From self-consciousness to success: When and why self-conscious emotions promote

positive employee outcomes

Rebecca L. Schaumberg

University of Pennsylvania

Jessica L. Tracy

University of British Columbia

Abstract

The question of whether guilt, shame, and pride can translate to productive work has long intrigued management scholars. In this chapter, we will explain that people's propensity to experience self-conscious emotions can shape a range of important employee outcomes. We discuss how guilt, shame, and the two facets of pride can be conceptually mapped along two dimensions. The first dimension is whether people positively or negatively deviate from social expectations, and the second dimension is the attributions people make for this deviation. By synthesizing social psychological and organizational behavior research on self-conscious emotions, we find that whether people positively or negatively deviate from social expectations may matter less than the attributions people make for these deviations in terms of the consequences for their daily work lives. In particular, attributing deviations to one's more mutable behavior as compared to something core and fixed about the self can facilitate positive employee outcomes, including prosocial and ethical behavior, task effort and persistence, and leadership emergence and effectiveness.

From self-consciousness to success: When and why self-conscious emotions promote

positive employee outcomes

Self-conscious emotions of guilt, shame, and pride are some of the most private emotions people experience, and yet, they are central emotions for governing collective and organizational life. A missed deadline, a forgotten email or a poor performance review can evoke feelings of guilt or shame. Victory over a competitor, a successful product launch, or a compliment from a colleague can evoke feelings of pride. Organizational scholars have theorized about how self-conscious emotions affect a range of employee outcomes such as responses to layoffs (Brockner, Davy, & Carter, 1985), positive inequity (Adams, 1965; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978), and institutional reproduction (Douglas Creed, Hudson, Bokhuysen, & Smith-Crowe, 2004), but empirical evidence in support of these claims has been sparse, particularly in comparison to research on other emotional experiences such as positive and negative affectivity.

Guilt, shame, and pride are considered to be not only self-conscious, in the sense of requiring a focus on the self and self-evaluations, but also moral emotions, because of the central role they play in determining moral choices and motivating people to behave in line with moral standards (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). These emotions predict a range of important moral and ethical behaviors (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010; Dearing, Stuewig, Tangney, 2005; Dorfman, Eyal, & Bereby-Meyer, 2014; Hart & Matsuba, 2007; W. Hoffman & Fisher, 2012; Tangney, Stuewig, & Martinez, 2014). The association between self-conscious emotions and morality is, in and of itself, important to organizations that seek to promote ethical workplaces. However, guilt, shame, and pride regulate not only people's moral life, but also the more amoral aspects of their work days. In this chapter, we will explain that people's propensity to experience

self-conscious emotions can shape a range of important employee outcomes including prosocial and ethical behavior, leadership, and task effort.

The Function of Self-Conscious Emotions`

Self-conscious emotions link individuals to the groups to which they belong (Tangney & Fischer, 1995; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). They reinforce socially valued behaviors by providing information about how well or poorly one is meeting standards of expected behavior (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney & Fischer, 1995; Tracy, Robins, & Tangney, 2007; Weidman, Tracy, & Elliot, 2016). Guilt or shame signals that one has violated (or will violate) standards of expected behavior, and thus one's social standing and self-worth is in jeopardy. Pride indicates that one is meeting or exceeding these standards, and thus one's standing and self-worth is secure (Weidman et al., 2016). These emotions align individual action with collective behavior because (theoretically) people will adjust their behavior to meet social expectations, in order to avoid the aversive experience of guilt or shame and to increase the positive experience of pride (Barrett, 1995).

In support of this functionalist account, research has shown that people automatically display nonverbal expressions of pride in response to success, and nonverbal expressions of shame in response to failure. Tracy and Matsumoto (2008) found that sighted, blind, and congenitally blind individuals in the Olympic and Paralympic Games displayed nonverbal expressions of pride in response to success in a competition, and nonverbal expressions of shame in response to failures. Pride displays to success were observed among athletes from all cultural contexts examined, but the extent to which athletes showed nonverbal markers of shame varied across cultures, with sighted athletes from highly individualistic countries displaying less pronounced nonverbal expressions of shame. Combined with the finding that congenitally blind athletes across cultures displayed shame, these results suggest that individuals from highly

individualistic Western cultures likely suppressed displays of shame upon losing a competition, presumably because of the stigma associated with shame in Western cultural contexts.

The evidence that pride and shame displays are reliably shown by individuals across cultures and by blind individuals, who could not have learned to show them from watching others, suggests that these displays may be evolved behavioral tendencies, which likely function to communicate one's success or failure—and thus one's status (i.e., the amount of respect, admiration, and deference one deserves) to others. Shariff and Tracy (2009) and Shariff, Tracy, and Markusoff (2012) directly tested this idea by assessing people's automatic associations between these nonverbal displays of emotion and high or low status concepts. In support of their predictions, participants responded more quickly when nonverbal displays of pride were associated with high status rather than low status, and when nonverbal displays of shame were linked with low status than with high status. Moreover, these associations held even when participants viewed competing and contradictory information about a displayer's status (e.g., when they viewed a pride displayer who appeared to be homeless; Shariff et al., 2012). In subsequent work, these authors documented a similar pattern of results in Fiji, with participants who were highly isolated members of a traditional small-scale society, who had never previously used a computer (Tracy, Shariff, Zhao, & Henrich, 2013). These findings suggest that the pride and shame displays may be universal signals of high and low status.

Despite similarities in the theorized function of self-conscious emotions, these emotions are not similarly "functional" at regulating behavior to become more in line with collective standards. A central theme to emerge from research on self-conscious emotions is that similar emotional experiences (e.g., guilt and shame) can have divergent effects on the regulation of behavior (see Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tracy & Robins, 2007b for reviews), with guilt and the psychologically adaptive facet of pride—known as authentic pride—more effectively regulating

behavior in the theorized way than shame and the more psychologically maladaptive facet of pride—known as hubristic pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). This difference arises in part because of the different attributions for one's behavior that are associated with these emotional experiences (Tracy & Robins, 2006; 2007b).

Distinguishing Guilt and Shame and Authentic Pride from Hubristic Pride

As shown in Figure 1, the self-conscious emotions can be conceptually mapped along two dimensions, the first being whether people positively or negatively deviate from social expectations. We consider a positive deviation to mean meeting or exceeding standards of expected behavior and a negative deviation to mean falling short of these standards. The second dimension is the attribution people make for this deviation. Do people attribute it to a mutable behavior or to something core and fixed about the self?

Distinguishing Guilt and Shame.

Shame arises when people attribute the source of their failure to something core and fixed about themselves; in contrast, guilt arises when people attribute the source of their failure to a controllable and therefore changeable behavior that is often specific to the situation (Niedenthal, Tangney, & Gavanski, 1994; Tangney & Tracy, 2012; Tracy & Robins, 2006). Consider an employee who makes a mistake on an important presentation to a client. If this employee attributes the transgression to her erroneous behavior in this situation (e.g., "I made a mistake because I didn't take enough care to go over all the details."), she is likely to experience guilt. If she instead attributes the transgression to something core about herself (e.g., "I made a mistake because I am a careless person."), she is likely to experience shame.

Not surprisingly given this attributional distinction, guilt and shame relate to distinct patterns of agency and control (Lewis, 1971; Tangney, 1995; Tracy & Robins, 2006). Guilt prompts people to focus on what they could have done differently, or what they could do

differently in the future (Niedenthal et al., 1994). Shame focuses people on how things would be different if *they* were different people (Niedenthal et al., 1994). To wit, guilt-proneness is positively associated with a growth-oriented mindset, whereas shame-proneness is positively associated with an entity, or a performance-oriented, mindset (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Moreover, changing people's attributions for their transgressions can affect the extent to which they feel guilt or shame. Niedenthal and colleagues (1994) had participants write an essay about a transgression. In one condition, participants focused on how the events described in their essay would have been different if they had behaved differently. In the other condition, participants described how the events would have been different if they possessed different personal attributes. When the counterfactual prompt focused participants on their behaviors, participants reported greater feelings of guilt than shame; when the counterfactual prompt focused participants on their internal qualities, they reported greater feelings of shame than guilt.

The controllable, and mutable attributions characteristic of guilt are at the heart of what makes this emotion more functional than shame in terms of regulating behavior (see Tracy & Robins, 2006). Because guilt is associated with the belief that one's behavior can change, it has a reparative action tendency; it leads people to amend their past mistakes and to adjust their behavior to prevent future missteps (Tangney, 1990; Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996). Moreover, guilt-proneness is positively associated with perspective taking and other-oriented empathy because feelings of guilt focus people on their behaviors and how these behaviors affect others (Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, 1995; Tangney et al. 1996).

In contrast to guilt, shamed individuals see their bad actions as stemming from a fixed, immutable feature of their character. This belief leads people to engage in behaviors that minimize their painful feelings of self-reproach (Lindsay-Hartz, Rivera, & Mascolo, 1995), even if these behaviors are unproductive for themselves or their organizations, such as avoiding

interpersonal interaction or blaming others for one's own mistakes (Stuewig, Tangney, Heigel, Harty, & McCloskey, 2010; Tangney, 1995; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992; Tracy & Robins, 2006). Moreover, the painful self-focus of shame also disrupts empathic processes because it leads people to focus more on the consequences of their actions for their own character than on the consequences of their actions for others (M.L. Hoffman, 1984; Tangney, 1995).

Distinguishing Authentic and Hubristic Pride

Pride is generally defined as an emotion that is "generated by appraisals that one is responsible for a socially valued outcome or for being a socially valued person" (Mascolo & Fischer, 1995, p.66). Some regard pride as hubris and as a sin; others see it as virtue and key to personal achievement (Tracy, 2016; Tracy & Robins 2006, 2007b). This discrepancy exists because pride is a multifaceted emotion. The same term, in English, captures pride in the sense of self-aggrandized views or narcissism, and also pride in the sense of authentic feelings of confidence or self-worth, typically about specific achievements or prosocial behavior.

Tracy and Robins (2004, 2007b) theorized that the attributional differences that distinguish guilt from shame may also distinguish these two facets of pride, which they labeled hubristic and authentic pride. Imagine an employee who delivers a great presentation to a client. If this employee attributes the success to mutable behavior (e.g., "I succeeded because I worked hard"), the employee is likely to experience authentic pride. If this same employee attributes the success to a fixed, internal feature of the self (e.g., "I succeeded because I am the best."), the employee is more likely to experience hubristic pride. In support of this, across several correlational and experimental studies, Tracy and Robins (2007b) found that controllability and stability were key attributional dimensions distinguishing the two facets of pride, with

controllable, unstable attributions associated with authentic pride, and uncontrollable, stable

attributions more associated with hubristic pride.

To illustrate, in one experiment (Tracy & Robins, 2007b, Experiment 4), participants

imagined themselves in a variety of pride-eliciting scenarios such as doing very well on an exam.

The scenarios differed in the attributional focus for the success event, with some scenarios

attributing the event to unstable, controllable causes (e.g., the participant's effort), and other

scenarios attributing the event to stable, uncontrollable causes (e.g., the participant's ability).

Participants reported that they would feel greater authentic pride in response to the scenarios that

involved unstable, controllable attributions for the success event, and greater hubristic pride in

response to the scenarios that involved stable, uncontrollable attributions for success event.

Authentic pride and hubristic pride are both associated with an approach orientation

(Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010), but relate to different ways of engaging the social world and

pursuing one's goals (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). People who are high in authentic pride are highly

motivated to pursue their goals, but they put both their failures and successes in perspective. In

contrast, people who are high in hubristic pride tend to have unrealistic goals. They also see any

positive outcome as proof of their own greatness (Carver et al, 2010; Tracy & Weidman, 2018).

However, this does not mean that people who are high in hubristic pride always see themselves

as great. In fact, whereas authentic pride is related positively to both explicit and implicit self-

esteem, hubristic pride is negatively related to self-esteem, yet positively to narcissism (Tracy,

Cheng, Robins, & Trzesniewski, 2009). Tracy and Robins (2003) have argued that hubristic

pride may be part of a defensive self-regulatory strategy used by those with fluctuating, unstable

self-esteem. In this view, individuals with unstable or event-contingent self-esteem are

chronically motivated to suppress shame and increase pride, as a way of attaining (momentary)

high levels of self-esteem. Yet the pride these individuals seek is typically not the authentic

variety that promotes more stable self-esteem, but rather a more defensive and artificial hubristic pride, which can provide momentary relief from shame but not promote a stable sense of self-worth (Tracy & Robins, 2003; Tracy, Cheng, Martens, & Robins, 2011). Moreover, authentic pride is associated with a relatively adaptive and socially desirable personality profile, but hubristic pride is not (Tracy & Robins, 2007b; Tracy et al., 2009).

Trait-Based Differences in the Experience of Self-Conscious Emotions

The studies by Niedenthal et al. (1994) and Tracy and Robins (2007b) show that changing the attributions people make for their success or failures can change the emotions people experience in response to the event. However, studies have found that there are reliable individual differences in people's propensity to experience these emotions (see Tangney, 1990; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tracy & Robins, 2007b). Faced with the same transgression, some people tend to experience shame, some people tend to experience guilt, some people tend to experience both emotions, and some people tend to experience neither. These general tendencies reflect the extent to which an individual is guilt-prone and shame-prone (Cohen, Wolf, Panter, & Insko, 2011; Tangney, 1990; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney et al., 1992). Similarly, faced with the same success, some people tend to experience authentic pride, some people tend to experience hubristic pride, some people tend to experience neither emotion, and some people experience both emotions (Tracy & Robins, 2007b).

Self-Conscious Emotions and Positive Employee Outcomes

In the following sections, we overview recent research which has identified how people's experience of guilt, shame, and pride relate to a range of employee outcomes such as prosocial or ethical behavior, leadership, and task effort. We focus on these emotions as predictors of employee behavior rather than on the factors in one's workplace that elicit these emotions. Thus, we do not address a range of important topics including what drives people to experience guilt

and pride for others' actions (e.g., collective guilt, or collective pride) and the factors that

engender specific discrete emotions as work.

Prosocial and Ethical Behavior

   Guilt and shame. Feelings of shame and guilt can lead to opposing effects on moral and

ethical behavior (Tangney et al., 2007). Previous research has explored these differences at

length (see Cohen & Morse, 2014; Cohen, Panter, & Turan, 2012; Tangney et al., 2007), with

two of the main insights being that shame and guilt are not equally moral emotions (Tangney et

al., 2007) and that highly guilt-prone people are some of the most moral and cooperative

members of society (Cohen & Morse, 2014).

   In support of these insights, guilt-proneness (but not shame-proneness) has emerged as

one of the most important factors to distinguish high moral character from low moral character

individuals (Cohen, Panter, Turan, Morse, & Kim, 2014). Moreover, guilt-proneness (but not

shame-proneness) is positively associated with a range of prosocial and ethical behaviors such as

lower levels of delinquency in adolescents and recidivism rates among previously incarcerated

populations (Tangney et al., 2014; Dearing et al., 2005). In the workplace, guilt-proneness (but

not shame-proneness) has been shown to relate positively to organizational citizenship behavior

and negatively to counterproductive work behaviors (Cohen et al., 2014). Guilt-proneness also is

associated negatively with using unethical behaviors in negotiations (Cohen, 2010).

   Authentic pride and hubristic pride. From a theoretical perspective, pride is thought to

encourage ethical behavior because people derive self-worth from behaving in ways that meet or

exceed moral standards (see Barrett, 1995; Tangney et al., 2007), and, indeed, some research

suggests pride encourages prosocial behavior (see Michie, 2009). However, other research

suggests it does not (Mishina, Dykes, Block, & Pollock, 2010). Similar to the distinction

between guilt and shame, whether pride promotes or inhibits ethical behavior depends on the specific facet of pride people experience.

Authentic pride is positively associated with volunteering to help and advise others, increased generosity, and the self-control that allows individuals to avoid temptations (Cheng et al., 2010; Dorfman et al., 2014; Hart & Matsuba, 2007; W. Hoffman & Fisher, 2012). Moreover, authentic pride is negatively, and hubristic pride positively, associated with anger and aggression—correlations that may help explain why pride can both enhance and impede prosocial behaviors (Brosi, Spörrle, Welpe, & Shaw, 2016; Tracy et al., 2009).

In one test of this suggestion, Sanders and colleagues (2009) asked participants to reflect on scenarios that evoked either authentic or hubristic pride. Participants then played a dictator game in which they could divide 50 lottery tickets between themselves and a supposed other participant. On average, participants who were induced to feel authentic pride gave more tickets to the supposed other participant than those induced to feel hubristic pride. Other work consistent with this suggestion has found that individuals experimentally induced to feel hubristic pride demonstrate greater prejudice toward those who are different from them (i.e., individuals belonging to a different ethnic group or sexual orientation), whereas individuals induced to feel authentic pride show greater support and empathy toward the same outgroup members (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012).

Task Effort

Guilt and shame. Distinguishing guilt and shame clarifies the relationship between negative self-conscious emotions and task effort. Feelings of guilt are thought to relate positively to task effort because people who feel guilt often work harder (i.e., put in more effort) as a means of ameliorating the negative, behavior-focused feeling of guilt (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). In support of this relationship, highly guilt-prone employees exert greater effort at their job-related

tasks and perform better than their less guilt-prone counterparts—over and above other established predictors such as the Big Five personality traits (Flynn & Schaumberg, 2012). Shame similarly tells individuals experiencing it that their behavior does not, or will not, meet expectations. However, because shame is associated with avoidance and blaming of a negative global self, rather than specific behaviors, feelings of feelings of shame do not reliably translate into greater effort (see Flynn & Schaumberg, 2012).

Authentic and hubristic pride. Although studies examining the effect of pride on task effort and persistence typically have not distinguished between the two facets of pride, from a theoretical stance, it makes sense that authentic pride—the facet of the emotion linked to specific, hard earned achievements, high conscientiousness, and effort attributions (Tracy & Robins, 2007)—would be more positively predictive of task effort compared to hubristic pride—which is not as associated with traits relevant to effort and responsibility. Consistent with this suggestion, one study found that individuals dispositionally high in authentic pride showed high levels of achievement at a creativity task, whereas those dispostionally high in hubristic pride performed poorly at this task (Damian & Robins, 2012). Similarly, Herrald and Tomaka (2002) showed positive effects of pride on the quality of participants' responses to a series of interview questions. Similarly, Williams and Desteno (2008) found that participants induced to experience pride in one task exerted greater effort on a subsequent tedious task, compared to participants not induced to experience pride. In these latter two studies, the researchers did not separately measure authentic versus hubristic pride, but several of the items they used to assess pride (e.g., "satisfied with their performance") suggest that participants were likely experiencing the authentic variety.

Another possibility, however, is that even authentic pride can be negatively associated with task effort—if this relation emerges because low levels of authentic pride are experienced in

response to poor performance. In such cases, low authentic pride may serve an informational function, telling the experiencer that his or her behavior must change in order to improve performance and attain higher desired levels of pride. In line with this suggestion, Weidman and colleagues (2016) observed that students who did poorly on a class exam and felt low authentic pride about their poor performance responded by studying harder for their next exam, and consequently did better on this later exam. In a series of longitudinal studies, these authors were able to directly trace participants' low levels of authentic pride to improved exam performance over the course of the term. Similarly, Becker and Curhan (2018) proposed that pride may engender complacency; people infer from their feelings of pride that they are accomplished in a domain, and thus subsequently exert less effort –and, as a result-- perform less well in that same domain. They tested this idea in the context of sequential negotiations. The authors found that negotiators' feelings of pride for their performance in the first negotiation related negatively to their objective performance in the second negotiation.

Leadership Emergence and Leadership Effectiveness.

Who ends up in leadership roles and how do they perform in these roles? The first question concerns leadership emergence. Research on emergent leadership is generally conducted in the context of small, leaderless groups of equal-status peers and is focused on identifying who ends up leading the group and why that individual ends up in the leadership position (Bales, 1950; deSouza & Klein, 1995). The second question is about leadership effectiveness, and is often concerned with the characteristics, styles, and situational factors that make people more or less successful in their leadership positions (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Self-conscious emotions are associated with perceived and actual achievement and status (e.g., Tracy & Matsumoto, 2008), and the socioemotional and

task initiating behaviors people exhibit in groups. Consequently, self-conscious emotions are relevant to both leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness.

Guilt and shame. Guilt and shame show different relationships and with leadership emergence, which can be attributed, at least in part, to these emotions' different action orientations. Guilt is associated with an approach orientation, whereas shame is associated with an avoidance orientation. People who are prone to experience guilt take action to try to make situations better, but people who are prone to shame do not. Schaumberg & Flynn (2012) reasoned that with their strong sense of duty and responsibility for others as well as their strong action-orientation, high guilt-prone people would be more likely than low guilt-prone people to emerge as leaders. To test this prediction, they had groups engage in two leaderless group tasks and then rate the emergent leadership behaviors of each group member (e.g., the extent to which he or she assumed a leadership role, influenced the group's decisions). Guilt proneness was positively associated with emergent leadership. This was not the case for shame proneness, which showed a negative albeit weak overall relationship with leadership emergence. Schaumberg & Flynn (2012) found similar patterns of results when they assessed leadership effectiveness. Young managers were assessed by their colleagues, clients, and supervisors on their leadership ability. Guilt proneness related positively to these leadership effectiveness ratings, but shame proneness did not.

The positive relationship between guilt proneness leadership emergence and effectiveness likely emerges because high guilt-prone people feel a greater responsibility for others compared to low guilt-prone people (Levine, Bitterly, Schweitzer, & Cohen, 2018; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2012), which leads high guilt-prone people to be more trustworthy than low guilt-prone people (Cohen et al., 2011; Levine et al., 2018). That said, the relationship between guilt proneness and leadership effectiveness may not be axiomatic. Leaders are tasked with making tough decisions,

in which no matter what they do some constituent may be harmed. In these instances, in which people face competing standards of expected behavior, it is not clear how high guilt-prone (or high shame-people, for that matter) will respond and whether their decisions are always the best.

Authentic and hubristic pride. There is strong evidence to suggest that both authentic and hubristic pride may promote leadership emergence, but through different routes; in fact, some have argued that pride evolved in humans to facilitate the fundamental need of social rank attainment (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; Tracy, 2016; Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010). Hubristic pride may facilitate leadership emergence via dominance by motivating individuals to behave in an aggressive and intimidating manner, and providing them with a sense of grandiosity and entitlement that allows them to take power rather than earn it, and to feel little empathy for those who get in their way (Ashton-James & Tracy, 2012; Tracy et al., 2009). In contrast, authentic pride may facilitate the attainment of prestige by motivating and reinforcing achievements and other indicators of competence, and providing individuals with feelings of genuine self-confidence that allow them to demonstrate social attractiveness and generosity (see Tracy, 2016). In support of this account, one study found that undergraduate varsity athletic team members who were prone to authentic pride tended to be judged by their teammates as highly prestigious, whereas team members who were prone to hubristic pride tended to be judged by their teammates as dominant (Cheng et al., 2010).

Whether or under which circumstances authentic pride and hubristic pride relate to leadership effectiveness remains a more open question. On average, leaders tend to be more effective when they exert their power in more subtle ways, taking care to affirm the autonomy and self-worth of their subordinates (Yukl, 1989). In contrast, leaders engender resistance from subordinates when they display power in a more arrogant, manipulative, or domineering manner (Yukl, 1989). This suggests that authentic pride—with its positive relationship to prestige—

would facilitate leadership effectiveness, whereas hubristic pride—with its positive relationship to dominance—would impair it. That said, the relationship between each facet of pride and leadership effectiveness may depend on situational demands. Contingency models of leadership suggest that leadership styles linked to specific contextual demands result in better performance outcomes. When the situation demands an autocratic leadership style, hubristic pride may be a positive leadership characteristic. In contrast, when the situation demands a more participatory or consultive leadership style, authentic pride may be a more valuable leadership characteristic (e.g., Vroom and Yetton, 1973).

Conclusion

The question of whether guilt, shame, and pride can translate to productive work has long intrigued management scholars (e.g., Adams, 1965; Walster et al., 1978). By synthesizing social psychological and organizational behavior research on self-conscious emotions, it is clear that these emotions can motivate people to work hard, behave well, and to take charge, but these behaviors depend on the specific self-conscious emotion people experience——with guilt and authentic pride being more positive drivers of these outcomes than shame and hubristic pride. This suggests that it may not be the valence of the self-conscious emotion, but the attribution people make for their behaviors that give rise to these emotions, that are the most important for facilitating positive employee outcomes.

References

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology (*pp. 267-297). New York: Academic Press.

Ashton-James, C. E., & Tracy, J. L. (2012). Pride and prejudice: How feelings about the self influence judgments of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(4), 466-476.

Bales, R. F. (1950). *Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups*. Cambridge, MA: Addison–Wesley.

Barrett, C. K. (1995). A functionalist approach to shame and guilt. In J.P. Tangney & K.W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 25-63). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Becker, W. J., & Curhan, J. R. (2018). The dark side of subjective value in sequential negotiations: The mediating role of pride and anger. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(1), 74-87.

Brockner, J., Davy, J., & Carter, C. (1985). Layoffs, self-esteem, and survivor guilt: Motivational, affective, and attitudinal consequences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36*(2), 229-244.

Brosi, P., Spörrle, M., Welpe, I. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2016). Two facets of pride and helping. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(5), 976-988.

Carver, C. S., Sinclair, S., & Johnson, S. L. (2010). Authentic and hubristic pride: Differential relations to aspects of goal regulation, affect, and self-control. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(6), 698-703.

Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., & Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the

top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank

and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 103–125.

Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations

of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 31*(5), 334-347.

Cohen, T. R. (2010). Moral emotions and unethical bargaining: The differential effects of empathy

and perspective taking in deterring deceitful negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*(4),

569-579.

Cohen, T.R. & Morse, L. (2014). Moral character: What it is and what it does. In A.P. Brief &

B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*: *Vol. 34* (pp. 43-61). Greenwich,

CN: Elsevier.

Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., & Turan, N. (2012). Guilt-proneness and moral character. *Current

Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(5), 355-359.

Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., Turan, N., Morse, L., & Kim, Y. (2014). Moral character in the

workplace. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*(5), 943-963.

Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2011). Introducing the GASP scale: A

new measure of guilt and shame-proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 100*(5), 947-966.

Damian, R. I., & Robins, R. W. (2012). The link between dispositional pride and creative

thinking depends on current mood. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*, 765-769.

de Souza, G., & Klein, H. J. (1995). Emergent leadership in the group goal-setting process. *Small

Group Research, 26*, 475–496.

Dearing R.L., Stuewig, J., Tangney J.P. (2005). On the importance of distinguishing shame from

guilt: Relations to problematic alcohol and drug use. *Addictive Behavior. 30*(7). 1392–

404.

Dorfman, A., Eyal, T., & Bereby-Meyer, Y. (2014). Proud to cooperate: The consideration of

    pride promotes cooperation in a social dilemma. *Journal of Experimental Social*

    Psychology, 55, 105-109.

Douglas Creed, W. E., Hudson, B. A., Okhuysen, G. A., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2014). Swimming

    in a sea of shame: Incorporating emotion into explanations of institutional reproduction

    and change. *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(3), 275-301.

Flynn, F. J., & Schaumberg, R. L. (2012). When feeling bad leads to feeling good: Guilt-proneness

    and affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 124-133.

Hart, D., & Matsuba, M. K. (2007). The development of pride and moral life. In J. L. Tracy, R.

    W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*

    (pp. 114–133). New York: Guilford

Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a

    mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and human*

    behavior, *22*(3), 165-196.

Herrald, M. M., & Tomaka, J. (2002). Patterns of emotion-specific appraisal, coping, and

    cardiovascular reactivity during an ongoing emotional episode. *Journal of Personality*

    and Social Psychology, 83(2), 434-450.

Hoffman, M. L. (1984). Interaction of affect and cognition in empathy. In C. Izard, J. Kagan, &

    R. Zajonc (Eds.), *Emotion, cognition, and behavior* (pp. 103–131). Cambridge, England:

    Cambridge University Press.

Hofmann, W., & Fisher, R.R. (2012). How guilt and pride shape subsequent self-control. *Social*

    Psychological and Personality Science, 3(6), 682-690.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. L., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and

    personality. *American Psychologist*, *49*, 493–504.

Leith, K. P., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal

conflicts: guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality, 66*(1),

1-37.

Levine, E. E., Bitterly, T. B., Cohen, T. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2018). Who is trustworthy?

Predicting trustworthy intentions and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 115*(3), 468-494.

Lewis, H.B., (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: Intenrational universities press.

Lindsay-Hartz, J. de Rivera J., & Mascolo, M. F. (1995). Differentiating guilt and shame and their

effects on motivation. In J.P. Tangney & K.W. Fischer (Eds*.), Self-conscious emotions:

The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 274-300). New York, NY,

US: Guilford Press.

Michie, S. (2009). Pride and gratitude: How positive emotions influence the prosocial behaviors

of organizational leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 154*(4), 393–

403.

Mishina, Y., Dykes, B. J., Block, E. S., & Pollock, T. G. (2010). Why 'good' firms do bad

things: The effects of high aspirations, high expectations, and prominence on the

incidence of corporate illegality. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(4), 701–722.

Mascolo, M. F., & Fischer, K. W. (1995). Developmental transformations in appraisals for pride,

shame, and guilt. In J. P. Tangney & K. W.Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The

psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 64–113). New York: Guilford

Press.

Niedenthal, P. M., Tangney, J. P., & Gavanski, I. (1994). "If only I weren't" versus" If only I

hadn't": Distinguishing shame and guilt in counterfactual thinking. *Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 585-595.

Schaumberg, R. L., & Flynn, F. J. (2012). Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown: the link

between guilt-proneness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(2), 327-342.

Shariff, A. F. & Tracy, J. L. (2009). Knowing who's boss: Implicit perceptions of status from the

nonverbal expression of pride. *Emotion*, *9*(5), 631-639.

Shariff, A. F., Tracy, J. L., & Markusoff, J. (2012). (Implicitly) judging a book by its cover:

Theautomatic inference of status from pride and shame expressions. *Personality and Social*

Psychology Bulletin, *38*(9), 1178-1193.

Stuewig, J., Tangney, J. P., Heigel, C., Harty, L., & McCloskey, L. (2010). Shaming, blaming, and

maiming:

Functional links among the moral emotions, externalization of blame, and aggression.

Journal of Research in Personality, 44(1), 91-102.

Tangney, J. P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt:

development of the Self-Conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 59(1), 102-111.

Tangney, J.P. (1995). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In J.P. Tangney & K.W.

Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment,*

and pride (pp. 114-139). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford.

Tangney J.P, & Fischer, K.W. (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt,*

embarrassment, and pride. New York: Guilford Press.

Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Martinez, A. G. (2014). Two faces of shame the roles of shame and

guilt in predicting recidivism. *Psychological Science, 25*(3), 799-805.

Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual*

Review of Psychology, 58, 345-372.

Tangney, J. P., & Tracy, J. (2012). Self-conscious emotions. In M. Leary, & J. P. Tangney

   (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed.). (pp. 446-478). New York, NY: Guilford

   Press.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation

   of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social*

   Psychology, *62*(4), 669-675.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation

   of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan.

   Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70(4) 797-809.

Tracy, J. (2016). *Take pride: Why the deadliest sin holds the secret to human success.* Boston,

   MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., Robins, R. W., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2009). Authentic and hubristic

   pride: The affective core of self-esteem and narcissism. *Self and Identity, 8*(2-3), 196-

   213.

Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., Martens, J. P., & Robins, R. W. (2011). The affective core of

   narcissism: Inflated by pride, deflated by shame (pp. 330-343). In W. K. Campbell, & J.

   Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder.* New York:

   Wiley.

Tracy, J. L., & Matsumoto, D. (2008). The spontaneous display of pride and shame: Evidence for

   biologically innate nonverbal displays. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,*

   105(33), 11655-11660.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2003). "Death of a (narcissistic) salesman": An integrative model

   of fragile self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 14*, 57-62.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Show your pride: Evidence for a discrete emotion expression. *Psychological Science, 15*(3), 194-197.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2006). Appraisal antecedents of shame and guilt: Support for a theoretical model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(10), 1339-1351.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007a). The self in self-conscious emotions: A cognitive appraisal approach. In J.L. Tracy, R.W. Robins, & J.P. Tangney (Eds.) *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pg. 3-20). New York: Guilford Press.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007b). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(3), 506-525.

Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., & Tangney, J.P. (2007). *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., & Cheng, J. T. (2010). A naturalist's view of pride. *Emotion Review, 2*(2), 163-177.

Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., Zhao, W., & Henrich, J. (2013). Cross-cultural evidence that the pride expression is a universal automatic status signal. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 142*(1), 163-180.

Tracy, J. L. & Weidman, A. C. (2018). Pride. In A. Scarantino (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Emotion Theory*. London, UK: Routledge University Press.

van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 243–295.

Weidman, A., Tracy, J. L., & Elliot, A. J. (2016). The benefits of following your pride: Authentic pride promotes achievement. *Journal of Personality, 84*(5), 607-622.

Williams, L. A., & DeSteno, D. (2008). Pride and perseverance: The motivational role of pride. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(6), 1007-1017.

Walster, E.H., Walster, G.W., & A.W., Berscheid. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*.

    Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of*

    Management, 15(2), 251-289.

	Attribution for deviation	
Direction of the deviation from social expectations	**Immutable qualities of the self**	**Mutable qualities of one's behavior**
Positive	Hubristic Pride	Authentic Pride
Negative	Shame	Guilt

Figure 1. Conceptual mapping of the self-conscious emotions according to direction of the deviation from social expectations and the attribution made for this deviation