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What is This?
College students in the United States and in the People’s Republic of China completed a set of questions related to the circumstances in which they would feel pride, shame, and guilt. Both Chinese and Americans claimed that they would feel more guilty and ashamed if they were caught cheating on an examination than if their brother were caught, with the intensity of guilt and shame less for Chinese than for Americans. Chinese claimed that they would feel more proud if their child were accepted to a prestigious university than if they were accepted themselves, whereas Americans claimed they would feel equally proud in these two circumstances. Americans had more positive attitudes toward expressing pride in personal accomplishments, and Chinese were more likely to claim that pride should only be experienced for outcomes that benefit others. The findings extend the notion of collectivism to include shared self-related emotions.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AMERICANS
AND CHINESE IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES
EVOKING PRIDE, SHAME, AND GUILT

DEBORAH STIPEK
University of California, Los Angeles

Chinese and American cultures are often differentiated in terms of the degree of interconnectedness among individuals. Kitayama, Markus, and Matsumoto (1995) distinguish between an emphasis in Western cultures on independence, in which “the self is conceived of primarily as an autonomous entity” (p. 442), and an Asian emphasis on interdependence, defined as “the inherent connectedness among different individuals” (p. 442), in which the self is conceived of primarily as part of a relationship. A similar contrast is made by Hsu (1953, 1963, 1981) between Chinese “mutual dependence” and American “individual-centeredness” and “self-reliance” and by Yang (1981) between a social and an individual orientation.

The Chinese social orientation is rooted in the Confucian ideal that individuals are concerned first and foremost with their place in the scheme of human relations (Hsu, 1953, 1981; Wu, 1976). Tu (1985) explains that in Confucian literature, the self is often understood in terms of dyadic relation-
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ships, to the point that "a Confucian self devoid of human-relatedness has little meaningful content of its own" (p. 233). Chu (1985) likewise claims that for Chinese, the self is almost entirely defined in the context of significant others. This Confucian social conception of the self contrasts starkly with descriptions of the American individualistic concept of the self (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Chu, 1985; Hsu, 1981; Leung, 1996).

More recent empirical support for these proposed cultural differences in conceptualizations of the self come from a study by Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990). When asked to complete 20 statements that began with "I am," Chinese participants were almost three times more likely than Americans to give a collective response (i.e., identifying themselves in terms of group membership; see also Leung, 1996). Studies have found also that one of Chinese parents' most frequent descriptions of a good child is for the child to be group oriented and cooperative (Wu, 1996) and that from an early age Chinese children are taught to pursue group-related goals (see Yu, 1996). This cultural difference in the boundaries between self and others is evident even in living arrangements. Whereas American homes are constructed to maximize privacy, Chinese homes are often constructed like a train, requiring family members to pass through the doors of others' bedrooms to enter their own (Hsu, 1953).

Thus, in a collectivist culture such as China, boundaries between the self and others appear to be more permeable than they are in more individualistic cultures such as the United States. In light of emotion theorists' claims that culture shapes emotional experiences (e.g., Wallbott & Scherer, 1995), these cultural differences in the strength of self/other boundaries might be expected to have implications for self-related emotions, such as pride, shame, and guilt.

These three emotions are generated in situations in which individuals compare a personal characteristic or an outcome of their activities to some standard. Personal achievements or situations in which the comparison is favorable generate pride; unfavorable comparisons generate shame or guilt. Shame results from failure to meet personal standards, and guilt is associated with transgressing social rules (see Ausubel, 1955; Campos & Barrett, 1984; Izard, 1977; Lindsay-Hartz, de Rivera, & Mascolo, 1995; Lewis, 1971; Tangney, Burggraf, & Wagner, 1995).

American emotion theorists consider pride, shame, and guilt to involve self-evaluation and usually to require a perception of personal responsibility. Weiner (1986) and other theorists have pointed out, however, that individuals can experience these so-called self-evaluative emotions as the result of others' deeds when the other is "perceived as within one's ego boundaries" (p. 250). In a collectivist culture in which self/other boundaries are relatively weak,
individuals might experience self-related emotions as a consequence of another’s deed more intensely than in an individualistic culture. Thus, an achievement or transgression of a closely related person might engender more intense feelings of pride or shame in Chinese than in Americans. Guilt may also be shared, although less so than shame, because guilt is presumed to require personal responsibility (Weiner, 1992).

Although much has been written comparing Chinese to American character—especially the different conceptualizations of the self—little has been said about the implications of these differences for emotional experiences. As one of the few who has suggested such a cultural impact on emotions, Hsu (1953) comments that in China, “a humble inhabitant of a district shares the glory of one who becomes great” (p. 149; see also Eberhard, 1967). Hsu (1953) suggests that in contrast to the Chinese, “to the successful American, his sense of his own greatness is quite unrelated to the people surrounding him” (p. 149). In another reference to self-related emotions, Bond (1986) points out in a discussion of mental illness that emotions such as shame and guilt afflict members of the Chinese family and especially the head of the family and not the mentally ill person him- or herself. In general, he claims that “an individual in Chinese society always belongs to some groups which absorb and reflect that individual’s glory or shame” (p. 247). Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, and Lucca (1988) imply that pride for others’ achievements should be associated with a collectivist more than an individualistic orientation by including items in their questionnaire measure of allocentrism versus idiocentrism, such as “Even if a child won the Nobel prize the parents should not feel honored in any way” (p. 330).

These observations have merit. But surely Americans, too, share in the glory of their family or community members’ accomplishments and can experience shame for a family member’s condition or acts. What is needed is systematic, empirical comparisons between Chinese and Americans. The present study was designed, therefore, to test the hypothesis, implicit in writings described above, that Chinese experience self-related emotions (pride, shame, and guilt) more intensely than do Americans as a consequence of achievements and transgressions of close relatives and affiliates.

The study was also designed to explore cultural differences in beliefs about expressing pride. Asian cultures and especially the Chinese have also been described as generally restrained in their emotional expressions (Bond, 1986). Wu (1996) notes that the Confucian roots of Chinese parenting practices are designed to teach the child to “never reveal his or her thoughts and feelings” (p. 146). Chinese have also been described as self-effacing in their attributions (Bond, Leung, & Wan, 1982). A cultural norm for being self-effacing
in combination with a collectivist orientation suggest that pride, especially in personal accomplishments, would be discouraged in China. This proposal is consistent with a study by Sommers (1984), in which Chinese respondents were less likely than Americans to rate pride as an emotion they would like to experience, and with the findings of Bond et al. (1982) that Hong Kong university students liked individuals who made self-effacing attributions following success more than individuals who made self-enhancing (i.e., pride-related) attributions. Studies have also found that Chinese make relatively more modest claims about their personal competencies (see Leung, 1996) and more self-effacing causal attributions for achievement outcomes (Crittenden, 1996). Additional support for the proposal that Chinese would de-emphasize pride in personal achievements comes from Stipek, Weiner, and Li’s (1989) finding that a higher proportion of Americans than Chinese referred to personal achievements in their descriptions of pride-evoking events.

Studies of achievement motivation among Chinese suggest that although pride might not be tolerated for personal achievements, it may be encouraged for achievements that benefit others. For example, Blumenthal (1977) found in an analysis of children’s stories published in the People’s Republic of China since the Cultural Revolution that achievement for the group was stressed but personal goals were not. Bond (1986) concluded in a brief review of the achievement motivation literature that for Chinese, “achievement motivation is more firmly rooted in the collectivist than in the individualistic orientation” (p. 36)—although he also proposes that Chinese students’ value orientation may be shifting toward greater individualism. The second hypothesis of the present study, therefore, is that Chinese participants would view favorably the experience and expression of pride in accomplishments that benefit others but not in personal accomplishments. Americans, in contrast, were expected to have an equally positive view of pride in personal accomplishments and accomplishments that benefit others.

Emotions—especially self-related emotion—are important to understand because they provide energy for and guide behavior (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995; Tomkins, 1970; Weiner, 1992) and therefore serve an important function in maintaining cultural norms (Ausbubel, 1955; Campos & Barrett, 1984; Izard, 1977). For example, individuals are presumed to behave in ways they expect to engender pride (Atkinson, 1964; Weiner, 1992) and to abstain from behaviors they expect to engender the painful emotions of shame or guilt (Ausbubel, 1955; Campos & Barrett, 1984; Emde & Oppenheim, 1995; Izard, 1977; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995). Socializing pride, shame, and guilt reactions to particular outcomes
could, therefore, encourage culturally desirable behaviors and inhibit undesirable behaviors. Pride in group outcomes, for example, might be socialized more in the People's Republic of China than in the United States in part to foster behaviors that produce positive group outcomes. Socializing individuals to experience shame or guilt when a family member or community member transgresses might motivate individuals to pressure group members to conform to cultural norms. This emotion socialization may be particularly important for Chinese, who are reported to place more emphasis on conformity than are Americans (Bond, 1986; Chen, 1969; Hsu, 1953).

The present questionnaire study compares Chinese and American perceptions of emotional reactions to events concerning the self versus affiliated persons. Most items in the study concern the self and family members, but some items are related to individuals outside of the family (team members). This allows an examination of whether the relatively weak self/other boundaries among Chinese are restricted to family members. Family relationships and kinship loyalty are emphasized in Confucian teaching and Chinese culture and remain the primary social unit in the People's Republic of China (Baker, 1979). Indeed, according to Goodwin and Tang (1996), it is "difficult to overstate the significance of kinship in the family in Chinese societies" (p. 303). Bond (1986) nevertheless claims that important affiliations can also include work groups, friends, one's ethnic group, and classmates, among others (see also, Gabrenya & Hwang, 1996). It was expected, therefore, that family relationships are central to the Chinese definition of self and therefore to emotional experiences but that nonfamily groups are also important.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

The 101 Chinese participants (53 females and 48 males) were all undergraduate students in their first or second year at Hangzhou University, a public university drawing from a fairly diverse population primarily from Zhejiang Province. The 78 American participants (48 females and 30 males) were undergraduates at the University of California, Los Angeles. The American sample included 63 Caucasians, 11 Asian Americans, and 4 Hispanics. Nearly all participants were between the ages of 18 and 25. Although the American and Chinese participants are similar in terms of their age and education, generalizations beyond college students must be made cautiously.
MEASURES

The questionnaire was first written in English and then translated into Chinese by a person who was brought up and attended college in the People’s Republic of China and is a certified translator. The accuracy of the translation was assessed by having the Chinese version of the questionnaire translated back into English by two other certified Chinese translators (students from the People’s Republic of China attending graduate school at an American university). Five graduate students who spoke only English were then asked to compare each Chinese version with the English version and to judge the translation as the same or not the same as the English in meaning. There were thus 10 ratings of the equivalence of each item in the Chinese and the English version of the questionnaire. All five English-speaking raters judged all translations as the same as the English version. Also, the Chinese version of the characters for guilt, shame, and pride were all retranslated into these English words.¹

PROCEDURE

In both countries, participants completed the questionnaire at the end of a class period. To ensure anonymity, participants were instructed not to put their names on their questionnaires.

Participants were first given a set of six stories designed to assess the strength of emotional responses when they or affiliated individuals (i.e., family members or teammates) were responsible for an outcome. Two stories described an individual caught cheating: In one of the stories, the respondent was caught, and in the other story, the respondent’s brother was caught. Participants rated on a 7-point scale how guilty and how ashamed they would feel in each of these situations. Two other stories described someone being accepted to a prestigious university; in one story, it was the respondent, and in the other story, it was the respondent’s child. Respondents rated the intensity of their pride. Finally, two stories described an athletic event. In one story, the respondent performed well but the team lost; in the other story, the respondent performed badly but the team won. Respondents rated how proud and ashamed they would feel under each of these sets of circumstances. These stories were interspersed with other stories not reported here.

The second set of questions was designed to examine differences between American and Chinese attitudes toward pride and shame. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale the degree to which they agreed with nine
statements. Three statements concerned the value of pride in personal achievements (e.g., “Children should always be encouraged to take pride in their personal achievements”), and two statements concerned the desirability of pride for achievements that benefit others (e.g., “Children should be encouraged to take pride only in achievements that benefit others”). Two statements concerned the desirability of expressing pride in personal achievements (e.g., “A child who expresses pride in personal accomplishments will not be respected by his or her peers”). Two statements concerned shame related to a family member’s transgression (e.g., “Any behavior that brings shame to an individual also brings shame to his or her family”).

RESULTS

EMOTIONS RESULTING FROM OUTCOMES RELATED TO THE SELF VERSUS OTHERS

For this first set of questions, it was hypothesized that American participants would claim to have much more intense emotional experiences for outcomes related to themselves than for outcomes related to family members or teammates. The intensity of the Chinese participants’ emotions was not expected to be affected as much as that of American participants by whether they or a family member or teammate were responsible for the outcome.

Two 2 (country) × 2 (cheater: self vs. brother) analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were computed for the cheating stories—one for guilt ratings and one for shame ratings. Cheater was a repeated measures variable. For guilt, the country, F(1, 174) = 24.86, and cheater, F(1, 174) = 423.07, main effects and the Country × Cheater interaction effect, F(1, 174) = 42.05, were highly significant (all ps < .001). For shame, as well, the country, F(1, 174) = 49.15, and cheater, F(1, 174) = 295.74, main effects, and the Country × Cheater interaction effect, F(1, 174) = 56.02, were highly significant (all ps < .001).

As can be seen from the mean emotional ratings on Table 1, both the Chinese and American respondents claimed that their emotional response would be more intense if they were caught cheating than if their brother were caught. But as predicted, Chinese respondents rated their own guilt and shame higher than Americans when a brother was caught cheating, and the difference in their level of guilt and shame in the self and brother conditions was less for American respondents.

A 2 (country) × 2 (person: self vs. child) ANOVA on pride intensity ratings for acceptance to a prestigious university resulted in a significant country
TABLE 1
Mean Guilt and Shame Intensity
Ratings by Country and Cheater (self vs. brother)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
<th></th>
<th>Shame</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Republic of China</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

main effect, $F(1, 173) = 17.17, p < .001$, a significant person main effect, $F(1, 173) = 19.76$, and a significant Country $\times$ Person interaction effect, $F(1, 173) = 23.98, p < .001$. Although Americans claimed that they would be equally proud to have their child $(M = 6.65)$ or themselves $(M = 6.68)$ accepted, Chinese claimed that they would be more proud to have their child $(M = 6.50)$ accepted than to be accepted themselves $(M = 5.69)$.

Finally, two 2 (country) $\times$ 2 (outcome: self/good performance but team lost vs. self/bad performance but team won) ANOVAS were computed—one on pride and one on shame ratings. For pride, only the Country $\times$ Outcome interaction effect was significant, $F(1, 173) = 7.70, 4001$. The mean intensity ratings shown on Table 2 reveal that Americans claimed they would feel more proud when they performed well and their team performed badly than when they performed badly and their team performed well. Chinese rated their pride higher when their team won than when they had played well. Thus, pride for the Americans was based more on their own performance than on their team’s performance, whereas pride for the Chinese respondents was based more on their team’s performance.

The predictions for shame were not supported. The country main effect, $F(1, 173) = 8.09, p < .01$, and the outcome main effect, $F(1, 173) = 125.68, p < .001$, were significant, but the interaction effect was not significant. For participants in both countries, shame ratings were based much more on one’s own poor performance than on the performance of the team, but the Chinese rated shame more highly than did the Americans.

Finally, scores for the two statements concerning shame related to a family member’s transgression were averaged to examine cultural differences. A $t$ test revealed that Chinese participants $(M = 4.86)$ agreed more strongly than American participants $(M = 4.41)$ with statements claiming that a person would experience shame for a family member’s transgression, $t(177) = 3.22, p < .001$. 

Downloaded from joc.sagepub.com at UCLA on June 26, 2013
TABLE 2
Mean Pride and Shame Intensity
Ratings by Self Versus Team, Outcome, and Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pride</th>
<th>Shame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self good performance, team lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self bad performance, team won</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Chinese and American Attitudes Toward Pride

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Chinese (n = 101)</th>
<th>Americans (n = 78)</th>
<th>t (77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of pride in personal accomplishments</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>-15.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride only for achievements that benefit others</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>14.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing pride is bad</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>17.41***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The scale ranged from 1 to 7. A high score indicates agreement.

***p < .001.

THE VALUE OF PRIDE

For this second set of questions, it was hypothesized that Americans would have more positive attitudes toward experiencing and expressing pride in personal accomplishments than would Chinese. Chinese participants were expected to value pride only for accomplishments that benefited others. To test these hypotheses, the three categories of statements described above were created by averaging the ratings for relevant questions. To assess differences in American and Chinese participants’ responses in these three categories, t tests were then computed.

The results, presented in Table 3, are consistent with the predictions. Americans perceived greater value in experiencing and expressing pride in
personal accomplishments than did Chinese. Chinese but not American respondents believed that it is more acceptable to experience pride for achievements that benefit others than for personal achievements.

DISCUSSION

The interconnectedness and mutual dependence of the Chinese apparently have consequences for emotional experiences. As predicted, Chinese college students rated their own emotional responses to affiliated others’ achievements and transgressions as more intense than did the American students.

With regard to transgressions, Chinese respondents agreed more than Americans did with statements suggesting that individuals should feel ashamed for behavior or outcomes related to family members. Although both Chinese and Americans believed that they would feel guiltier and more ashamed if they were caught cheating on an exam than if their brother were caught, the difference in the intensity of both emotions between getting caught cheating themselves and having a brother get caught was less for Chinese than for Americans.

The significant effect for guilt is remarkable because guilt, at least as it is conceptualized by Western psychologists, requires personal responsibility (Lewis, 1971; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995; Weiner, 1992). It cannot be determined from these data whether guilt is conceptualized differently by Chinese (i.e., as not requiring personal responsibility) or whether guilt is experienced by Chinese more than by Americans for others’ transgressions because the Chinese boundaries between self and other are weaker.

The only finding that was inconsistent with the hypotheses concerned shame as a function of the outcome of an athletic event. In both cultures shame was linked almost exclusively to personal failure. Perhaps Chinese experience shame for another only when the other individual is very closely affiliated (such as a family member).

Although both American and Chinese respondents claimed that they would be affected by affiliated others’ achievement, Chinese respondents reported stronger emotional reactions than Americans to others’ achievements. Chinese participants claimed that they would feel more proud if their child were accepted to a prestigious university than if they were accepted themselves, whereas Americans claimed that they would feel equally proud in these two circumstances. Also as predicted, for Americans, pride related to a sporting event was based more on their own than on their team’s performance, whereas pride for the Chinese was based more on their team’s performance.
The American data are consistent with stereotypic characterizations of Americans as individualistic. They may also be related to the results of studies in which Americans, more than individuals in other cultures studied (e.g., Mexico), were willing to sacrifice positive group outcomes for personal gain (Kagan & Madsen, 1971).

The results also support hypotheses concerning perceptions of the value of pride. As predicted, Chinese respondents had a negative view of experiencing and expressing pride in personal accomplishments, and they tended to agree with statements suggesting that pride was only appropriate for achievements that benefit others. In contrast, American respondents valued pride and did not, on average, agree that it was inappropriate to experience or express pride in personal accomplishments. The Chinese de-emphasis on personal achievements is also evident in the findings that the Chinese participants’ pride following an athletic event was based more on their team’s than on their own performance and that they would feel more proud to have their child accepted to a prestigious university than to be accepted themselves.

The results of this study extend the collectivist characterization of Chinese to include emotions. The Chinese self, defined in the context of relationships with others, appears to have important implications for emotional experiences. The findings suggest that, compared to Americans, Chinese are more affected by the achievements and transgressions of affiliated others. For some emotions such as shame, permeable self/other boundaries may be restricted to family members. For other emotions such as pride, nonfamilial groups may be important.

The results for emotions may have implications for behavior. To the degree that emotions mediate behavior, they may serve to maintain cultural norms. Positive emotions such as pride may direct Chinese individuals toward activities that benefit the group and Americans more toward activities that benefit the self. Cultural differences in the degree to which negative emotions are experienced for another individual’s transgression may be related to cultural differences in the amount of social pressure for conformity. It would be useful in future research to examine how cultural differences in the circumstances evoking self-related emotions serve to maintain cultural differences in the norms for behavior.

Contemporary cross-cultural psychologists (e.g., Bond, 1986; Hofstede, 1980; Kitayama et al., 1995; Triandis, 1988, 1990; Triandis et al., 1988; Yang, 1981) trace the collectivist orientation of the Chinese to the fundamental features of their culture. The findings of the present study are, however, also consistent with prevailing socialist ideology of the People’s Republic of China, particularly its strong emphasis on the primacy of the group. Several items in the questionnaire refer to values explicitly fostered in mainland
China. A crucial test of these two explanations would involve comparing participants in the People’s Republic of China with their compatriots living under the capitalist system in Hong Kong, Taiwan, or Singapore. Extant research (e.g., Bond, 1986; Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1990; Yang, 1981) underscores the predominance of collectivism in several spheres in life in these nonsocialist settings. However, an explicit comparison of collectivism, holding the Chinese culture constant and varying sociopolitical systems, remains to be undertaken.

NOTE

1. The Chinese translations of the emotion terms are as follows:

Pride, 骄傲;

Shame, 丢脸;

Guilt, 内疚.
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