Gender and Empathic Differences in the Attribution of Pride and Joy

Andreea Roxana IORDACHE, Daniela Victoria ZAHARIA[1]
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University

Abstract: Following the differential tradition in the study of emotions, we were interested in exploring the differences between joy and pride as perceived by students. As a first objective of this study, we aimed at developing a scenario-based instrument that differentiates between pride and joy. As *a second objective*, we were interested in analyzing some of the personal characteristics (empathy level, gender, academic background) that may influence the attribution of the right emotion to a character in a specific situation. The results show that is was easier to identify joy-specific circumstances than pride-specific situations and that gender and empathy level influence the attribution of the two emotions in certain circumstances.

Key words: gender, empathy, pride, joy

Introduction

Many studies aim at a better understanding of the emotional states and processes, and most of them are concerned with exploring the negative emotions. The researchers' interest for negative emotions is explained, not only by their unpleasant nature and their undesired consequences at a cognitive and social level, but also by the fact that acknowledging and understanding them better may bring important contributions to the efficiency of emotional regulation.

Recently, a growing number of researchers have developed a steady interest in positive emotions because of their hedonic quality as well as their beneficial effects on different important variables (Isen, 1999). In order to recognize, induce and regulate positive emotions, we need to better understand not only the physiological, cognitive and motivational nature of the affective states, but also the nature of the situations in which they appear.

There are two main traditions in emotional research: one of them views emotions as specific and distinct (Ekman, 1992; Izard, 1993) – the differential approach - and one emphasizes the role of a few underlying dimensions that produce substantial and systematic associations between the fundamental emotions (Russell & Carroll 1999; Tellegen, Watson & Clark, 1999) – the dimensional approach. In the differential approach, a small number of discrete emotions are presumed to each reflect a specific set of eliciting stimuli and to trigger a

---

[1] Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Daniela Victoria Zaharia (dpop@psih.uaic.ro).

characteristic range of adaptive behaviors. In these theories, the positive emotions are, by far, less differentiated than the negative ones. For example, Ekman (1982) (as cited in Egloff, Schmukle, Burns, Kohlmann & Hock, 2003) found seven emotions to be cross-culturally recognizable - and happiness was the only positive one.

Other researchers propose further differentiations among emotions. Some perspectives enlighten the distinction between primary and secondary emotions. These terms are used by several researchers, in spite of having different views regarding the course of emotional development. Plutchik (1970) (as cited in Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger & Weiss, 1989) presumes that secondary emotions are derived from the earlier ones and are composed of the primary emotions (as all colours are composed from the three primary ones). Lewis and Michalson (1983) (as cited in Lewis et al., 1989) hold that emotions are tied to cognitive processes: those needing the least cognitive support appear first, and those needing more emerge later.

Lewis et al. (1989) argue that joy is a primary emotion, while pride is a secondary one. A child needs to develop self-referential behaviour and enough cognitive abilities to understand the existence of norms and rules in order to experience pride.

Joy is a positive emotion which appears when an individual wishes for something, and that brings him/her a certain reward (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001). The element of surprise is also associated with joy. The specific behavioural characteristics are hand clapping, jumping up and down, smiling and laughing (Geppert, Heckhausen (1998), as cited in Ficher, Manstead & Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999). Darwin (1872) describes joy as a strong emotion that can lead to extreme reactions such as dancing and hysterical laughing.

Pride is a complex and positive emotion which appears in a successful situation, after great effort. In such cases, the success generates higher self-esteem and is attributed to the abilities of the individual (specific pride) or of the in-group (empathic pride) (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001). Joy and pride can be recognized by several behavioural clues: a proud man exhibits his sense of superiority over others by holding his head and body erect. ``He is haughty, or high, and makes himself appear as large as possible, so that metaphorically he is said to be swollen or puffed up with pride`` (Darwin, 1872, pp. 263 - 264). Another behavioral characteristic is raising hands or placing them on the waste (Darwin, 1872).

Cognitive psychologists argue that the study of emotions implies not only a better understanding of the stimuli and of the specific situations that generate specific emotions, but also a better understanding of the way that these emotions are perceived by each and every one of us (Strongman, 2002). In agreement with them, we believe that the unexpected situations and the unexpected reward, in a form of an object or result that we want, are specific for joy. The appearance of a

reward as a result of somebody's effort or abilities is specific for pride. This differentiation stands at the base of this study.

As a first objective of this study, we aimed at developing a scenario-based instrument that differentiates between pride and joy. Some instruments that are scenario-based already exist, but concentrate either on differentiating among other emotions (e.g. Test of Self Concious Affect (TOSCA; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzov, 1989), as cited in Ferguson & Crowley, 1997), or on the correct recognition of an emotion felt in certain circumstances (e.g. Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999), Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT, Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003). TOSCA is a scenario-based measure of guilt and shame proneness in which participants rate their likelihood of responding to several situations in ways that were previously pre-coded to reflect guilt, shame or other emotions (Ferguson & Crowley, 1997). The MEIS and MSCEIT are based on the idea that emotional intelligence involves problem solving with and about emotions (Mayer et al., 2003). Both MEIS and MSCEIT contain tasks in which the subjects are asked to read some stories, and then identify the correct emotion to be attributed to the character in the stories.

As for *the first objective of this research*, we intended to develop a questionnaire that differentiates between the situations that induce mostly pride, and situations that generate joy. Because we recognize the importance of appraisal in the emotional process, we introduced in each situation, elements that can be clearly interpreted as specific clues for joy or pride. Further on, we were interested in the participants' abilities to identify the emotions that the character in a scenario feels in each situation. From this perspective, we followed the idea of Mayer et al. (2003) that emotional intelligence reflects, among other aspects, an individual's ability to attribute the right emotion to a specific situation.

So, our first general hypothesis was that there are specific situations that elicit pride and specific situations that elicit joy. Having this starting point, we formulated four specific hypotheses:

1.1. In pride-specific situations, participants will attribute (to the student in the stories) more frequently pride than joy.

1.2. In joy-specific situations, participants will attribute (to the student in the stories) more frequently joy than pride.

1.3. Pride will be attributed more frequently (to the student in the story) in pride-specific situations than in joy-specific situations.

1.4. Joy will be attributed more frequently (to the student in the story) in joy-specific situations than in pride-specific situations.

As *a second objective*, we were interested in analyzing some of the personal characteristics that may influence the attribution of the right emotion to a character in a specific situation. Our interest was to explore the differences in the attribution

of pride and joy between the subjects with high and low empathic abilities, and between female and male subjects.

As for the empathic ability, there are theoretical models that classify this concept as affective and cognitive (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), automatic and controlled (Hodges & Wagner, 1997). Mehrabian & Epstein (1972), referring to the affective side of the concept, define empathy as a prompt and accentuated response to the emotional experiences of others. Affective empathy has a major influence in our evaluations of other people's feelings, and in the way that we perceive them as individuals. We expect people with high empathy levels to more reliably recognize the emotions that others feel in certain circumstances.

The subjects' gender is often evoked in the studies on empathy and emotions. Brody and Hall (1995) (as cited in Strongman, 2003) argue that there are many factors that may explain the different results concerning males and females. The number of encouragements used by parents so that girls may more often express their emotions is significantly higher then those used by parents in their relationship with boys. Females in the western societies are more appreciated when they express their emotions in public, but males are perceived as weak when they behave like that in front of others (Brody & Hall (1995) (as cited in Strongman, 2003). Differences between men and women have also been found in interpreting other people's emotions. That is why we expect women to attribute more correctly the emotions to the right circumstances.

Significant differences have been found between children of different ages in the expression and recognition of pride and joy. Facial expressions specific for pride may be easily recognised by children older than four; the ability to recognise emotions is usually developed between the age of three and seven. Joy is the only emotion that can be correctly recognized by 3 year old children (Tracy, Robbins & Lagattuta, 2005). Joy is usually expressed around the age of 6 months and pride is expressed when a child reaches 36 months (Lewis, Alessandri & Sullivan, 1992).

Other studies (Ficher, Manstead & Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999) show the existence of differences between different countries concerning the perception of pride. For the Spanish people, pride is a positive emotion when is expressed as a result of the group's effort or ability (empathic pride), and it is perceived as arrogance when the individual expresses this emotion, an individual one (specific pride). On the other side, the Dutch people believe that those individuals that express pride as a result of their own effort are self-confident and have a high and healthy self-esteem. They also encourage the manifestation of pride in public, while the Spanish people judge such individual as being arrogant.

Taking all these into consideration, we proposed a second general hypothesis: The level of empathy and the gender and the academic background of the participants influence the correct attributions of pride and joy in specific generating circumstances. As specific hypotheses, we anticipated that:

2.1. The students with a high level of empathy will attribute (to the character in the scenarios) a higher level of pride in pride-specific situations, and a higher level of joy in joy-specific situations, as compared to the students with a low level of empathy.

2.2. The female students will attribute (to the student in the scenarios) more pride in pride-specific situations, and more joy in joy/specific circumstances, than the male students..

2.3. The students with a humanistic background will consider that the character in the scenarios will experience stronger emotions, as compared to the students with a technical background.

Method
Participants
Students from two universities took part in this study. 387 valid responses were collected for the final stage of this research from students in Philosophy, Psychology (humanistic academic background) and from students in Informatics, Computer Sciences, and Textiles and Leather Engineering (technical academic background). The age of the participants ranged from 19 to 35 years (m=20.66, s.d.=1.89). 191 participants were male (95 from technical faculties and 96 from humanistic faculties) and 196 were female (96 from technical faculties and 100 from humanistic faculties).

Research design
For this research we selected three independent variables (empathy level, gender and academic background), each one with two levels. Therefore, we used a 2x2x2 research design. The dependent variables were represented by the labelling of two different emotions: joy and pride.

Instruments
In order to measure affective empathy, we used the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Empathy Scale (Caruso & Mayer, 1998). The questionnaire has 30 items; each one was evaluated on a scale from 1 (Completely Disagree) to 5 (Completely Agree). After translating it into Romanian, we tested the internal consistency on 56 Romanian subjects, and the results were good: we obtained an Alpha Cronbach of 0.87).

In order to measure the accurate labelling/ attribution of emotions, we developed a questionnaire. In the first phase, after investigating the relevant literature, a definition was developed for joy and one for pride. Having these definitions as guidelines, 30 students were asked to describe three situations in which they felt joy and three situations in which they felt pride. Following a frequency analysis, 26 situations were retained (13 for joy and 13 for pride). These 26 situations were presented to a group of ten experts (psychologists); they were asked to identify which situations were more likely to generate joy, and which were more likely to generate pride. In the end, 20 situations were retained (10 for joy

and 10 for pride) (Annex 1). In the actual research, the main character in each scenario was a student called Alex – a name that can pertain both to women and men. After reading each scenario from the Joy and Pride Specific Situations Scale, each participant was asked to specify (on a six point scale) how much pride and how much joy would Alex feel.

Results

We obtained good internal consistency for the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Empathy Scale (Caruso & Mayer, 1998): the Alpha Cronbach index was 0.80. The internal consistency values were also good for pride and joy attributed to the character in the scenarios both in pride and joy situations (Table 1).

Table 1. Internal consistency values for pride and joy attributed in pride and joy situations

	Alpha Cronbach
Pride in pride situations	0.83
Pride in joy situations	0.88
Joy in pride situations	0.87
Joy in joy situations	0.80

1.1. In pride-specific situations, participants will attribute (to the student in the scenarios) more frequently pride than joy.

In order to test this hypothesis, we conducted Paired Sample t Tests for each of the items construed to reflect pride-generating circumstances, and then for the total score of the items.

Table 2. Differences between attributed pride and joy in pride-specific scenarios

	Attributed emotion			
	Pride	Joy	t	df
Item 1	4.51	5.06	-6.77***	386
	(1.30)	(1.12)		
Item 4	5.02	5.41	-5.25***	386
	(1.31)	(1.08)		
Item 5	4.54	4.73	-2.09*	386
	(1.39)	(1.23)		
Item 6	4.99	4.65	3.74***	386
	(1.25)	(1.32)		
Item 7	4.72	5.16	-4.90***	386
	(1.48)	(1.16)		
Item 9	4.79	5.05	-3.41***	386
	(1.36)	(1.26)		
Item 12	5.35	5.36	-0.10	386
	(1.10)	(1.11)		
Item 13	5.31	5.25	0.91	386
	(1.09)	(1.09)		
Item 15	4.48	5.39	-12.85***	386
	(1.46)	(0.83)		
Item 17	4.22	4.94	-8.08***	386
	(1.56)	(1.14)		
Overall score for pride situations	4.79	5.10	-6.31***	386
	(0.85)	(0.77)		

Note. * = $p < .05$, *** = $p < .001$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below the means.

The results (Table 2) show that the first hypothesis did not receive the empirical support we had expected. In only situation (item 6 – *in a difficult moment, proving to everyone what one is capable of*), the participants expected the character to feel more pride than joy. In two situations (items 12 –*gaining a scholarship, in spite of a very strong competition* - and 13 – *having one's project considered the best in a difficult competition*) there were no significant differences between the two emotions attributed to the character in the stories. In the rest of the situations, participants attributed more joy than pride to the student in the scenarios.

These first results demonstrate that it is difficult to identify situations in which the participants attribute more pride than joy. We only found one such scenario; in two other stories, there was no difference in the attribution of pride and joy.

A possible explanation is that, in most situations, pride is accompanied by joy. One could argue that situations that generate pride may also generate joy (although the vice-versa is not necessarily true). Both pride and joy may appear after a success, or when a person feels that (s)he gets closer to his/her goals. The difference is that pride appears (maybe along joy) when the task is difficult (the

goal is difficult to achieve), and when the person involved makes internal attributions for success.

In fact, it is more difficult to identify situations when one feels pride and not joy. Such situations could be those in which the person is too tired to feel joy, but still remains proud of his/ her accomplishment. The explanation could be formulated in terms of the cognitive component of the two emotions: the cognitive dimension seems more important for pride than for joy.

Moreover, joy is more visible than pride. Not only because it is a primary emotion and has external clues which are easily recognized even across cultures, but also because pride is sometimes a socially undesirable emotion (Ficher et al., 1999) and people try to hide it.

1.2. In joy-specific situations, participants will attribute (to the student in the scenarios) more frequently joy than pride.

In order to test this hypothesis, we conducted Paired Sample t Tests for each of the items construed to reflect joy-generating circumstances, and then for the total score of the items.

Table 3. Differences between attributed pride and joy in joy-specific situations

| | Attributed emotion | | | |
	Pride	Joy	t	df
Item 2	3.08	5.51	-27.06***	386
	(1.65)	(0.87)		
Item 3	2.25	5.20	-37.14 ***	386
	(1.39)	(0.94)		
Item 8	2.42	5.29	-33.17***	386
	(1.47)	(1.02)		
Item 10	3.52	5.53	-23.47***	386
	(1.57)	(0.81)		
Item 11	2.30	4.80	-30.56***	386
	(1.43)	(1.19)		
Item 14	3.05	4.47	-17.47***	386
	(1.57)	(1.24)		
Item 16	2.98	5.68	-30.53***	386
	(1.63)	(0.71)		
Item 18	3.44	5.13	-20.76***	386
	(1.56)	(1.09)		
Item 19	4.22	5.37	-14.90***	386
	(1.57)	(0.88)		
Item 20	3.08	5.31	-25.34***	386
	(1.71)	(1.00)		
Overall score	3.03	5.23	-39.67***	386
for joy situations	(1.08)	(0.60)		

Note. *** = $p < .001$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below the means.

The results show strong empirical support for the second hypothesis. In each situation, the participants thought that the character of the story felt more joy than pride. So, we can conclude that, in these situations, people have attributed more joy than pride. Though, it would be a good idea for us to see, in further studies, if joy is the most salient emotion in these situations, and not other positive emotions.

1.3. Pride will be attributed more frequently (to the student in the story) in pride-specific situations than in joy-specific situations.

In order to test this hypothesis, we conducted an Independent Sample t Test. The results (Table 3) sustain the fact that pride is attributed (to the student) more often in those situations that we thought were pride specific, than in those situations which were joy-specific. And the difference is quite large. This result encourages us to argue that there are situations in which people tend to feel more pride (as compared to other situations). But, relating this result with the ones we obtained while verifying hypothesis 1.1., still remains to be seen if we are able to identify, in the future, situations in which people feel and are attributed more pride than joy.

1.4. Joy will be attributed more frequently (to the student in the story) in joy-specific situations than in pride-specific situations.

We conducted an Independent Sample t Test in order to test this hypothesis. The results (Table 3) sustain the fact that joy is attributed (to the student) more often in those situations that we selected as joy specific than in those situations which were selected as pride-generating.

Table 3. Differences in attributed emotions between pride-specific and joy-specific situations

| | Situations | | | |
	Pride-specific	Joy-specific	t	df
Pride	4.79	3.03	34.44[***]	386
	(0.85)	(1.08)		
Joy	5.10	5.23	-3.77[***]	386
	(0.77)	(0.60)		

Note. *** = $p < .001$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below the means.

As a first conclusion for the first general hypothesis, we can say that, in the future, we need to create scenarios more specific for pride. Even if we don't manage to create situations in which pride is more frequently attributed than joy, we will try to create scenarios in which there are no statistical differences in favor of joy (joy being more salient than pride in pride- specific situations).

As a second conclusion for the first general hypothesis, we should verify if joy indeed, and no other positive emotion, is the most salient in joy-specific situations.

And as a third direction we should take into consideration is to ask the participants to place themselves in all the scenarios and compare those results with the ones we obtained in this study.

The second general hypothesis anticipated that the level of empathy, the gender and the academic background of the participants influence the correct attributions of pride and joy in specific - generating circumstances. More specifically, we have expected that:

2.1. The students with a high level of empathy will attribute (to the character in the scenarios) a higher level of pride in pride-specific situations, and a higher level of joy in joy-specific situations, as compared to the students with a low level of empathy.

2.2. The female students will attribute (to the student in the scenarios) more pride in pride-specific situations, and more joy in joy/specific circumstances, than the male students.

2.3. The students with a humanistic background will consider that the character in the scenarios will experience stronger emotions, as compared to the students with a technical background.

In order to test the second general hypothesis (and the second set of specific hypotheses), we applied Anova Univariate for each dependent variable of interest: pride attributed in pride situations and joy attributed in joyous situations. But before we did that, we had computed a total score for empathy (median= 3.40, mean=3.41, s.d.=0.50). We split the subjects into two groups: the low empathic subjects (their scores on the emotional empathy scale were under 3.40) and the high empathic subjects (their scores on the emotional empathy scale were above 3.40).

For *pride felt in pride-generating situations,* we only found a main effect of gender, and no interaction effects. The results (Table 4) show that female students attributed higher levels of pride (m=4.94, s.d.=0.63), as compared to the attributions of the male students (m=4.71, s.d.=0.66). This difference, though significant from a statistical point of view, is small from a practical perspective (η^2=0.016) (Table 4). It seems that women identify easier than men the potential for feeling pride in certain circumstances.

The results (Table 4) show no effect of empathy on the attribution of pride in what we thought to be pride – specific circumstances.

Still, we have to be cautious with the interpretation of the results, because for what we thought to be pride-generating circumstances, the participants attributed more joy than pride to the character in the scenarios.

Table 4. Main and interaction effects on the attribution of pride
in pride-generating circumstances

Source	Df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	6.24	0.016	0.01
Academic background	1	0.88	0.002	0.34
Empathy level	1	3.32	0.009	0.69
Gender* Academic background	1	0.47	0.001	0.49
Gender* Empathy level	1	2.68	0.007	0.10
Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.02	0.000	0.87
Gender* Academic background* Empathy level	1	2.09	0.005	0.14
Error (within groups)	379			

For the attribution of *joy in joy-generating situations,* the results show a main effect for each independent variable we included in the analysis, but no interaction effects (Table 5).

Table 5. Main and interaction effects on the attribution of joy
in joy-generating circumstances

Source	Df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	12.72	0.03	<0.001
Academic background	1	6.39	0.01	0.01
Empathy level	1	19.08	0.04	<0.001
Gender* Academic background	1	0.39	0.001	0.52
Gender* Empathy level	1	1.35	0.004	0.24
Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.98	0.003	0.32
Gender* Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.23	0.001	0.62
Error (within groups)	379			

The results show that the female students attributed higher levels of joy (m=5.36, s.d.=0.42), as compared to the male students (m=5.14, s.d.=0.45). This difference, though significant from a statistical point of view, is rather small from a practical perspective (η^2=0.03) (Table 5). It seems that women identify easier than men the potential for feeling joy in specific circumstances.

Another result shows that the students with a high level of empathy attributed higher levels of joy (m=5.38, s.d.=0.45), as compared to those having a low level of empathy (m=5.11, s.d.=0.42). This difference, significant from a statistical point of view, is medium sized from a practical perspective (η^2=0.04) (Table 5). The students with higher levels of empathy more correctly attribute joy to the right circumstances. This result comes as a proof for the construct validity of the joy-specific scenarios.

Moreover, the students with a humanistic academic background attributed to the character in the scenarios higher levels of joy (m=5.33, s.d.=0.43), as compared to those having a technical academic background (m=5.17, s.d.=0.44). This difference, though significant from a statistical point of view, is small from a practical perspective (η^2=0.01) (Table 5).

The results presented above, fully support hypothesis 2.2., and only partially hypothesis 2.1. Hypothesis 2.3 did not receive the empiric support we had expected. Females attribute more pride in pride-specific situations and more joy in joy-specific situations. Two explanations could be formulated for this result. It could be a tendency of women to perceive situations in a more emotional way than men. Or, it could mean that women are more sensitive to differences among positive emotions.

In order to see which of the two explanations are more plausible, we conducted several other analyses. We studied the existence of possible influences of the independent variables on joy attributed in what we anticipated to be pride-specific circumstances (Table 6), and on pride, attributed in joy-specific circumstances (Table 7).

Table 6. Main and interaction effects on the attribution of joy
in pride-generating circumstances

Source	Df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	0.45	0.001	0.50
Academic background	1	10.32	0.020	0.001
Empathy level	1	2.65	0.007	0.10
Gender* Academic background	1	3.28	0.009	0.07
Gender* Empathy level	1	2.40	0.006	0.12
Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.03	0.000	0.85
Gender* Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.64	0.002	0.42
Error (within groups)	379			

The results only show the existence of a main effect of academic background on the attribution of joy in pride-generating situations (Table 6). More specifically, we found that the students with a humanistic background attributed a higher level of joy to the character in the pride- specific scenarios (m=5.26, s.d.=0.58), as compared to the students with a technical academic background (m=4.99, s.d.=0.60).

Table 7. Main and interaction effects on the attribution of pride
in joy-generating circumstances

Source	Df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	0.31	0.001	0.57
Academic background	1	13.01	0.033	<0.001
Empathy level	1	1.64	0.004	0.20
Gender* Academic background	1	0.54	0.001	0.46
Gender* Empathy level	1	0.95	0.003	0.33
Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.37	0.001	0.53
Gender* Academic background* Empathy level	1	0.04	0.000	0.82
Error (within groups)	379			

The results only show the existence of a main effect of academic background on the attribution of joy in pride-generating situations (Table 6). More specifically, we found that the students with a humanistic background attributed a higher level of pride to the character in the joy-specific scenarios (m=3.26, s.d.=0.81), as compared to the students with a technical academic background (m=2.84, s.d.=0.84).

These results show that, on the whole, there is a tendency of the students with a humanistic academic background to perceive situations in a more emotional way (compared to the students with a technical background): they attribute to the

character in the stories more joy in both pride-specific and joy-specific situations and more pride in joy-specific circumstances.

But that is not the case with the gender end empathy level. The students with a high level of empathy are different from those with low levels of empathy only when attributing joy in joy-specific circumstances. The question is why the same differences didn't appear when making attributions of pride in pride-specific circumstances. The explanation could be related with the necessity to review the pride/specific scenarios.

On the other hand, females seem to be more sensitive than men to the situations we have developed; they recognize better than men both joy and pride in their specific circumstances.

Conclusion

Interest for negative emotions has dominated for a long time the field of emotion research. But lately, a growing number of researchers are investigating positive emotions, as well. Though we do not deny the findings of the dimensional approach in the study of emotions, we think that differentiating among positive emotions can bring us to a better understanding of these psychological phenomena and to a more fulfilling life experience.

We concentrated our attention on two positive emotions: joy (a primary emotion) and pride (a secondary emotion). Both emotions seem to be felt in situations in which a person's needs and objectives are met. Researchers argue that joy is more strongly related to surprise, while pride is felt in circumstances where success is attributed either to the person itself, or to the group to which that person belongs.

In this empirical research we tried to identify situations that generate mostly joy or pride. We managed to identify such situations for joy, but we had some problems with the situations the experts considered to be pride-specific. We think that a possible explanation is that, in most situations, pride is accompanied by joy. Most of the situations that generate pride may also generate joy (although the opposite is not necessarily true). Both pride and joy may appear after a success, or when a person feels that (s)he gets closer to his/her goals. The difference is that pride appears (maybe along joy) when the task is difficult (the goal is difficult to achieve), and when the person involved makes internal attributions for success. It seems more difficult to identify situations in which a person feels pride but not joy. Such situations could be those in which the person is too tired to feel joy, but still remains proud of his/ her accomplishment. The explanation could be formulated in terms of the cognitive component of the two emotions: the cognitive dimension seems more important for pride than for joy.

One of the conclusions we formulated after verifying the first general hypothesis is that we need to develop scenarios more specific for pride. Even if we don't manage to create situations in which pride is more frequently attributed than

joy, we will try to create scenarios in which there are no statistical differences in favor of joy (joy being more salient than pride in pride-specific situations). On the other hand, we should verify if joy indeed, and no other positive emotion, is the most salient in joy-specific situations.

Another set of conclusions may be formulated in relation with the variables associated with emotion attribution. Women seem to be more sensitive to the differences between the situations specific for joy and pride. Empathy is also relevant, but its effect was significant only for joyous situations.

Annex 1. The items of **Joy and Pride Specific Situations Scale**

1. After a sustained/ important/long effort, Alex is praised by someone important for him/her .
2. For his/her birthday, Alex receives something he/she has never hoped for.
3. On the way to school, Alex meets someone he/she holds dear, but whom he/she has not seen for a long time.
4. Alex has just passed a very difficult exam, for which he has learned a lot.
5. While solving a problem that a close friend has been having, Alex comes up with the best solution.
6. In difficult circumstances, Alex has proven how capable he/she really is.
7. Alex gets his/ her first wage/ salary from the job he has had a difficult time obtaining.
8. When expecting less, Alex finds a valuable object that he/she has believed was lost forever.
9. Alex is overweight and after a month of daily workouts and a drastic diet has succeeded in losing a lot of weight.
10. During summer holidays, Alex manages to get with his/her friends to a spectacular place where he /she has always wanted to go.
11. Alex's parents have forgiven him/her easier than he/she has expected.
12. Alex has managed to get a scholarship in spite of fierce competition.
13. Alex entered a contest that he/she had learned about, a contest for which he/she had to prepare a difficult project. Although a lot of people attended the contest, Alex's project was considered the best.
14. A person important for Alex has reached a goal sooner than expected.
15. Alex finds out that his/her family, that he/she loves and respects very much, has managed to complete an important project, for which they have worked for years.
16. After many health problems, doctors have told Alex that he/she is in good health.
17. Alex is from out-of-town, but he/she manages to find accommodation in spite of difficulties.
18. After wanting for a long time to travel by plane, Alex is living this experience for the first time in his/her life.
19. After several failed attempts, Alex finds out that he/she received a job, although he/she has only sent his/her resume.
20. Alex won 100 RON playing the lottery, although he/she is not usually so lucky.

Reference List

Caruso, D.R., & Mayer, J.D. (1998*). A Measure of Emotional Empathy for Adolescents and Adults*. Unpublished manuscript.

Darwin, Ch. (1872). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals,* London, England: John Murray, http://darwin-online.org.uk/, consulted on April, 15th, 2010.

Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion,* 6(3/4): 169-200.

Egloff, B., Schmukle, S. C., Burns, L.R., Kohlmann, C.-W., & Hock, M. (2003). Facets of Dynamic Positive Affect: Differentiating Joy, Interest, and Activation in the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 85, No. 3, 528–540.

Ferguson, T.J., Crowley S.L. (1997). Measure for measure: A multitrait – multimethod analysis of guilt and shame. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 69 (2), pp. 425-441.

Ficher, A., Manstead A., Rodriguez Mosquera P. (1999). The role of honour- related vs. Individualistic Values in Conceptualising Pride, Shame and Anger: Spanish and Dutch Cultural Prototypes. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13 (2), pp 149-179.

Hodges, S., & Wegner, D. M. (1997). Automatic and controlled empathy. In W. J. Ickes (Ed.), *Empathic accuracy* (pp. 311-339). New York: Guilford.

Isen, A.M. (1999). Positive Affect. In T. Dalgleish & M.J. Power (eds.) *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp.521-540), Chichester: John Wiley &Sons.

Izard, C. (1993). Four Systems for Emotion Activation: Cognitive and Noncognitive Processes. *Psychological Review*, 100, pp. 68–90.

Lazarus, R., Averill, J., & Opton E. (1970). Towards a cognitive theory of emotion. In M. Arnold (Ed.), *Feelings and emotions* (207-232). New York: Academic Press.

Lazarus, R., Cohen-Charash, Y. (2001). Discrete emotions in organizational life. Payne, R.L., Cooper, C. (Eds), *Emotions at Work – Theory, Research and Applications for Management* (pp. 45-81), Chichester: Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. & Sullivan M. (1992). Differences in Shame and Pride as a Function of Children s Gender and Task Difficulty. *Child Development*, 63, 630 – 638.

Lewis, M., Sullivan, M. W., Stanger, C., & Weiss, M. (1989). Self development and self-conscious emotions. *Child Development*, 60, 146-156.

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, 267–298.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring Emotional Intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 97–105.

Mehrabian, A. & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality,* 40, 525-543.

Russell, J. A., & Carroll, J. M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 3-30.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5–14.

Strongman, K.T. (2002). *The Psychology of Emotion.* Chichester:John Wiley & Sons.

Tellegen, A., Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1999). On the dimensional and hierarchical nature of affect. *Psychological Science, 10,* 297-303.

Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., & Lagattuta, K. H. (2005). Can Children Recognize Pride?. *Emotion*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 251–257.