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Hierarchies emerge across all human societies, resulting in some individuals holding more resources than others. Pride is a critical emotion that signals one’s status in the hierarchy to the self and others. We propose that pride is also related to the rationale individuals hold for the existence of hierarchies. Different aspects of pride may underlie the explanations people use for why hierarchies exist and the criteria upon which to judge others’ positions within the hierarchy. The current set of studies explore the relationship between two facets of pride and two attitudes related to hierarchy – a preference for the merit principle (PMP), which posits that resources should be distributed based on accomplishment and performance, and social dominance orientation (SDO), which posits that some groups of people are innately superior to others. Study 1 suggests that high trait levels of alpha pride, an emotion stemming from the belief that one’s success is due to stable, uncontrollable factors, are associated with high SDO and low PMP. High trait levels of beta pride, an emotion stemming from the belief that one’s success is due to unstable, controllable factors, are unassociated with SDO, but related to high PMP. These associations remain after controlling for alternative explanatory variables including entity beliefs, positive affect, and impression management. Study 2 manipulates experiences of alpha and beta pride in order to examine downstream effects on hierarchy-maintaining attitudes. The results of Study 2 indicate that while alpha pride is associated with increased SDO and beta pride is associated with decreased SDO, both facets of pride at the state level are associated with increased PMP. In order to begin addressing the mechanism underlying the associations between different facets of pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes, Study 3 manipulates attributions for failure. Results lend some evidence that the association can be attributed to motivated reasoning and a desire to preserve one’s elevated status.
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The level of wealth and income inequality in the US has been the source of heated debate. Recent populist movements such as the Occupy Movement and the Tea Party illustrate a contention between those who oppose and those who tolerate uncontrolled and increasing discrepancies in wealth. These debates highlight a deeper question – how should societies distribute resources and what degree of hierarchy should they tolerate? Recent work illustrates that while most Americans disapprove of the extent of inequality in the US, they are far from wishing for a completely classless system (Norton & Ariely, 2011). On average, Americans believe that society should be structured so that members of the upper class own about 66% percent more wealth than members of the lowest class.

While there is some consensual preference for this distribution of resources within the US, individuals differ in the underlying reasons for preferring to maintain some level of hierarchy. Americans admire stories of personal success and value a meritocratic system that rewards individuals in accordance with their accomplishments (Adams, 1963; Deutsch, 1975; Lerner, 2003). Meritocracy emphasizes accomplishments and allows for some to fall behind and some to advance in accordance with their measurable achievements. As such, a preference for meritocracy may be one reason individuals wish to maintain hierarchy.

Secondly, in addition to a preference for meritocracy, individuals vary in the degree to which they believe some groups of people are naturally and innately superior to others. This individual difference in social dominance orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) may be another underlying reason to maintain hierarchy. Social dominance orientation is distinct from a preference for meritocracy and represents a general attitude of seeing groups as innately and inherently distinct from one another, with some deserving of more resources than others (Hing et al., 2011). Whereas meritocracy prioritizes achievement, social dominance orientation prioritizes innate superiority regardless of achievement.

In this investigation, we treat both social dominance orientation and a preference for meritocracy as hierarchy-maintaining attitudes and explore how individuals’ judgments toward their own success influence each attitude.

Of the several contributing factors toward a preference for both meritocracy and social dominance orientation are one’s own reactions to personal success. It is possible to interpret one’s own success (e.g. increases in salary, promotions, or scholastic achievement) as stemming from unstable, controllable factors such as hard work and diligence or as stemming from stable, uncontrollable factors such as one’s innate superiority (Tracy & Robins, 2007). These reasons may, in turn, influence the rationale one provides for maintaining some level of hierarchy in society. We expect that these different interpretations and their respective experiences of pride will be associated with divergent rationales underlying hierarchy-maintaining attitudes.
Affect and Core Moral Attitudes

Our predictions regarding the relationship between pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes stem from a sizable body of research which suggests that affective reactions are at the core of many of our most central moral attitudes. Two related theories of emotion yield predictions about the role of pride in hierarchy-maintaining attitudes. At a general level, the social functional frameworks of emotion (Frijda & Mesquita, 1994; Keltner & Haidt, 1999) suggest that emotions have evolved as automatic processes to help coordinate reactions to the threats and opportunities of social living. As such, they are integral to key choices for individuals of any society, including problems of justice and resource allocation. We posit, as others have, that pride has evolved to motivate behaviors and cognitions associated with status attainment and attitudes toward groups of lower status (Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010). We extend this research, in combination with more recent work delineating two distinct facets of pride, to propose that these facets underlie corresponding rationales for supporting some level of hierarchy within society.

We draw upon the appraisal-tendency framework (Keltner, Ellsworth, & Edwards, 1993; Lerner & Keltner, 2000, 2001; Lerner & Tiedens, 2006) to make more concrete predictions regarding pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes. According to the framework, each distinct emotion is defined by core appraisals that influence judgments in related domains. For example, fear, with core appraisals of low control and certainty, influences judgments of uncertainty and uncontrollability, such as losing one’s job or having a heart attack. Judgments concerning hierarchy involve appraisals related to attainment and maintenance of status within that hierarchy. We therefore posit that pride and associated core appraisals of personal achievement and status will influence further attitudes toward hierarchy. Appraisals that success stems from ability may lead to different rationales for maintaining hierarchy compared to appraisals that success stems from effort.

Research from both the social functionalist and the appraisal tendency approaches has been applied across a broad field of attitudes, including moral values. Emotional reactions are core and integral to the process of moral judgments (Haidt, 2001; Rozin, Lowery, Imada, & Haidt, 1999; Horberg, Oveis, & Keltner, 2011). For example, disgust is associated with the domain of sexual and bodily purity due to its appraisals of contamination and signals unfamiliar and potentially harmful stimuli (Haidt, 2003; Rozin & Fallon, 1987). Studies using both trait and state measures support a strong and causal link between disgust and judgments of purity violations (Feinberg, Willer, Antonenko, & John, 2012; Horberg, Oveis, Keltner, & Cohen, 2009; Inbar, Pizarro, Knobe, & Bloom, 2009; Schnall, Haidt, Clore & Jordan, 2008).

We aim to extend this research on the association between affective reactions and social judgments by examining the association between hierarchy-maintaining attitudes and experiences of two facets of pride at the state and trait level.

Pride and Hierarchy

Pride is a pleasant emotion elicited in reaction to achieving a valued goal (Lazarus, 1991; Tangney, 1999; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Evolutionary accounts suggest that pride evolved in
order to help establish and reinforce hierarchies (Cheng, Tracy, & Heinrich, 2010; Tracy et al., 2010). According to these accounts, pride - and its associated verbal and physical displays - serve as a signal to others that a member of the group has attained status. Several key pieces of empirical evidence connect pride with attitudes and cognitions related to hierarchy.

Firstly, pride communicates status to others. Individuals associate pride with high status (Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000), and experiences of pride result in displays of high status behavior (Williams & DeSteno, 2009). Additionally, experiences of pride change one’s own perception of status. Inducing pride results in a sense of increased distance between the self and individuals seen as weak (e.g. the homeless) and decreased distance between the self and individuals seen as strong (e.g. CEO’s) (Oveis, Horberg & Keltner, 2010). Lastly, pride signals to others not only that an individual enjoys elevated status but also that the individual values hierarchy and meritocracy (Horberg, Kraus, & Keltner, in press). Overall, ample evidence suggests that pride serves to signal elevated status to the self and others. Core appraisals of pride involve calculations of one’s own and others’ relative positions within a hierarchy.

Due to its appraisals of status and hierarchy, we posit that pride will be associated with hierarchy-maintaining attitudes. However, the specific attitudes may depend on further nuances in the type of pride experienced. We argue that specific appraisals create different experiences or types of pride which are related to unique attitudes toward hierarchy.

Recent empirical studies have suggested there are two general kinds of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007). While alpha pride stems from appraisals in which success is attributed to internal, stable, and uncontrollable factors such as intelligence, beta pride stems from appraisals in which success is attributed to internal, unstable, and controllable factors such as effort.

In support of this two-facet account, researchers have used semantic coding and narrative accounts of pride-eliciting events (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Analyses from these paradigms suggest that there are two distinct clusters of semantic meaning within the category of pride. The first cluster represents a more narcissistic facet of pride and includes terms such as “smug” and “conceited.” This alpha pride cluster may fit better with a self-aggrandizing side of pride. The second cluster represents an achievement-oriented type of pride and includes terms such as “confident” and “accomplished.” Ratings of pride-related feelings during an experience of pride or of tendencies to experience different pride-related states form two clusters similar to the alpha and beta pride clusters found through semantic coding. These two clusters cannot be explained exclusively based on groupings of either good versus bad or state versus trait terms. An in-depth analysis of narrated accounts of pride events reveals that the distinguishing factors underlying these two facets are two different appraisals of an eliciting event (i.e. controllable / unstable versus uncontrollable / stable). Lastly, experimental manipulations to induce pride stemming from internal, stable, and uncontrollable factors resulted in increased experiences of alpha pride, whereas manipulations to induce pride stemming from internal, unstable, controllable factors resulted in increased experiences of beta pride.

This distinction has proven to be key in understanding the role of pride in interpersonal behavior and self-concept. A growing body of evidence has begun to emerge which suggests an association between alpha pride and a sense of superiority and dominance over others on one hand and links between beta pride and more socially-adaptive self-image on the other (Ashton-
Most studies examining the correlates of alpha and beta pride have focused on trait measures of these constructs. These evaluations have examined the relationship between habitual experiences of facets of pride, personality traits, self-concept, dominance strategies, and prejudice (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012; Cheng et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007; Tracy et al., 2009).

While trait level beta pride is positively associated with adaptive traits like extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and genuine self-esteem, alpha pride is negatively related to these traits and positively associated with self-aggrandizing narcissism (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Exploring the association between self-concept and pride, further research suggests that alpha and beta pride, respectively, form the affective core of two distinct attitudes toward the self – narcissistic self-aggrandizement and genuine self-esteem (Tracy et al., 2009). As a result, alpha pride is associated with poor relationship outcomes including anxious and avoidant attachment, lack of feelings of support, and low relationship satisfaction. Trait level experiences of beta pride, on the other hand, are associated with healthy relationship outcomes including secure attachment style, feelings of being supported by others, and high relationship satisfaction. Additionally, alpha and beta pride may serve an evolutionary function of motivating behaviors, thoughts, and feelings oriented toward attaining status in two distinct ways: through dominance and prestige, respectively (Cheng et al., 2010). While a strategy of dominance includes instilling fear in others, manipulating them, and controlling them against their will, a strategy of prestige includes demonstrating that one has earned status through achievement. Indeed, trait levels of alpha pride are positively associated with tendencies to use dominance strategies, while trait levels of beta pride are more strongly associated with the use of prestige strategies.

Lastly, alpha and beta pride have distinct associations with prejudice and attitudes toward stigmatized groups, including Asian Canadians and homosexuals (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). Additionally, trait reports of alpha pride were positively associated with racism toward African Americans as measured by the Modern Racism Scale.

Overall, research from self-report measures suggests that individuals who habitually experience alpha pride have less genuine self-esteem, which often manifests in self-aggrandizing narcissism and personality traits antithetical to cooperation. These individuals also tend to use dominance instead of prestige to attain status and hold negative attitudes toward individuals from minority groups. Individuals who tend to experience beta pride, on the other hand, show associations with prosocial personality traits, genuine self-esteem, positive relationship outcomes, preference for prestige as a status-attainment strategy, and lowered negative attitudes toward minority groups.

While work on trait level correlates is growing, experimental research examining attitudes and behaviors associated with alpha and beta pride is more limited. Work on prejudice demonstrates that inductions of alpha pride through a recall task, compared to a control condition, led to increased negative evaluation of Asian Canadians as well as homosexuals. Conversely, inductions of beta pride, compared to a control condition, increased positive evaluations toward this group (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). Little else is known about state-level experiences of alpha and beta pride; therefore, while we make concrete predictions regarding the associations between trait levels of pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes, our examination of the state level experiences of pride are more exploratory.
We make distinct predictions concerning the associations of each type of pride with two individual hierarchy-maintaining attitudes – meritocracy and social dominance orientation. We view these individual differences as separate rationales for supporting hierarchy. Whereas a preference for meritocracy is related to a support of hierarchy based on actual achievement, social dominance orientation focuses on innate “superiority” of some groups of people.

**Preference for the Merit Principle (PMP)**

In the US, there is pervasive support for the meritocratic system in which individuals are rewarded in accordance with their performance, ability, or effort (Adams, 1963; Deutsch, 1975; Lerner, 1977). Overall, individuals prefer to distribute resources based on contribution and performance and try to restore meritocratic outcomes when they are breached (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983). Norms of meritocracy are often as strong as self-interest (Greenberg, 1988; Greenberg & Leventhal, 1976). Furthermore, individuals who believe their salary and bonuses are based on their performance are more satisfied and engaged with their coworkers (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). Overall, individuals hold a strong preference for, and positive associations with, meritocracy.

Those who prefer meritocracy support hierarchy. By definition, under a meritocratic system, rewards are distributed unequally in accordance with performance. Unequal distributions in rewards are tolerated insofar as they reflect differences in achievement. Under a meritocratic system, certain individuals will gain greater wealth and status due to their performance while others will lose wealth and status.

We predict that trait alpha and beta pride will have distinct associations with a preference for meritocracy. Firstly, because trait beta pride is associated with achievement-oriented pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007), individuals who habitually interpret their own success as resulting from hard work and diligence are likely to wish to propagate this system of rewards. On the other hand, because trait alpha pride is negatively associated with attaining status through prestige and marks of accomplishment, individuals who habitually experience alpha pride and attribute their success to innate superiority may degrade a system that rewards accomplishment and ignores innate markers of superiority. We therefore predict that at a trait level, alpha pride will be negatively associated with a preference for meritocracy, while beta pride will be positively associated with this preference.

However, because research concerning state experiences of alpha and beta pride is more limited, our predictions concerning their associations with a preference for meritocracy are somewhat more exploratory. It is possible that any situations in which individuals are rewarded or feel they have achieved a goal will increase preference for meritocracy. Therefore, we predict that, as a marker of personal success and achievement, both facets of pride will be associated with increased preference for meritocracy at a state level. In other words, individuals who experience success, no matter how they interpret it, may prefer a system that rewards success. It is possible that only habitual interpretation of success as stemming from innate qualities is related to a lowered preference for meritocracy.

**Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)**
While Americans, overall, are tolerant of resource distribution based on achievement, there is a somewhat greater variation in the belief that the current hierarchy, in which some groups fare better than others, is tolerable, natural, and even preferable. This preference has been summarized well through work on social dominance orientation (SDO; Pratto et al., 1994). SDO is a motivated ideology stemming from the theory that societies create legitimizing myths to promote the superiority of one group over others. Individuals high in SDO believe that some groups are naturally better than others and entitled to a larger share of resources.

Social dominance orientation is associated with other beliefs including racism, sexism, and political-economic conservatism (Pratto et al. 1994). Each of these attitudes separates people into groups and promotes hierarchies among them, based on the belief that some are inherently better and others are inherently worse. Individuals who score high on a scale measuring SDO believe that some groups of individuals should be afforded positive social value including wealth and status over others. SDO is a hierarchy-maintaining attitude, which draws upon conceptions of innate superiority as the basis of this hierarchy.

We postulate that, due to its unique self-focused nature, association with dominance motives, and prejudice, trait alpha pride will be positively associated with SDO. Because beta pride lacks these associations, we predict it will have a weak or negative association with SDO at a trait level. Again, our predictions about state level associations are more exploratory. We predict that manipulations of alpha pride will lead to an elevated SDO, while manipulations of beta pride will lead to a lowered SDO.

**Ruling out Alternative Explanations**

We contend that any associations we find between pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes are the direct result of the attributions people make for success. However, it is possible that any associations we uncover between trait levels of pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes are better explained by other individual difference factors such as implicit theories concerning the stability of traits, affective dispositions, and impression management.

Implicit theories are unarticulated beliefs about the world, and they influence a broad spectrum of judgments (Chiu, Hong, & Dweck 1997). One such set of beliefs, entity theory, contends that core traits and aspects of personality are fixed and unchangeable. Entity theory is associated with a host of attitudes about the self and others including stereotype formation and intergroup bias (Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). Individuals high in trait alpha pride may hold entity beliefs to a higher degree than those who are high in trait beta pride. It may be differences in these beliefs, more so than affective reactions to success, that explain the relationship between pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes.

In addition to entity beliefs, it is possible that a predisposition toward positive affect lies at the heart of the association between the two facets of pride and hierarchy-maintaining beliefs. There may be a key difference in overall positive affect between individuals disposed to experience alpha pride and those disposed to experience beta pride. Because affective states are known to influence interpersonal judgments (Johnson & Tversky, 1983), it is possible that affective traits better explain the diverging relationships between these two facets of pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes.

Similarly, it is possible that the associations between the two facets of pride and SDO and PMP are driven by impression management. Impression management is the tendency to misrepresent oneself to others by exaggerating one’s positive qualities and/or hiding negative
ones (Paulhus, 1988). Individuals with higher trait levels of alpha pride may simply be less concerned with creating a positive impression and are, therefore, more likely to endorse SDO more and PMP less. Likewise, individuals with higher trait levels of beta pride may be more concerned with making a good impression and are more likely to endorse PMP.

We postulate that despite any other measurable individual differences, the association between the two facets of pride and both SDO and PMP is not due to differences in implicit theories about the stability of traits, variation in general positive affect, or tendencies toward impression management.

Motivated Reasoning

We contend that the associations between state level experiences of the two facets of pride will lead to changes in SDO and PMP as a result of individuals’ motivations to preserve positive self-regard and status. Individuals often support attitudes and beliefs insofar as they help them maintain a positive self-regard. In a similar fashion, individuals may support a rationale for hierarchies so long as they will remain at the top of such a hierarchy. For example, individuals who experience alpha pride and believe their success to stem from stable uncontrollable traits are more likely to endorse SDO – a belief that society should be structured to reward people like themselves who are innately better than others. However, individuals who experience beta pride do not hold these beliefs about their own stable uncontrollable traits and are likely to derogate such a system.

At the state level, individuals who succeed will likely increase their PMP. Because PMP is agnostic as to the source of achievement, individuals alter their PMP due only to their success. We call these changes in endorsement of SDO and PMP due to a desire to preserve one’s status the motivated reasoning explanation.

One other possibility is that individuals are not changing their SDO and PMP beliefs due to a desire to maintain their status, but due to changes in how they think about success and failure. Individuals who complete a task that they know to be reflective of stable uncontrollable traits may be focused on such traits as well as their importance in society and, as a result, increase SDO beliefs that some kinds of people are simply better than others. Similarly, individuals who complete a task that they know to be reflective of unstable controllable traits may be focused on such traits and lower their endorsement of SDO accordingly. Additionally, it is possible that simply completing a task and thinking about concrete accomplishments will increase PMP beliefs. This implicit theory hypothesis maintains that it is not success or failure at the task that is important, but what kind of theories about the stability and controllability of traits that the task highlights. We attempt to distinguish between these two hypotheses in our last study.

Current Studies

The current studies aim at understanding the relationship between two facets of price (alpha and beta) and two hierarchy-maintaining attitudes (preference for meritocracy and social dominance orientation).

Studies 1a and 1b explore these associations at a trait level. We predict that reports of trait level alpha pride will be associated with lower preferences for meritocracy, whereas trait level beta pride will be associated with higher preferences for meritocracy. Furthermore, we expect that reports of trait level alpha pride will be associated with higher social dominance orientation, whereas trait level beta pride will be associated with lower social dominance
orientation. These studies also include measures of entity theory, positive affect, and impression management. We predict that the associations between each facet of pride and each hierarchy-maintaining attitude will remain after controlling for these other traits.

Study 2a addresses the relationship between state-levels of alpha and beta pride. We predict that inductions of both alpha and beta pride will be associated with increased preferences for meritocracy compared to a neutral control. Furthermore, inductions of alpha pride will be associated with increased social dominance orientation, whereas inductions of beta pride will be associated with decreased social dominance orientation compared to a neutral control condition.

Lastly, we contend that these state level changes are due to a motivated reasoning process in which individuals support the type of hierarchy that would keep them positioned at the top. To begin testing this hypothesis, Study 3 explores changes in SDO and PMP following induction of failure. We predict that any induction of failure will lead to a reduction in support of PMP. However, attributing failure to stable uncontrollable aspects of the self (shame) will lead to decreased endorsement of SDO, whereas one attributing failure to unstable controllable aspects of the self (guilt) will not result in changes to SDO.

Study 1a

In this study, we examine the relationship between a key set of affective responses to personal success and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes. Alpha and beta pride are affective responses stemming from distinct appraisals of success (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Here we test the relationship between trait level experiences of each of these types of pride and two distinct attitudes toward hierarchy – social dominance orientation (SDO: Pratto et al., 1994) and Preference for the Merit Principle (PMP: Davey, Bobocel, Hing, & Zanna, 1999). Additionally, we examine the contribution of entity beliefs in this association by measuring these beliefs (Levy & Dweck, 1998).

Method

Participants

Ninety-seven participants (55% female) completed measures through Amazon Mechanical Turk in exchange for payment. The average age of participants was 37.8 years. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (78%), with smaller percentages identifying as African American (6%), Asian American (11%), Latino (2%), or more than one ethnicity (3%). Participants completed all components of the study online from a location of their choice. All participants were residents of the United States.

Measures

Trait pride. Participants completed the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (Tracy & Robins, 2007). The authentic, or beta, pride subscale includes seven items such as “productive,” “confident,” and “accomplished.” The hubristic, or alpha, pride subscale includes seven items such as “arrogant,” “conceited,” and “smug.” Items were measured on 5-point scales (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Previous work has shown this scale to be a reliable measure of two distinct facets of pride with alpha pride stemming from appraisals of success which originates from internal, uncontrollable, and stable factors (e.g. ability) (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Conversely, beta pride has been shown to stem from appraisals of internal, controllable,
and unstable factors (e.g. effort) contributing to success. These two facets have also been described as feeling pride in “who I am” versus “what I did” (Tracy & Robins, 2007).

In line with previous research, the two facets were not correlated, \( r(100) = -.08, p = .42 \), and showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .89 for alpha and .93 for beta).

**Preference for the meritocracy principle.** In order to assess attitudes towards meritocracy, participants also completed the 15-item Preference for the Merit Principle Scale (PMP: Davey et al., 1999). Sample items from the scale include: “The effort a worker puts into a job ought to be reflected in the size of raise he or she receives” and “Between two equally smart students applying to the same job, the one who is the harder worker ought to get the job.” Items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Preference for the Merit Principle Scale showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .75).

**Social dominance orientation.** Participants completed the 16-item Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994). Sample items from the scale include, “Some groups of people are just more worthy than others,” and “It’s probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.” Individuals who endorse items on the scale are more accepting of inequality and those with lower scores prefer egalitarian distribution of resources. Items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Social Dominance Orientation Scale showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .94).

**Entity Theory.** Belief in entity theory was assessed using the Implicit Persons Theory Measure (Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998). The scale consists of 8 items including: “The kind of person someone is is something basic about them, and it can’t be changed very much” and “People can’t really change their deepest attributes.” Individuals who endorse items on the scale tend to hold entity beliefs. Items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The scale showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .78).

**Results**

Across all participants, reports of trait-level beta pride \( (M = 3.21) \) were higher than trait level alpha pride \( (M = 1.70) \), \( r(96) = 12.89, p < .001 \). All reported correlations control for any effects of gender, income, and political conservatism. As predicted, trait level alpha and beta pride had diverging associations with PMP. While alpha pride showed a negative correlation with PMP, \( r = -.28, p < .01 \), beta pride showed a positive association, \( r = .30, p < .01 \). Additionally, trait level alpha pride was positively associated with SDO, \( r(96) = .26, p < .01 \). There was no relationship between trait level beta pride and SDO, \( r(96) = -.11, p = .27 \). Table 1 summarizes these correlations.

Entity theory showed no relationship with alpha pride, \( r(96) = .04, p = .69 \), or beta pride, \( r(96) = -.15, p = .13 \). The correlations between the two facets of pride and each hierarchy-maintaining attitude (SDO and PMP) remained significant after controlling for any possible effects of entity beliefs.
**Study 1b**

Study 1a supports hypotheses that trait levels of alpha and beta pride have distinct associations with hierarchy-maintaining attitudes, even when controlling for entity beliefs. Study 1b explores the possibility that two other variables are responsible for this relationship: impression management and trait positive affect.

**Method**

**Participants.**

Study 1b had a larger participant pool of 224 individuals (52% female). Again, participants were predominantly Caucasian (74%), with smaller percentages identifying as African American (6%), Asian American (9%), Latino (5%), “Other” (5%), or more than one ethnicity (1%).

Participants completed all components of the study online from a location of their choice through Amazon Mechanical Turk for payment. As in Study 1a, all participants were residents of the United States.

**Measures**

Participants completed the same measures of alpha and beta pride, SDO, and PMP as in Study 1a.

**Positive Affect.** In order to keep the survey succinct and match the format of other questions, participants were asked their level of agreement with generally feeling “joyous,” “compassionate,” “grateful,” and “in awe.” These items were randomly presented among the alpha and beta pride items. Participants rated these items on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The scale showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .75).

**Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding.** Impression management was assessed using the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR: Paulhus, 1988). The impression management subscale of the BIDR consists of 20 items including: “I always obey laws, even if I’m unlikely to get caught” and “I never drive faster than the speed limit.” Each item was rated on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). Individuals trying to exaggerate their positive traits and cover up negative aspects of their personalities are likely to endorse these items. Therefore, participants scoring high on this scale are said to be high impression managers. The BIDR showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .73).

**Results**

The main findings of Study 1a were confirmed in Study 1b. Trait level alpha and beta pride had diverging associations with PMP and SDO. Table 2 shows the details of these associations.
Positive affect was associated with both the alpha and beta facets of pride, \( r(234) = .17, p < .05 \) and \( r(234) = .70, p < .01 \), respectively. Positive affect was also associated negatively with SDO, \( r(234) = -.14, p < .05 \), but not PMP, \( r(234) = .05, p = .48 \). However, the association between the two facets of pride and both SDO and PMP remained significant after controlling for positive affect. Table 2 shows these partial correlations in detail.

Impression management was significantly negatively associated with alpha pride, \( r(234) = -.20, p < .01 \), but unassociated with beta pride, \( r(234) = -.03, p = .62 \). Impression management was also associated negatively with SDO, \( r(234) = -.20, p < .01 \), but not PMP, \( r(234) = -.03, p = .62 \). However, the association between the two facets of pride and both SDO and PMP remained significant after controlling for impression management. Table 2 shows these partial correlations in greater detail.

**Study 2a**

In order to extend the findings of Study 1, Study 2a included a manipulation of alpha pride and beta pride. We predict that inductions of both alpha and beta pride will increase scores on PMP, but that each type of induction will have a divergent effect on SDO. We expect that alpha pride will increase social dominance orientation, whereas beta pride will decrease it.

**Method**

**Participants**

One hundred eleven participants (63% female; average age = 39.1) took part in a study on Amazon Mechanical Turk in exchange for a small payment. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (68%), with a smaller percentage identifying as African American (8%), Asian American (4%), Latino American (5%), Native American (1%), “Other” (5%), and more than one ethnicity (9%). Participants completed all components of the study online from a location of their choice. All participants were residents of the United States. Three participants failed to complete the Social Dominance Orientation Scale and were therefore not included in pertinent analyses.

**Procedure**

Participants were told that they would take part in a study of math performance and personality. All participants then completed a moderately difficult set of five math problems taken from a sample interview guide for applicants to McKinsey Consulting Firm. One example from the set of problems read:

*If 10 gallons of orange juice are added to 40 gallons of a mixture that is 10 percent orange juice, then what percent of the resulting mixture is orange juice?*

After completing all problems, all participants were told that they performed very well (scoring in the 93rd percentile compared to others who had taken the test). Next, one third of the participants were assigned to the alpha pride condition and received further feedback stating that this score reflects “an innate, stable ability to work though math problems quickly and handle large numbers” and that they should feel proud of their “innate intellect.” This feedback was meant to replicate the underlying appraisals of alpha pride including attribution of a successful event to a stable uncontrollable factor such as ability. Another one third of participants were
assigned to the beta pride condition and received feedback that their score reflects their “focus and effort” and “not a measure of an innate ability or intellect.” This feedback was meant to model attributions of success to unstable controllable factors, such as effort. The last one third of participants in the control condition did not receive any feedback about their performance on the math problems.

After receiving this feedback, participants filled out a measure of SDO and PMP as in Study 1.

Results

A one-way analysis of variance revealed a main effect of condition on SDO, $F(2, 107) = 3.24, p < .05, \eta_b^2 = .06$. Post-hoc tests revealed that there is a significant difference between alpha ($M = 2.64, SD = 1.02$) and beta pride conditions ($M = 2.07, SD = .98$), $t(73) = 2.03, p < .05$. However, the control condition ($M = 2.41, SD = .85$) did not differ significantly from either the alpha pride, $t(73) = 1.07, p = .29$, or the beta pride, $t(64) = -1.5, p = .15$, conditions.

Previous work using similar manipulations of alpha and beta pride has suggested a linear relationship between outcome variables stemming from these conditions, one such that the level of outcome variable decreases respectively between an alpha pride, control, and beta pride conditions (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012). As shown in Figure 1, a linear trend analysis (1 = alpha pride, 0 = control, -1 = beta Pride) revealed a linear relationship between condition and SDO scores in each condition ($F(2, 105) = 5.48, p < .05$). SDO scores lowest in the beta pride condition and highest in the alpha pride condition with the control condition in between.

Similarly, as shown in Figure 2, a one-way analysis revealed a main effect of condition on Preference for the Merit Principle, $F(2, 107) = 3.39, p < .05, \eta_b^2 = .06$. Comparisons between the control condition and each pride condition also revealed significant differences. Compared to the control condition ($M = 4.49, SD = .57$), the alpha pride condition led to an elevation in PMP scores ($M = 5.29, SD = .55$), $t(79) = 2.50, p < .05$. Similarly, the beta pride condition also resulted in higher PMP scores ($M = 5.31, SD = .72$) as compared to the control condition, $t(79) = 2.17, p < .05$. As anticipated, alpha and beta pride conditions did not differ significantly from each other, $t(76) = 1.32, p = .89$.

Study 2b

While Study 2a lends support for hypotheses regarding the associations between state pride and hierarchy-maintaining attitudes, it was uncertain whether the manipulations included in the study indeed increased levels of alpha and beta pride. To test the effectiveness of these inductions, Study 2b repeated the emotion manipulation conditions in Study 1a and included a measure of alpha and beta pride.

Method

Participants

One hundred twenty nine participants (51% female) enrolled and completed the study through Amazon Mechanical Turk in exchange for a small payment. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (75%), with a smaller percentage identifying as African American (7%), Asian American (5%), Latino American (3%), “Other” (4%), and more than one ethnicity (6%). Participants completed all components of the study online from a location of their choice.
All participants were residents of the United States. Three participants failed to complete the Social Dominance Orientation Scale and were therefore not included in pertinent analyses.

**Procedure**
Participants were assigned to the same three conditions as those in Study 2a. However, upon receiving feedback about their performance, participants completed Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (Tracy & Robins, 2007).

**Results**
A one-way analysis of variance revealed a marginal and very small effect of condition on alpha pride, $F(2, 128) = 2.56, p = .08, \eta^2_p = .04$, but no effect of condition on beta pride, $F(2, 128) = 1.0, p = .37, \eta^2_p = .02$. Comparisons between the alpha and beta pride conditions revealed marginal differences in the predicted direction for levels of alpha pride and trending levels for beta pride, $t(92) = 1.80, p = .08$ and $t(92) = 1.52, p = .13$. Comparing the alpha pride condition with the control condition also revealed a marginal difference in alpha pride, $t(77) = 1.96, p = .06$. However, compared to the control condition, the beta pride condition had no effect on beta pride, $t(83) = .91, p = .36$. Figure 3 shows the result of these analyses in greater detail.

**Study 2c**
**Studies 2c and 2d**
In light of the mixed results of the manipulation check in Study 2b, two new methodologies were piloted and subsequent state levels of alpha and beta pride were assessed.

**Participants**
One hundred and fifty three participants (58% female) completed this component of the study.

**Procedure**
Participants completed all components of this study online through Amazon Mechanical Turk.

Participants first took part in the Contrast Sensitivity Task adapted from previous research (Troyer, 2001; Wagner, Ford, & Ford, 1986). The task presents five pairs of abstract black and white shapes (Figure 4) and asks participants to decide which shape contains a greater area of the color white. In actuality, all the pairs contain an equal amount of white space. Because of their complexity, participants readily believe that there is a correct answer and invest a significant amount of effort in making their decisions.

All participants received false positive feedback indicating that they had performed in the top 93rd percentile of all other participants who completed the task. Participants were then assigned to one of three conditions including a neutral control, alpha pride, and beta pride. Those in the alpha and beta pride conditions were given further feedback about their performance. In the alpha pride condition, the task was described as a measure of one’s ability to “quickly and easily detect patterns and make inferences.” Participants were told that this ability is stable and outside of their control. Participants in the beta pride condition were told that the task is a measure of one’s ability to “put effort into a task asking you to detect patterns and make inferences.” Participants were told that this ability is unstable and within their control.
After reading feedback about the task and their performance, all participants completed the same state measure of alpha and beta pride as in Study 2.

**Results**

A one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant effects of condition on either alpha pride, $F(2,151) = .67, p = .51$, or beta pride, $F(2,151) = .74, p = .48$.

**Study 2d**

**Participants**

One hundred and seventy six participants (53% female) completed this component of the study.

**Procedure**

The procedure parallels that of study 2a with the exception of the emotion induction task. Instead of completing the Contrast Sensitivity Task and receiving feedback, participants were asked to recall one of three types of events. This emotion recall procedure is adapted from previous work examining the effects of state alpha and beta pride (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012).

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. Participants in the alpha pride condition were asked to “recall a time that you behaved in a self-important manner, or felt pretentious or stuck-up.” Participants in the beta pride condition were asked to “recall a time that you felt you had succeeded through hard work and effort, reached your potential, or achieved goal.” Participants in the control condition were instructed to recall their activities that day. All participants were asked to write in as much detail as possible about the event.

**Results**

A one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant effects of condition on either alpha pride, $F(2,174) = .70, p = .50$, or beta pride, $F(2,174) = .48, p = .62$.

**Discussion**

Study 2a supports hypotheses regarding the effects of experiencing alpha and beta pride on SDO and PMP attitudes. Participants induced to experience alpha or beta pride increased endorsement of PMP. Participants who experienced alpha pride reported greater endorsement of SDO than either participants who experienced beta pride or those in a control condition.

Study 2b demonstrates one potential limitation of this study. The effects of the alpha pride manipulation used in Study 2a are marginal, and those of beta pride are only trending in the appropriate direction. It is possible that beta pride is difficult to manipulate because of large ceiling effects with all participants reporting high levels. Study 2c and 2d demonstrate that other paradigms, including those validated in previous work, face even more limitations without even marginal effects. It is important to interpret results with these limitations in mind.

Study 2a raises an additional question: why are individuals changing their hierarchy-maintaining attitudes? As a result of our theoretical contentions about alpha and beta pride, we believe that motivated reasoning is the best explanation for these results. Following a success,
individuals adopt those beliefs that would stabilize their elevated status. Some of these beliefs do not depend on interpretations of success but simply the presence of the accomplishment. More specifically, individuals will always endorse PMP after success since PMP is agnostic about the source of success. Other beliefs will differ in accordance to how individuals interpret their success. More specifically, if individuals attribute their success to stable uncontrollable traits and experience alpha pride, they will adopt SDO beliefs since these beliefs reflect a preference for structuring a society in which those with innate traits are at the top. On the other hand, if individuals attribute their success to unstable controllable traits, they will decrease endorsement of SDO.

An alternative explanation contends that it is not a desire to maintain personal success that drives these associations, but a shift in how people see success and failure more generally. General implicit theory contends that individuals shift their beliefs about the role of innate traits and accomplishments in accordance to how they view these events more globally. It is possible that in Study 2a, individuals in the alpha pride condition increased their SDO beliefs as a reflection of their general belief that success is based on innate traits. Similarly, individuals in the beta pride condition decreased their SDO beliefs as a reflection of their general belief that success is not based on innate traits.

Therefore, whether one fails or succeeds, completing a task that reflects stable uncontrollable traits should increase SDO while completing one that reflects unstable controllable traits should decrease SDO. This theory would additionally contend that it is not a motivation to maintain elevated status that leads to increases in PMP after both alpha and beta pride conditions, but a shift in thinking that accomplishments are important. Whether they fail or succeed, individuals told that they just completed an important task will increase PMP because they think accomplishments are important. Study 3 is one attempt to disambiguate these explanations. By manipulating attributions for failure instead of success, the study attempts to explore whether personal elevated status and its preservation are key to the findings in Study 2a.

Study 3

Study 3 explores whether individuals adopt hierarchy-maintaining beliefs such as SDO in order to preserve their own status following experiences of alpha and beta pride or whether they do so simply because these states activate beliefs about the stability of traits.

Participants are induced to feel shame or guilt, two distinct affective reactions to failure (Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). While shame stems from the belief that one has failed because of stable uncontrollable traits (parallel to alpha pride), guilt stems from the belief that one has failed because of unstable controllable traits (parallel to beta pride) (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Figure 5 outlines the predictions that each theory would make concerning SDO and PMP beliefs after manipulations of failure.

Method

One hundred forty five participants (56% female) enrolled and completed the study through Amazon Mechanical Turk in exchange for a small payment. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (79%), with a smaller percentage identifying as African American (6%), Asian American (5%), Latino American (4%), “Other” (2%), and more than one ethnicity (4%). Participants completed all components of the study online from a location of their choice. All participants were residents of the United States.
Procedure

Procedures paralleled that of Study 2 precisely with the exception of feedback to participants. Participants were randomly assigned to the control, shame, or guilt condition. All participants were given feedback telling them they performed in the 40th percentile of other people who had taken this math test and that this meant they had scored lower than 60% of other participants. Participants in the shame and guilt condition received additional information about the test. For those in the shame condition, the test was described in exactly the same terms as in the alpha pride condition of Study 2 – as a measure of “innate ability.” For those in the guilt condition, the test was described in exactly the same terms as in the beta pride condition of Study 2 – as a measure of “effort and concentration.”

Results

A one-way analysis of variance revealed a main effect of condition on SDO, \( F(2, 143) = 4.23, p < .05 \). Post-hoc tests revealed that, compared to the control condition (\( M = 2.92, SD = 1.2 \)), both the shame (\( M = 2.92, SD = 1.0 \)) and the guilt (\( M = 2.47, SD = 1.1 \)) condition decreased SDO, \( t(96) = 2.74, p < .01 \) and \( t(101) = 1.99, p < .01 \).

[Figure 6 here]

Similarly, as shown in Figure 4, a one-way analysis revealed no significant main effect of condition on Preference for the Merit Principle, \( F(2, 143) = 1.51, p = .86 \).

Discussion

While Study 3 attempted to disambiguate the motivated reasoning and general implicit theory explanations of Study 2 findings, it had limited success. Some evidence supported the motivated reasoning explanation. Individuals in the shame condition showed decreased SDO scores compared to a control condition. This supports the motivated reasoning explanation and goes against the general implicit theory explanation. However, individuals in the guilt condition also decreased their SDO beliefs lending support for the general implicit theory explanation. Shame and guilt had no effect on PMP scores, whereas the two competing explanations of Study 2 data make distinct predictions.

General Discussion

Individuals differ in both their level and rationales for accepting unequal distributions of resources in society. The studies here support the hypothesis that the ways in which people interpret their own success plays a part in these different rationales. Across all studies, alpha and beta pride were differentially related to hierarchy-maintaining attitudes.

SDO

Social dominance orientation is one set of attitudes that are used to rationalize hierarchy. Individuals with high levels of SDO believe that some groups of people are intrinsically better and more worthy than others. By this account, hierarchy is natural and even desirable. It is possible that individuals who habitually feel that their own success stems from their innate traits tend to endorse SDO beliefs. Indeed, Study 1a and Study 1b support this hypothesis. Individuals’ levels of trait alpha pride are strongly correlated with their endorsement of SDO. In
contrast, trait beta pride is unrelated to SDO, including when controlling for entity beliefs, positive affect, and impression management. It is important to note that these associations held up across gender, different types of political orientation, and levels of income.

There is some evidence to suggest that this relationship may be explained by the motivation to preserve one’s status. Individuals who feel alpha pride may be adopting SDO in order to ensure that they maintain their elevated status and continue receiving rewards. In Study 2a, individuals who were induced to feel alpha pride increased their SDO beliefs as compared to those who weren’t given specific feedback about their strong performance and those induced to feel beta pride. This suggests a causal link between alpha pride and SDO. Furthermore, in Study 3, individuals who were induced to attribute failure to stable uncontrollable traits lowered their SDO. This suggests that, rather than simply activating beliefs about the stability and uncontrollability of traits, inducing distinct emotional reactions such as alpha pride and shame leads to increased motivations to alter the rationale behind social hierarchies in order to maintain an elevated position or change a diminished one.

PMP

In contrast to SDO, individuals may hold beliefs that success should be based on measurable accomplishments. This preference for meritocracy emphasizes success rather than any internal stable uncontrollable traits that may differentiate one person from the next. Several findings in the current studies suggest that facets of pride are differentially related to preferences for meritocracy. However, the findings between our trait and state studies differ. At a trait level, alpha pride is negatively associated with PMP, while beta pride is positively associated with it. At a state level, we find that inducing either alpha or beta pride leads to increased PMP. This state level finding may suggest that individuals are, as in the case of SDO, motivated to adopt those hierarchy-maintaining attitudes that would benefit themselves in society. Since both conditions make salient an accomplishment, it may be that individuals are endorsing the basis of hierarchy on achievement in order to preserve their elevated status and/or rewards in the future. However, individuals induced to feel failure did not lower their PMP beliefs.

Relationship Between SDO and PMP

Previous research suggests that PMP is unrelated to SDO (Davey et al., 1999). Individuals who believe that rewards should be distributed in proportion to personal accomplishments may or may not also believe that some groups of people are naturally more deserving than others. Other work emphasizes that PMP is a preference for meritocracy and is contrasted with the belief that meritocracy exists. This latter belief is described as a hierarchy legitimizing myth and is empirically associated with SDO (Son Hing, Babocel, & Zanna, 2011). It is notable that despite these previous findings, our data suggest that PMP and SDO are somewhat negatively associated. Across Study 1a and 1b, the two attitudes correlated at levels between -.19 and -.36 with at least a marginal level of significance. The reason behind these findings and their contrast to previous work is beyond the scope of the present studies and provides room for further investigation.

Motivated Reasoning and Other Potential Mechanisms

Several pieces of information suggest that the associations between the two facets of pride and two hierarchy-maintaining attitudes represent a motivated reasoning process for individuals. We find that at a trait and state level, people who believe that their success stems
from uncontrollable stable qualities want to preserve a system in which similar qualities are the basis for hierarchy. Social dominance orientation represents this set of beliefs. Additionally, individuals who are led to believe that their recent failure is due to stable uncontrollable internal factors endorse SDO to a lower degree than those who are not led to these beliefs. These individuals may be decreasing their endorsement of SDO in an effort to regain some status.

On the other hand, our PMP findings remain ambiguous in regard to our motivated reasoning hypothesis. Individuals induced to feel any success elevated their preference for the meritocratic principle. This may stem from the fact that a preference for the meritocratic principle emphasizes achievement and is vague as to whether this achievement is based on stable and uncontrollable or unstable and controllable factors. Hence, when people are successful, they may elevate PMP beliefs regardless of what was responsible for their most recent success. However, at a trait level, it is possible that people inherently think of PMP as based on effort and are thus more likely to endorse it if they are high in beta pride while endorsing it less if they are high in alpha pride.

Future Directions

These findings extend the burgeoning research on alpha and beta pride. In addition to their divergent associations with racism, dominance strategies, and narcissistic personality traits (Tracy et al., 2009; Cheng et al., 2010; Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012), the studies here suggest that alpha and beta pride are also divergently related to hierarchy-maintaining attitudes including SDO and PMP.

A central limitation of the current study is the difficulty in inducing beta pride. Future studies should continue exploring strategies to elicit these distinct states in individuals. Additionally, future efforts should address the discrepancies between the state and trait level associations between the two facets of pride and each hierarchy-maintaining attitude discovered here. Lastly, while there was some evidence to support our motivated reasoning hypothesis for the findings reported here, other findings were counter indicative. The precise mechanism underlying the associations found in the studies presented here remains unclear. One possibility is that individuals adopt hierarchy-maintaining strategies to either maintain their own elevated status or to ensure that their lowered status will change. Another possibility is that individuals adopt views about the permanence of status more globally without regard for their own level of status.

These findings have potential implications across several domains. Attitudes toward hierarchy may underlie preferences with regard to policies governing taxation as well as efforts to reduce poverty and promote equality by subsidizing housing, food, education, and health care. The extent to which individuals view these efforts as important and beneficial may depend on their attitudes toward hierarchy within society – not only whether we should reduce hierarchy but also for whom and why. One’s own perception of personal success may influence these attitudes.
Table 1
Study 1a – Correlations among Pride Facets, Social Dominance Orientation, Preference for the Merit Principle with and without Controlling for Entity Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Alpha Pride</th>
<th>Beta Pride</th>
<th>SDO</th>
<th>PMP</th>
<th>Entity Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pride</td>
<td>1.70 (.70)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Pride</td>
<td>3.20 (.93)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>2.51 (1.10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>5.23 (.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Beliefs</td>
<td>3.99 (.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partiallling Entity Beliefs

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pride</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, † p < .1
Table 2

*Study 1b – Correlations among Pride Facets and SDO and PMP with and without Controlling for Positive Affect and BIDR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Alpha Pride</th>
<th>Beta Pride</th>
<th>SDO</th>
<th>PMP</th>
<th>Positive Affect</th>
<th>BIDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pride</td>
<td>1.55 (.69)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Pride</td>
<td>3.35 (.89)</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>2.48 (1.23)</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>5.38 (.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>2.94 (.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIDR</td>
<td>4.04 (.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partialling Positive Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Alpha Pride</th>
<th>Beta Pride</th>
<th>SDO</th>
<th>PMP</th>
<th>BIDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pride</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Pride</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partialling BIDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Alpha Pride</th>
<th>Beta Pride</th>
<th>SDO</th>
<th>PMP</th>
<th>BIDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pride</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Pride</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, †p < .1*
Figure 1
Study 2a – Linear Trend in Social Dominance Orientation Scores across Three Experimental Conditions.
Figure 2
Study 2a – Preference for the Merit Principle Scores across Three Experimental Conditions.
Figure 3
Study 2b – Manipulation Check of State Experiences of Alpha and Beta Pride in Experimental Conditions
Figure 4

*Study 2b – Sample of Task Item Administered to Participants*

Please indicate which of the following two figures contains a greater area of the color white:
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Figure 5
*Study 3 – Hypothesis of Results Based on Two Alternative Explanations of Study 2a Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Attributions</th>
<th>Motivated Reasoning</th>
<th>General Implicit Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictions for SDO Compared to Control</td>
<td>Predictions for SDO Compared to Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictions for PMP Compared to Control</td>
<td>Predictions for PMP Compared to Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Stable uncontrollable</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable uncontrollable</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>Unstable controllable</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstable controllable</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6
Study 3 – Social Dominance Orientation Beliefs in Three Different Experimental Conditions
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