., & Matsumoto, D. (2014a). Cultural differences in victory signals of triumph. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 48(2), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397113510875>

- Hwang, H. C., & Matsumoto, D. (2014b). Dominance threat display for victory and achievement in competition context. *Motivation and Emotion, 38*(2), 206–214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-013-9390-1>
- Hwang, H. C., Matsumoto, D., Yamada, H., Kostić, A., & Granskaya, J. V. (2016). Self-reported expression and experience of triumph across four countries. *Motivation and Emotion, 40*(5), 731–739. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9567-5>
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224–253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- Mast, M. S., Hall, J. A., & Roter, D. L. (2008). Caring and dominance affect participants' perceptions and behaviors during a virtual medical visit. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 23*(5), 523–527. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-008-0512-5>
- Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. S. (2012). Evidence for a nonverbal expression of triumph. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 33*(5), 520–529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.01.005>
- Matsumoto, D., Keltner, D., Shiota, M. N., O'Sullivan, M., & Frank, M. (2008). Facial expressions of emotion. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 211–234). The Guildford Press.
- Matsumoto, D., Kudoh, T., Scherer, K., & Wallbott, H. (1988). Antecedents of and reactions to emotions in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19*(3), 267–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022188193001>
- Matsumoto, D. (1999). Culture and self: An empirical assessment of Markus and Kitayama's theory of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*(3), 289–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00042>
- Mauro, R., Sato, K., & Tucker, J. (1992). The role of appraisal in human emotions: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(2), 301–317. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.301>
- Mazur, A. (1985). A biosocial model of status in face-to-face primate groups. *Social Forces, 64*(2), 377–402. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/64.2.377>
- Mouterde, S. C., Duganzich, D. M., Molles, L. E., Helps, S., Helps, F., & Waas, J. R. (2012). Triumph displays inform eavesdropping little blue penguins of new dominance asymmetries. *Animal Behavior, 83*(3), 605–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.11.032>
- Ritzenhöfer, L., Brosi, P., & Welpe, I. M. (2019). Share your pride: How expressing pride in the self and others heightens the perception of agentic and communal characteristics. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 34*(6), 847–863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9595-0>
- Sato, T., & Cameron, J. E. (1999). The relationship between collective self-esteem and self-construal in Japan and Canada. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(4), 426–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224549909598402>
- Scherer, K. R. (1993). Studying the emotion-antecedent appraisal process: An expert system approach. *Cognition & Emotion, 7*(3–4), 325–355.

- Scherer, K. R. (1997). The role of culture in emotion-antecedent appraisal. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 73(4), 902–922. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.5.902>
- Scherer, K. R. (2001). Appraisal considered as a process of multi-level sequential checking. In K. R. Scherer, A. Schorr, & T. Johnstone (Eds.), *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory, methods, research* (pp. 92–120). Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, K. R., & Ellgring, H. (2007). Multimodal expression of emotion: Affect programs or componential appraisal patterns? *Emotion*, 7(1), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.1.158>
- Scherer, K. R., & Wallbott, H. G. (1994). Evidence for universality and cultural variation of differential emotion response patterning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(2), 310–328. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.2.310>
- Scherer, K. R., Wallbott, H. G., & Summerfield, A. B. (Eds.). (1986). *Experiencing emotion: A cross-cultural study*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shiota, M. N., Campos, B., Keltner, D., & Hertenstein, M. J. (2004). Positive emotion and the regulation of interpersonal relationships. In P. Philippot & R. S. Feldman (Eds.), *The regulation of emotion* (pp. 129–155). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Takata, T. (1999). Development process of independent and interdependent self-construal in Japanese culture: Cross-cultural and cross-sectional analyses. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 47(4), 480–489. <https://doi.org/10.5926/jjep1953.47.4.480>
- 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(33), 11655–11660. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0802686105>
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(2), 103–125. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1502_01
- 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), 516–530. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.3.516>
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2014). Conceptual and empirical strengths of the authentic/hubristic model of pride. *Emotion*, 14(1), 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034490>

Author Biographies

Hisung C. Hwang, Researcher at San Francisco State University and Humintell.

David Matsumoto, Professor of Psychology at San Francisco State University.

Hiroshi Yamada, Professor of Psychology at Nihon University.

Aleksandra Kostic, Professor of Social Psychology (retired) at the University of Nis.

Juliana Granskaya, Professor of Psychology at St. Petersburg State University.