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Contribution Statement

Prior research has shown that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride or happiness (McFerran, Aquino, and Tracy 2014; Wilcox, Kramer, and Sen 2011). The past research, however, only examines this effect when consumers have ample cognitive resources (e.g., not being distracted when making a decision). In fact, consumers usually make decisions with limited cognitive resources (e.g., while being distracted). Therefore, by taking cognitive resources into account, this research advances the theory on pride and indulgence by demonstrating that authentic pride leads to more licensing in indulgence than hubristic pride, but only when cognitive resources are available; yet, when cognitive resources are limited, hubristic pride leads to more of a licensing effect in indulgence. Further analysis shows that perceived resistance to temptation mediates this effect. Thus, this research provides a unique theoretical contribution to pride on indulgence by advancing our understanding of emotion and decision-making.

Data Collection Paragraph

The first author managed the data collection and data analysis for all studies. We collected data for study 1 in the fall of 2012 (from September 11\textsuperscript{th} to Oct 17\textsuperscript{th}, 2012), data for study 2 in the fall of 2013 (from Oct 28\textsuperscript{th} to Dec 05\textsuperscript{th}, 2013), and data for study 4 in the fall of 2013, at the University of Iowa Human Subjects Marketing Department behavioral lab. We also collected data for Study 3 in the summer of 2013 (from May 29\textsuperscript{th} to June 10\textsuperscript{th}, 2013) and data for study 5 in the fall of 2014 (from March 22\textsuperscript{nd} to March 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 2014) from the MTurk panel described in the methods section. The first author analyzed the data under the supervision of the second two authors. All authors jointly prepared the experimental designs, questionnaires and manuscript.
Abstract

The current research investigates how authentic and hubristic pride influence licensing effects in indulgence. Previous research examining the influence of pride on indulgence has generally found that pride could lead to both indulgence and self-control. The current research suggests that the reason for the discrepancy within the previous research is that pride is not a unitary construct. Rather, the two distinct types of pride—hubristic and authentic—have different consequences on indulgence. Consistent with prior literature, the results from the first two studies suggest that authentic pride leads to more licensing in indulgence than hubristic pride. We further demonstrate how cognitive resources moderate the effect of pride on indulgence. By manipulating pride in different ways and using different measures of indulgent choice, the results from the last three studies confirm that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride, especially when cognitive resources are available. However, when cognitive resources are limited, hubristic pride leads to more indulgence. We further demonstrate how resisting temptation mediates indulgence licensing. This research contributes to our basic understanding of the dynamics of pride on licensing effects.
“We drink Diet Coke – with Quarter Pounders and fries at McDonald’s. We go to the
gym – and ride the elevator to the second floor. We install tankless water heaters – then take
longer showers. We drive SUVs to see Al Gore’s speeches on global warming.” (Rosenwald,
Michael S, July 18, 2010)

INTRODUCTION

People sometimes justify indulging in unhealthy goods, such as tasty, but fattening food,
alcohol, and tobacco with a variety of rationales (Witt Huberts, Evers, and De Ridder 2012).
Previous research has shown that the act of doing something good (e.g., eating a healthy diet,
engaging in pro-social behaviors) can sometimes give individuals a reason for indulging or
acting immorally (Khan and Dhar 2006; Merritt, Effron, and Monin 2010; Witt Huberts et al.
2012). This paper examines the phenomenon of why and when being good gives people
permission to be a little bad, a phenomenon often referred to as the “licensing effect.”

Licensing effects happen when consumers recall past behaviors (or even imagine future
behaviors) that boost their self-esteem; when consumers recall these past behaviors, they are
more likely to reward themselves with indulgent, or even immoral behavior. For example,
drinking a diet soda might give consumers license to indulge in eating French fries; using an
energy-efficient washer and dryer might encourage consumers to do excessive laundry; driving a
fuel-efficient car might encourage one to drive to work instead of using public transit; and
buying sustainable products may lead people to cheat more on follow-up tasks in order to get
highly paid (Zhong, Strejc, and Sivanathan 2010). Although prior research has shown that
previous good behavior is correlated with licensing effects, it was not clear how pride influences the licensing effects of indulgence.

This paper focuses on pride as an antecedent to licensing effects, for both theoretical and empirical reasons. Theoretically, pride is an emotion that plays a critical role in many domains of consumer decision-making and moral judgment. Pride is particularly interesting because it belongs to the class of emotions called conscious emotion, which is involved both in self-assessment and self-awareness (Tracy, Shariff, and Cheng 2010). Managerially, because pride is a powerful and persuasive emotion, marketers try to generate pride through their commercials. For example, P&G’s “Best Job Sochi 2014 Olympic Game” commercial shows a proud mother watching her child win in the Olympics. From a managerial perspective, if marketers want to tap into this powerful emotion, they should understand its complex effect on choice. Although pride is important in consumer decision-making for both theoretical and empirical reasons, researchers have just begun to investigate how it works in influencing consumer decision processing and decision-making (Aaker and Williams 1998b; Fredrickson 2001; Patrick, Chun, and MacInnis 2009; Wilcox et al. 2011). This paper builds on existing research by examining how different types of pride (authentic vs. hubristic pride) influence licensing effects.

Although pride is important in consumer decision-making for both theoretical and empirical reasons, little is known about how pride influences consumer decision processing and decision-making. Pride, one of the self-conscious emotions, is a newcomer to the field of consumer research. Pride has received ample attention in social psychology in the last 10 years, but has gotten little attention in the marketing management literature. A PsycINFO keyword search of “pride” and “consumer” only yielded 16 journal articles on pride (as of June 15th, 2014).
When consumers feel a sense of achievement, they tend to make more indulgent choices, but when they also feel increased self-awareness, they tend to make virtuous choices (Wilcox et al. 2011). However, in the psychology literature, pride is broken down into authentic and hubristic sub-types. A recently published paper has suggested that feeling authentic pride leads to more luxury purchases (McFerran et al. 2014). Yet, such findings are based on the assumption that consumers have ample cognitive resources. It remains unclear how authentic and hubristic pride will interact with cognitive resources to influence licensing effects. Therefore, the purpose of the present research is to build on the previous work regarding pride and licensing effects and provide a deeper understanding of how authentic pride (compared to hubristic pride) and cognitive resources jointly influence licensing effects in the consumer indulgence domain.

Pride is too broad a concept to be considered as a singular and unified construct (Lewis 1993). Instead, pride is more appropriately viewed as having two distinct facets: authentic and hubristic pride (Tracy and Robins 2007b). Specifically, authentic pride is associated with self-confidence and accomplishment (“I did well because I worked hard”). Hubristic pride is associated with arrogance and self-aggrandizement (“I did great because I am great”). Cluster analyses show that authentic pride includes words such as “accomplished” and “confident,” which fit with a pro-social, achievement-oriented conceptualization of pride, whereas hubristic pride includes words such as “arrogant” and “conceited.” Tracy and her colleagues also showed that the two pride facets might be elicited by distinct cognitive appraisals.

Based on prior research, we predict that differences in indulgence between authentic and hubristic pride will be especially strong when consumers have cognitive resources to think about their feelings. Because authentic pride is associated with self-accomplishment, it will lead to stronger licensing than hubristic pride because consumers will have the cognitive resources to
justify their indulgence after feeling pride about their earned accomplishments. However, when cognitive resources are low, we will see more indulgent choice for individuals experiencing hubristic pride than for individuals experiencing authentic pride. To be specific, similar to Wilcox, Kramer and Sen (2011), we argue that authentic pride promotes indulgent choices when consumers believe they deserve a reward after experiencing a sense of achievement (a cognitively complex process). On the other hand, we argue that hubristic pride promotes indulgent choices when consumers use the indulgent choice as a means of mood management, arising from feelings of hubristic pride (a cognitively simple process) (Pham 1998; Pham et al. 2001; Tice, Bratslavsky, and Baumeister 2001a). Together, we have completed five experiments to examine the differences between authentic and hubristic pride on licensing effects.

We will review the pride literature by starting with the differences between authentic and hubristic pride. We will then discuss the literature on licensing effects by discussing the differences between licensing effects and impulsive behavior. Next we will discuss the main factors that influence licensing effects. Based on dual-process theory, system I and system II, we show how authentic pride leads to licensing effects when cognitive resources are available; however, hubristic pride leads to licensing effects when cognitive resources are not available. Finally, we will present the results of six experiments.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Self-Conscious Emotions and Basic Emotions
Emotions play a significant role in goal pursuits and licensing effects (Fishbach and Labroo 2007; Wilcox et al. 2011; Zhang, Fishbach, and Dhar 2007). Emotions can be classified into self-conscious and basic emotions. Self-conscious emotions are cognition-dependent and involve a high level of self-appraisal, self-reflection and need self-evaluation (Tangney and Fischer 1995; Tracy and Robins 2004). Basic emotions, on the other hand, are more biologically dependent than self-conscious emotions and relate to adaption and survival (Lewis 1993).

Examples of self-conscious emotions include pride, guilt, shame, and embarrassment; examples of basic emotions include joy, happiness, sadness and fear. The major distinction between self-conscious and basic emotions is that self-conscious emotions involve people’s reactions to their own behaviors or characteristics, require the ability to form self-representation, focus on the self, and generate self-evaluation (Tracy and Robins 2004).

Self-conscious emotions play a central role in motivating and regulating people’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors; indeed, they are fundamentally important to a wide range of psychological processes (Tangney and Fischer 1995). Self-conscious emotions drive people to work hard toward their goals (Wilcox et al. 2011), and to behave in socially appropriate ways (Ashton-James and Tracy 2011; Tracy and Robins 2004; Tracy and Robins 2006; Tracy et al.). Self-conscious emotions emerge later in human development than basic emotions (Lewis 1993) and involve complex appraisals of how one’s behavior will be evaluated by the self and others (Beer et al. 2003), which requires one to infer the mental states of others. Although self-conscious emotions play a more significant role in self-regulation than do basic emotions (Beer et al. 2003; Oveis, Horberg, and Keltner 2010; Tangney 1999), they have received relatively little scholarly attention, compared to basic emotions (e.g., happiness) (Tracy and Robins 2004).
Pride is a unique and important persuasive emotion that plays a critical role in many domains of consumer decision-making and moral judgment. It is particularly interesting because it belongs to the class of conscious emotions, involving both self-assessment and self-awareness. The literature on pride and long- and short-term goal pursuit is conflicting. On the one hand, previous research has suggested that pride, similar to other positive emotions, can help people build their enduring personal resources (including physical, intellectual, social and psychological resources). Therefore, pride can broaden individuals’ thought-action repertoires by, for instance, driving individuals toward greater future achievements (Fredrickson 2001). Furthermore, previous research has also suggested that pride can promote people’s perseverance (Williams and DeSteno 2008). For example, Williams and DeSteno (2008) showed that by highlighting pride, people persevered more on an effortful and difficult task, compared to the control condition. The authors proposed that the experience of pride serves a crucial role in providing an incentive to pursue success, despite short-term losses, a belief that they call the “motivational hypopaper of pride” (Williams and DeSteno 2008). In one of their studies, participants were asked to complete a dot-estimation task, involving visual perception and mental rotation. Participants were either given feedback to (or not to) induce pride. The results showed that participants who received pride feedback had greater perseverance on an effortful and hedonically negative task than those in the control condition.

Yet, another line of evidence suggests that pride, despite its positive effects on self-regulation, may have an opposite effect on short-term goal pursuits leading to indulgence. Wilcox, Kramer, and Sen (2011) showed that pride could lead to indulgence or self-control,
depending on whether a sense of achievement or self-awareness is activated. For example, they found that when cognitive resources were available, a sense of achievement mediated the effects of pride on indulgence. However, when self-awareness was high, pride led to less indulgence than happiness or a neutral condition. How could one emotion have different consequences in consumer decision-making? We believe the reason for the discrepancy within the previous research is that pride is not a unitary construct. Rather, the two distinct types of pride—hubristic and authentic— have different antecedents and consequences (Tracy and Robins 2007b). In sum, one limitation with previous research on pride is that most previous studies do not distinguish between authentic and hubristic pride. For example, Wilcox, Kramer, and Sen (2011) asked participants to write about an achievement, which only induced authentic pride. We propose that, in fact, there are two different types of pride that lead to different licensing effects. In the following section, building on the two facets of the pride model, authentic and hubristic pride, and dual-process theory, we develop a framework to show that authentic and hubristic pride work differently on licensing effects: authentic pride leads to licensing effects through system II (cognition), while hubristic pride leads to licensing effects through system I (emotion).

Authentic Pride and Hubristic Pride

Two recent models (the two-facet Authentic/Hubristic model (Tracy et al. 2010) and the Merited/Unmerited model (Holbrook, Piazza, and Fessler 2013) suggest that pride is too broad a concept to be considered as a singular and unified construct (Lewis 1993); instead, pride is more appropriately viewed as two distinct facets characterized by distinct ways of appraising the
causes of achievement (Holbrook et al. 2013; Tracy and Robins 2004; Tracy and Robins 2007b; Tracy et al.).

Evidence for the two-facet Authentic/Hubristic model (A/H model) initially came from a cluster analysis of words generated in multiple experiments, based on 2,000 participants, conducted by Tracy and Robin (2007). When participants were asked to think about and list words relevant to pride, the results generated two very different categories of concepts, which empirically formed two separate clusters of semantic meaning. This finding suggests that pride is not a unitary construct; rather, it has two distinct facets: authentic pride and hubristic pride. Cluster analyses show that authentic or beta pride (the first cluster) includes words such as “accomplished” and “confident,” which fit with a pro-social, achievement-oriented conceptualization of pride. However, hubristic or alpha pride (the second cluster) includes words such as “arrogant” and “conceited.” Authentic pride promotes positive attitudes toward out-group, stigmatized individuals, while hubristic pride fits with a more self-aggrandizing, egotistical conceptualization, promoting prejudice and discrimination (Ashton-James and Tracy 2012; Cheng, Tracy, and Henrich 2010; Tracy and Robins 2007b; Tracy et al. 2010). Tracy and her colleagues also showed that the two pride facets might be elicited by distinct cognitive appraisals. One experimental study provides support for appraisal differences in the two types of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007, Study 4). In this study, Tracy and Robin (2007) manipulated effort vs. ability attributions using vignettes, and found relatively greater authentic pride in response to effort, and relatively greater hubristic pride in response to ability. The results suggest that authentic pride might result from success attributed to internal, specific and controllable causes (e.g., I did well because I worked hard; I won because I practiced). Hubristic pride, on the other hand, might result from success via internal, but stable and uncontrollable causes (e.g., I did
great because I am great; I won because I am great). However, Tracy and Robin (2013) mentioned that these were relative differences between effort and ability, so it remains likely that the effort/ability distinction is not the only distinction between authentic and hubristic pride.

Previous research has focused on the positive side of authentic pride and the negative side of hubristic pride. For example, studies have shown that authentic pride is associated with secure self-esteem, a genuine positive self-image, self-worth, high empathetic concern, and low attitudes toward racism. On the other hand, hubristic pride is associated with insecurity, low self-worth, arrogance, self-aggrandizement and narcissism (Ashton-James and Tracy 2012; Tracy and Robins 2007a; Tracy et al. 2010). How does authentic and hubristic pride influence consumer decision-making? It is not clear how these two types of pride—authentic and hubristic pride—affect people’s licensing effects. In the following section, we will first clarify that licensing effects are different from impulsive behavior. We will then discuss the main factors that influence licensing effects. Finally, based on dual-process theory, system I and system II, we will state our predictions and will discuss the methods to test them.

Factors That Influence Licensing Effects

Consistent with prior research, we define licensing effects as the phenomenon by which previous positive behaviors can give people a reason or license for indulgence (Khan and Dhar 2006; Merritt et al. 2010; Witt Huberts et al. 2012). Prior research has shown that factors influencing licensing effects include ease of justification, perceived goal progress, boosted self-concept, and the role of thinking about future choices. Previous research has examined the roles of ease of justification in influencing licensing effects. Licensing relies on reasons to justify
subsequent gratification and implies that people abandon their self-control on purpose by relying on justifications to permit themselves an otherwise forbidden pleasure, rather than lose self-control (Witt Huberts et al. 2012). People are more likely to indulge when they can justify their consumption, choice, or prejudice toward others (Khan and Dhar 2006; Kivetz and Simonson 2002b; Kivetz and Simonson 2002a; Kivetz and Zheng 2006). Licensing permits one to choose the disallowed pleasure if it is easily justified. Indeed, findings from decision-making research suggest that people are more likely to make indulgent choices if such choices can be easily justified by previous efforts (Kivetz and Simonson 2002b). For example, a dieter can permit himself to have a supersized ice cream cone after a two-hour workout; an ex-smoker can allow herself to smoke light cigarettes because they are lower in nicotine content. However, when the choice is hard to justify, people are less likely to experience licensing effects.

In addition, goal-fulfillment can also lead to licensing effects. Fishbach and Dhar (2005) explained that consumers were more likely to indulge if they paid attention to their goal progress and believed that they had made enough or quick progress toward their goals. When consumers have multiple conflicting goals, the pursuit of a focal goal can lead them to unrelated or even conflicting goals. For example, opening a savings account (the goal being to save money for retirement) may lead to overspending because consumers might interpret having made progress in approaching their savings goals, thus leading to licensing effects in overspending (Fishbach and Dhar 2005). In short, this result confirmed that goal fulfillment by focusing on goal progress can lead to a deviation from the focal goal, which constitutes a licensing effect in goal pursuits.

Furthermore, mere exposure can also lead to licensing effects in consumer consumption. For example, exposure to a healthy option can lead to an indulgent option (Wilcox et al. 2009). For example, McDonald’s inclusion of “healthy” options on their menu ironically increased
McDonald’s success in selling burgers and fries, which was considered as a key to success for fast food. Consumers wanted healthy options on the fast food menu, but this did not mean that they were going to eat them. Mere exposure to healthy food by adding healthy items to a menu can make unhealthy food items look less threatening. Therefore, people are more likely to choose the unhealthy over healthy selections.

Finally, individuals whose prior behaviors have established them as ethical, helpful, compassionate or reasonable people will be more likely to exhibit self-licensing effects (Merritt et al. 2010). Thus, having a boosted positive self-concept impacts questionable consumer choices (Khan and Dhar 2006). When participants were asked to choose between designer jeans and a vacuum cleaner, those who were asked to imagine that they had volunteered to spend three hours a week doing community service were more likely to choose the designer jeans rather than those who were in the control condition. Furthermore, participants in the license condition rated themselves as having a higher positive self-concept than those in the control condition. Self-concept was measured by using four statements, such as, “I am compassionate”; “I am sympathetic”; “I am warm”; and, “I am helpful.” A prior commitment to a virtuous act boosts one’s positive self-concept, which leads to licensing effects (which, in turn, increases one’s preference for relatively luxury options) (Khan and Dhar 2006).

To summarize, prior literature suggests that licensing effects can occur through different ways. However, it is still not clear how pride can potentially influence licensing effects. Prior research has examined the influence of elevated arousal in influencing positive mood and its resistance to temptation (Fedorikhin and Patrick 2010), which suggests that both valance and arousal play a role in licensing effects. Prior research has also examined the roles of affect and cognition in influencing consumer decision-making (Shiv and Fedorikhin 1999). Previous
research on positive emotion and moral licensing has also shown that positive affect could promote immoral behavior by facilitating the justification of immoral behavior. That is to say, positive affect could increase cognitive flexibility, an ability that could redefine events, broaden categories, and facilitate the connections between concepts that are unrelated to each other (Ayal and Gino 2011). However, two points should be noted. First, emotions from the same valence have different antecedents and consequences. Second, it is possible that authentic and hubristic pride influence licensing through different systems. To conclude, we are going to review the literature on dual-process theory first. Then we will build our framework on dual-process theory.

The Differences between the Licensing Effect and Impulsive Behavior

Licensing effects are different from impulsive behaviors. Rook (1995) describes buying impulsiveness as a consumer’s tendency to think and act spontaneously, unreflectively, immediately, which usually results in undesirable consequences (Rook and Fisher 1995). Impulse buying is relatively more extraordinary and exciting than ordinary buying, more spontaneous than cautious, more emotional than rational, and is more likely to be perceived as “bad” than “good.” Thus, consumers are more likely to feel out of control after buying impulsively (Rook 1987). Two elements must be present for impulsive behaviors: first, an impulse—an urge to act in some way and second, a lack of restraint, or control of that impulse (Carver, Johnson, and Joormann 2009; Hofmann, Friesen, and Strack 2009). Most times, people feel guilty after engaging in impulsive behaviors. Furthermore, considerable work has treated impulsivity as an individual variable, which is a dimension of relatively stable individual differences in the tendency to be impulsive (Barratt, Monahan, and Steadman 1994; DeYoung
De Young (2010) defined impulsivity as the tendency to act on immediate urges, either before consideration of possible negative consequences or despite the consideration of likely negative consequences. Impulsive personality traits have been shown to be associated with a traumatic upbringing during childhood (Figueroa and Silk 1997). In addition, impulsivity has been examined as a personality trait linking extraversion and aggression (Barratt et al. 1994; Goldberg et al. 2006). In summary, impulsivity has been largely considered as a personality trait.

Dual-Process Theory: Cognition and Emotion

Emotion and cognition play different roles in consumer decision-making (Shiv and Fedorikhin 1999). In this paper, we adopt dual-process theory to explain the roles of authentic and hubristic pride on licensing effects. Dual-process theory consists of two processes: system I and system II. System I relies on an emotional response: it is quick, simple, uncontrolled and heuristic based. System II relies on a cognitive response: it is slow, complex, deliberate and analytic based (Evans 2008; Evans and Over 1996).

Recent work extends this dual-process theory to the process of emotion and cognition in influencing consumer decision-making. Shiv and Fedorikhin (1999) proposed that the two types of processes are engaged in a choice task: one is affective in nature, while the other is cognitive (Shiv and Fedorikhin 1999). The former process is more automatic and is less likely to be affected by the availability of processing resources. However, the latter process is more controlled and is more likely to be affected by the availability of processing resources. Therefore, when cognitive resources are limited, people are more likely to rely on the first, automatic
process. In this case, emotion plays a more important role on choice than cognition. However, when cognitive resources are not constrained, people are more likely to rely on the second, controlled process. In this context, cognition plays a more important role on choice than emotion. Metcalfe and Mischel (1999) also proposed that cognition and emotion play different roles in self-control. They proposed two types of processing: hot and cool systems. The hot, emotional system relies on quick emotional processing, which they refer to as the “go” system. The cool, cognitive system relies on complex and rational thoughts, which they refer to as the “know” system (Metcalfe and Mischel 1999).

Extensive research has shown that cognitive resources can impact a person’s self-regulation (Baumeister 2002; Baumeister 2003; Baumeister et al. 1998; Baumeister, Muraven, and Tice 2000; Muraven and Baumeister 2000; Van Dillen, Papes, and Hofmann 2012; Vohs et al. 2008); however, the results are conflicting. On the one hand, the traditional view suggests that limited cognitive resources lead to decreases in willpower or self-control. For example, when one’s cognitive load is high, he or she is more likely to engage in indulgent choices, or is less persistent with goal pursuits (Baumeister 2002; Baumeister 2003; Baumeister et al. 1998; Shiv and Fedorikhin 1999; Vohs et al. 2008).

However, recently, some articles have shown that limited cognitive resources do not always lead to reduced self-regulation: for example, Van Dill (2013) found that cognitive load can reduce the impact of temptations on cognition and behavior. This notion challenges the proposition that cognitive load always hampers self-regulation. By using a spatial categorization task to manipulate cognitive load, four studies showed that participants who were under a low cognitive load allocated more attention to tempting over neutral stimuli (e.g., attractive high-calorie food vs. low-calorie food; attractive vs. unattractive female faces). However, this effect
disappeared for participants under a high cognitive load. The findings suggest that recognizing temptation requires cognitive resources; therefore, when one is under a high cognitive load, he or she may overcome the captivating power of temptation, and thus, increase self-regulation (Van Dillen et al. 2012).

Another study conducted by Wilcox (2011) also showed that limited cognitive resources do not always impair self-regulation. Participants were asked to write either a story about an accomplishment, or a happy or typical day (control). Cognitive load was manipulated by asking participants to spend 2 minutes memorizing a list of 20 words (high cognitive load), or they were not given a cognitive load task (low cognitive load). The results showed that when the cognitive load was low, participants were more likely to make an indulgent choice when they wrote about an accomplishment, compared to those who wrote about a happy or typical day. When the cognitive load was high, participants were less likely to make an indulgent choice as they wrote about an accomplishment, compared to those who wrote about a happy or typical day. These results provide support that a high cognitive load does not always lead to reduced self-regulation. Although this research details how authentic pride affects indulgent choice under different cognitive load conditions, it does not detail how hubristic pride affects indulgent choice.

Licensing effects can occur through either system I or system II. System I relies on an emotional response: it is intuitive, quick, simple, uncontrolled and heuristic based. System II relies on a cognitive response: it is deliberate, slow, complex, and analytic based (Evans 2008; Evans and Over 1996). The dual-system framework suggests that consumers’ choices and preferences can arise either mainly from intuitive processing, which requires little deliberation, or they can be attributed to deliberate thought, which requires ample deliberation (Dhar and Gorlin 2013). Based on the dual-system framework, we argue that while some licensing effects
can be attributed to intuitive system I processing, especially in cases where system I generates a strong preference in favor of an indulgent or dishonest option, other licensing effects can be attributed to deliberate system II processing, especially when it is easy to justify one’s options. Based on dual-process theory, we propose that cognitive resources moderate the effects of authentic and hubristic pride on licensing effects. We theorize that authentic pride leads to licensing effects though the cold, cognitive system, which allows consumers to justify an indulgence on their earned accomplishments. In particular, we predict that authentic pride, associated with self-accomplishment, will lead to stronger licensing effects than hubristic pride, especially when consumers have cognitive resources available to justify their choice.

On the other hand, we also propose that hubristic pride leads to indulgence through the hot, emotional system, which allows one to indulge in immediate impulses to make one feel better. Hubristic pride is more likely to lead to indulgence when cognitive resources are low. Previous research has shown that hubristic pride is positively related to negative emotions, such as shame and anger (Carver, Sinclair, and Johnson 2010). Therefore, hubristic pride is more likely to lead to indulgence, when one’s affect and intuition generate a strong preference in favor of an indulgent option. The literature in depleted self-control can explain this phenomenon. For instance, previous research suggests that most times, people rely on heuristic processing, quick and superficial thinking, and shallow decision-making, potentially resulting in licensing effects, especially when people are in a positive mood (Bless et al. 1990), or when they lack self-control resources (Muraven and Baumeister 2000). When people are in a positive mood, they are motivated to maintain their positive mood, and thus, are more likely to engage in self-licensing. Prior research has found that a positive mood stimulates self-licensing behaviors, such as drinking (Cyders et al. 2007) and overspending money (Rook 1987). In addition, affect
regulation theory (Tice, Bratslavsky, and Baumeister 2001b) predicts that when one feels bad, he or she wants to feel good urgently at the expense of long-term goals. This urge to improve one’s mood leads to indulgent choices. When cognitive resources are low, people rely on quick emotional judgments to make a decision (Metcalfe and Mischel 1999). Therefore, hubristic pride is more likely to lead to indulgence when consumers rely on affect, and they try to repair their mood with hedonic choices. McFerran, Aquino, and Tracy (2014) showed that authentic pride increased participants’ preference for luxury brands. Built upon prior research, we predict that authentic pride, associated with self-accomplishment, will lead to stronger licensing effects than hubristic pride, especially when consumers have cognitive resources available to justify their choice. Therefore we predict:

**H1**: Authentic pride leads to stronger indulgence than hubristic pride, especially when cognitive resources are available.

**H1**: Cognitive resources moderate the effects of pride (authentic vs. hubristic pride) on indulgence.

**H1a**: Authentic pride leads to strong indulgence than hubristic pride, especially when cognitive resources are available.

**H1b**: Hubristic pride leads to stronger indulgence than authentic pride, especially when cognitive resources are limited.

Overview of the Studies
We completed five studies to test our hypotheses regarding the effect of pride on licensing effects. Across the first two studies, consistent with prior literature, we find that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride. In studies 3 to 5, we further test the moderating role of cognitive resources on how pride influences indulgence. The results support our prediction that when cognitive resources are available, participants in the authentic pride condition are more likely to indulge than those in the hubristic pride or control conditions. However, when cognitive resources are not available, participants in the authentic pride condition are less likely to indulge than those in the hubristic pride condition. Finally, study 5 provides further evidence of the process by showing that perceived resistance to temptation mediates the effects of pride and cognitive resources on indulgence.

**STUDY 1**

The objective of study 1 was to test our basic premise that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions (authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. happy vs. the control). Indulgence was measured with the choice of a movie ticket vs. gas card. Consistent with Khan and Dhar (2006) and Kivetz and Simonson (2002), we used the choice of a hedonic option as a measure of licensing effects.

**Method**

*Pretests.* Two pretests were conducted: (1) to identify a hedonic choice; and (2) to verify that the selected stimuli were considered as a hedonic option.
In the first pretest (N = 40), participants recruited from MTurk were asked to list one luxury and one necessity item (with a retail value between $10-$50) that they would like to buy. Participants received the definition of “hedonic” and “utilitarian” products, which were adopted from the work of Strahilevitz and Myers (2010) and Khan and Dhar (2006). We defined a hedonic or luxury product item as something designed primarily to fulfill a desire for pleasure, fantasy, and fun (Khan and Dhar 2006; Strahilevitz and Myers 2010). We described a utilitarian or necessity product as something mainly designed to fulfill a basic need or to accomplish a functional or practical task. Results showed that the three hedonic products categories mentioned most frequently were designer watches, clothes, bags and sunglasses (27.5%); entertaining music, movies, games or electronic accessories (22.5%); and restaurants or gourmet foods (20%). The top three necessity products mentioned were basic clothing or shoes (28%); groceries (26%); and products for work (16%). It is noteworthy that our results were generally consistent with Kivetz and Simonson (2002)’s paper. Consistent with previous research, we decided to choose a $10 gift card for movie tickets as a hedonic option, and a $10 gift card for a gasoline purchase as a utilitarian option for several reasons. First, our pretest showed that an entertainment product and a gasoline purchase were mentioned most frequently in the open-ended questions as representing typical hedonic or utilitarian choices, respectively. Second, previous research has used movie tickets and gasoline purchases as respective measures of hedonic and utilitarian choices (Kivetz and Simonson 2002b; Kivetz and Simonson 2002a).

A second pretest (N = 281, participants recruited from MTurk) was conducted to verify the hedonic and utilitarian choices. Participants were asked to indicate their perceptions of a $10 gift card for a gasoline purchase and a movie ticket on a 6-point scale with the following five items (1 = not functional, useless, unnecessary, dull, not delightful; 6 = functional, useful,
necessary, exciting, delightful). The first three items were combined into a utilitarian index 
(α=.84), while the last two were combined into a hedonic index (α = .91). The results revealed 
that participants rated a movie ticket gift card, compared to a gasoline gift card, as more hedonic 
(M_movie = 4.67, SD = 1.36 vs. M_gasoline = 4.13, SD =1.66, t(281) = 4.53, p<.0001; and as 
less utilitarian (M_movie = 2.99, SD =1.56 vs. M_gasoline = 4.89, SD = 1.52, t(281) = -15.02, p 
< .001).

Participants. A total of 160 undergraduate students from a Midwestern university 
participated in this study in exchange for partial course credit.

Procedure. Participants completed the experiment outside of class time in a behavioral 
lab running Qualtrics experimental software. The study was separated into two parts, which were 
disguised as separate studies. The first part included an emotion manipulation task, and the 
second last part included a measurement of the dependent variable.

First, participants were randomly assigned to one of four emotion conditions (authentic 
pride, hubristic pride, happy and control). The manipulation of emotion was adapted from 
Ashton-James and Tracy (2011). Participants in the authentic pride condition were asked to 
recall a time when “You felt very proud of yourself. Please think about a time you felt like you 
had succeeded through hard work and effort, when you had done your best, reached your 
potential, or achieved your goals. Everyone has experienced a sense of accomplishment and self-
worth at some time in their lives, even if only for a moment. In the space below, describe in as 
much detail as possible, a time when you felt pride like this: Where were you? What were you 
doing? Who were you with?” Participants in the hubristic pride condition were asked to recall 
and describe a time when “You felt very proud of yourself. Please think about a time when you 
may have behaved in a pompous manner, or perhaps felt snobbish, pretentious, stuck-up or
arrogant. Everyone has, at one time or another, felt innately superior to or better than others, even if only for a moment. In the space below, describe in as much detail as possible, a time when you remember feeling pride like this: Where were you? What were you doing? Who were you with?” Participants in the happy condition were asked to write about a time when they felt happy. And participants in the control condition were asked to write about a time when they did laundry.

After participants finished writing their story, they indicated their feelings on emotion measures of pride-related, happiness-related and sadness-related words, which served as manipulation checks for the emotion manipulations. Consistent with previous research, the extent to which participants experienced pride was measured by the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales, which asked participants to rate, using a 5-point scales (1 = not at all, 5 = very much), the extent to which they currently felt each of 14 affective states. The authentic items included: “accomplished,” “like I am achieving,” “confident,” “fulfilled,” “productive,” “like I have self-worth,” and “successful.” The hubristic items included: “arrogant,” “conceited,” “egotistical,” “pompous,” “smug,” “snobbish,” and “stuck-up.” The extent to which participants experienced happiness was measured on 5-point scales (1= not at all, 5 = very much; α = .96), consisting of positive-valence words (e.g., happy, cheerful, merry, excited, contented, and joyful; revised from Eyal and Fishbach 2009). The extent to which participants experienced sadness was also measured on 5-point scales (1= not at all, 5 = very much; α = .89), consisting of negative-valence words (sad, unhappy, and miserable).

Finally, participants were asked to choose a reward of a $10 movie ticket or a gas card. We selected those two items because previous research suggests that a movie ticket is a hedonic product, and a gasoline purchase is a utilitarian product. A hedonic product is a more indulgent
Results and Discussion

*Manipulation Checks.* Participants’ responses to the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (AHPS) (Tracy & Robins, 2007) were averaged into composite measures of authentic and hubristic pride ($\alpha$s = .97 and .94, respectively). As expected, participants in the authentic pride condition reported greater authentic pride ($M = 4.47$) than those in the hubristic pride condition ($M = 4.12$; $t = 2.82, p < .01$), and control condition ($M = 3.58$; $t = 4.46, p < .001$). In addition, participants in the hubristic pride condition reported greater hubristic pride ($M = 2.55$) than participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 1.78$; $t = 3.78, p < .001$) and control condition ($M = 1.41$; $t = 5.63, p < .001$). We averaged three items to form a happiness measure (happy, cheerful, and excited, $\alpha = .90$). Participants in authentic pride condition ($M = 3.63$) experienced similar amounts of happiness when compared to the hubristic pride condition ($M = 3.45$, $t = -.99$, $p = .31$), but more than in the control condition ($M = 2.76$, $t = 4.76, p < .0001$). Participants reported equal amounts of sadness (average of three items: sad, unhappy and miserable, $\alpha = .86$) across all conditions (all $ps > .10$).
**Indulgent Choice.** The key dependent variable was indulgent choice, coded as 0 if participants chose the $10 discount for the gasoline purchase, and 1 if they chose the $10 discount for movie theater tickets. The indulgent choice was regressed on the manipulation of emotion. The logistic regression showed a significant effect of emotion on indulgent choice (Wald’s $x^2 = 18.39; p < .001$). As predicted, authentic pride (41.86%) led to more indulgent choice (movie ticket) than hubristic pride (22.97%; Wald’s $x^2 = 4.67; p < .05$), happiness (12.90%; Wald’s $x^2 = 7.94; p < .01$) or the control (23.91%; Wald’s $x^2 = 4.26; p < .05$). There was no significant difference in indulgent choice between the hubristic (22.97%) and happy (12.90%; Wald’s $x^2 = 1.92; NS$), or control conditions (23.91%; Wald’s $x^2 = .04; NS$) (see fig. 1).

Discussion. The results of study 1 support our prediction that authentic pride leads to more indulgent choice than hubristic pride. One limitation of study 1 was that the choice of a movie ticket was considered as indulgent, but this may not be a good measurement. Therefore, to generalize our results, in the next two studies, we measure indulgence in a different way and manipulate pride differently.

**STUDY 2A**

The purpose of studies 2A and 2B is to conceptually replicate study 1 using different measures of licensing effects and different manipulations of pride. In study 2A, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. the control).
We assessed licensing effects by asking participants the amount they were willing to pay for a luxury watch.

Method

Participants. A total of 78 undergraduate students from a Midwestern university participated in this study in exchange for partial course credit.

Procedure. The procedure of study 2A was similar to study 1, which was separated into two parts and disguised as separate studies. The first part included an emotion manipulation task, and the second part included a measurement of the dependent variable.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three emotion conditions (authentic pride, hubristic pride, and the control). The manipulation of emotion was adapted from McFerran, Aquino and Tracy (2014). Specifically, participants in the authentic pride condition were asked to write about a time when they felt accomplished. Participants in the hubristic pride condition were asked to write about a time when they felt snobbish (McFerran et al. 2014). We chose those two items (accomplished and snobbish) because previous research showed they have the highest factor loadings for authentic and hubristic pride, respectively (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Participants in the control condition were asked to write about the geography of their state. Then participants completed an emotion manipulation check with the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales. Finally, participants indicated how much they would pay for a Rolex luxury watch, which served as our dependent variable. We chose a Rolex watch because previous research has shown that Rolex watches are considered as an indulgent product (McFerran et al. 2014).
Results and Discussion

**Pride Manipulation Check.** Participants’ responses to the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (AHPS) (Tracy & Robins, 2007) were averaged into composite measures of authentic and hubristic pride ($\alpha$s = .97 and .96, respectively). As expected, participants in the authentic pride condition scored higher on the authentic pride scale ($M = 4.48$) than participants in the hubristic pride condition ($M = 2.56; t = 6.58, p < .001$) and the control condition ($M = 3.37; t = 3.85, p < .001$). In addition, participants in the hubristic pride condition scored higher on the hubristic pride scale ($M = 3.48$) than participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 1.60; t = 7.61, p < .001$) and the control condition ($M = 1.65; t = 7.55, p < .001$).

**Indulgence.** Indulgence was measured with using the log-transformed price participants were willing to pay for the luxury watch. We used log-transformed data because the original data were not normally distributed. As predicted, a one-way ANOVA showed a significant main effect of emotion on how much consumers were willing to pay ($F(1, 76) = 4.25, p < .01$), such that participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 7.92$) were willing to pay for more for a luxury watch than those in hubristic pride condition ($M = 6.84; t = 2.50, p < .01$) and control condition ($M = 6.83; t = 2.59, p < .01$) (see fig. 2).

Insert Figure 2 about here

Discussion.** The results of study 2 provide additional support for our prediction that feelings of authentic pride can lead to more indulgence than hubristic pride. With a different
measure of licensing effect, and a different manipulation of pride, we successfully replicated our earlier findings.

**STUDY 2B**

The purpose of study 2B is to conceptually replicate studies 1 and 2A, using a different measure of licensing effects and a different manipulation of pride. In study 2B, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. the control). We assessed licensing effects by asking participants the amount they were willing to pay for a pair of luxury sunglasses. We expected our results to replicate those in previous studies.

**Method**

*Participants.* A total of 98 undergraduate students from a Midwestern university participated in this study in exchange for partial course credit.

*Procedure.* The procedure of study 2A was similar to previous studies, which was separated into two parts and disguised as separate studies. The first part included an emotion manipulation task, and the second part included a measurement of the dependent variable.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three emotion conditions (authentic pride, hubristic pride, and the control). The manipulation of emotion was adapted from McFerran, Aquino and Tracy (2014). Participants in the *authentic* pride condition were asked to write a brief story about themselves using the following four words: successful, confident, fulfilled and productive. Participants in the *hubristic* pride condition were asked to write a brief story about themselves using the following four words: snobbish, conceited, arrogant and smug. Participants
in the control condition were asked to write about a typical day in their life. We used the remaining three items from the AHPS scale as a manipulation check (accomplished, like I am achieving, like I have self-worth, $\alpha = .86$ for authentic pride; egotistical, pompous, and stuck-up, $\alpha = .87$ for hubristic pride). Finally, participants indicated how much they would pay for a pair of Prada luxury sunglasses, which served as our dependent variable. We chose a pair of Prada sunglasses because previous research has shown that Prada sunglasses are considered as an indulgent product (McFerran et al. 2014).

Results and Discussion

_Pride Manipulation Check._ As expected, participants in the authentic pride condition reported greater authentic pride ($M = 3.96$) than those in the hubristic pride ($M = 2.55$; $t = 5.35$, $p < .001$) and control conditions ($M = 2.88$; $t = 4.08$, $p < .001$). Participants in the hubristic pride condition reported greater hubristic pride ($M = 2.34$) than those in the authentic pride ($M = 1.89$; $t = 2.21$, $p < .05$) and control conditions ($M = 1.69$; $t = 3.01$, $p < .01$).

_Indulgence._ Indulgence was measured with the log-transformed dollar amount people were willing to pay for the luxury sunglasses. We used log-transformed data because the original data were not normally distributed. As predicted, a one-way ANOVA showed a significant main effect of emotion on indulgence ($F(1, 96) = 3.73$, $p < .05$), such that participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 5.96$) were willing to pay more for a luxury product than those in hubristic pride condition ($M = 5.56$; $t = 2.16$, $p < .05$) and those in the control condition ($M = 5.48$; $t = 2.51$, $p < .01$) (see fig. 3).
Discussion. The results of 2B again support our prediction that feelings of authentic pride lead to more indulgence than hubristic pride. Across the three studies, our results show converging evidence that authentic pride has stronger licensing effects on indulgence than the hubristic pride or control conditions. Thus, the first two studies demonstrate that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride, which is consistent with McFerran, Aquino and Tracy (2014) and Wilcox, Kramer, and Sen (2001). However, it is not clear whether authentic pride always leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride, given that cognitive resources will interact with this effect. Therefore, in the next three studies, we manipulated both pride and cognitive resources in order to better understand the underlying process.

STUDY 3

The purpose of study 3 is to examine whether authentic pride always leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride. As a result, we manipulated cognitive resources. The overall design of the study was a 3 (emotion: authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. the control) × 2 (cognitive resource: high vs. low) between-subjects design, with both factors being manipulated.

Method
Participants. A total of 65 students from a Midwestern university participated in this study in exchange for partial course credit.

Procedure. Participants completed the experiment outside of class time in a behavioral lab running Qualtrics experimental software. The study was separated into three parts, which were disguised as separate studies. The first part included an emotion manipulation task. The second part included the cognitive resource manipulation. Finally, the last part included a measurement of the dependent variable.

The manipulation of pride was the same as in study 1, except that participants in the control condition wrote about a time when they did laundry. After the emotion manipulation checks, participants were asked to remember a “password,” which was adapted from Conway and Gawronski (2013). In the low cognitive resource condition, participants were asked to remember a complex password involving letters, numbers, punctuation, and more than one case (e.g., Hj69736741?); in contrast, for the high cognitive resource condition, participants were asked to remember a fairly easy password, involving only three numbers (e.g., 123) (Conway and Gawronski 2013). After completing the cognitive load manipulation, participants did a price-assignment task, in which they were asked to indicate how much they would pay for four items with their school’s logo (e.g., a T-shirt, notebook, license plate frame and toaster) and nine items without their school’s logo (e.g., a vacuum, electric toothbrush, shampoo, backpack, pineapple, etc.). Participants were presented with color images of those products in random order and were asked to list the price that they would be willing to pay for each product, which was adapted from previous literature (Vohs and Faber 2007). We chose these products because (1) they allowed for enough variance in the range of prices so as to capture differences in willingness to pay; and (2) participants usually have to pay extra for products with school logos, even if they
serve the same functions as products without the school logos. We predict that feeling authentic pride will increase WTP for school logo products when cognitive resources are available. After completing the price-assignment task, participants were asked to complete two questions that served as the manipulation of cognitive load: “How much effort did you put into thinking about/remembering the password during the experiment? (1=lots of effort, 7=no effort at all),” and, “How easy was it for you to remember the password during the experiment?” (1=very difficult, 7=very easy). Finally, participants were debriefed and dismissed.

Results and Discussion

_Cognitive Load Manipulation Checks_. Participants in the low cognitive resource condition reported having to spend more effort remembering the password than those in the high cognitive resource condition ($M_{low} = 5.39, M_{high} = 3.89, F(1, 64) = 25.36, p < .001$).

_Indulgence_. We measured indulgence by averaging the standardized price participants were willing to pay for the four items with the school logo. We also calculated a control price index based on the average price participants were willing to pay for nine items without the school logo. We standardized the price assigned to each product before calculating the average. Repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant interaction involving our repeated measure (price), emotion, and cognitive resources ($F(2, 59) = 4.52, p < .02$), such that when cognitive resources were available, participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = .37$) assigned higher prices to the logo items than those in hubristic pride condition ($M = -.62, t = 2.56, p < .01$). However, when cognitive resources were limited, participants in the hubristic pride ($M = .70$) condition assigned significantly higher prices to the logo items than those in the authentic pride
condition \( (M = -0.49, t = 3.05, p < .01) \). Our control price index did not differ significantly across conditions. For example, when cognitive resources were available, participants in the authentic pride condition \( (M = -0.11) \) assigned similar price amounts to products as those in the hubristic pride \( (M = -0.29, t = .44, \text{NS}) \) and control conditions \( (M = 0.19, t = .74, \text{NS}) \).

Discussion. The results show that feeling authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride when resources are available, but when resources are limited, hubristic pride leads to more indulgence. We replicate the results of study 3 with a different measure of indulgence in the next study.

STUDY 4

The purpose of study 4 is to further examine whether authentic pride always leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride. The overall design of the study was a 3 (emotion: authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. the control) \( \times 2 \) (cognitive resource: high vs. low) between-subjects design, with both factors being manipulated. Similar to study 1, indulgence was measured with a choice between a $10 movie theater ticket or gasoline card.

Method
Participants. A total of 134 students (52 females; $M_{age}$: 20.65, range: 18 to 23) from a Midwestern university participated in this study in exchange for partial course credit.

Procedure. The procedure was similar to study 3, except that we measured indulgence by asking participants to make a choice between a $10 movie theater ticket or gasoline card.

Results and Discussion

Indulgence. A logistic regression showed a significant two-way interaction of emotion and cognitive load on indulgent choice ($Wald’s x^2 = 6.73; p < .01$). When cognitive resources were high, participants in the authentic pride condition were more likely to choose the movie ticket (55.56%) than those in the hubristic pride condition (40.74%). However, when cognitive resources were low, participants who were in the hubristic pride condition were more likely to choose the hedonic option (59.26%) than those in the authentic pride condition (44.44%). No other effects were observed (all $ps > .05$) (see fig. 5).

Discussion. The results of study 4 again showed that feeling authentic pride leads to indulgence, especially when cognitive resources are available, but that when cognitive resources are limited, feeling hubristic pride leads to more indulgence than authentic pride.
The purpose of study 5 is to extend our investigation of the interactive effects of pride and cognitive resources on indulgence by using different ways of manipulating cognitive resources and measuring indulgence. In our prior experiments, cognitive resources were manipulated by asking participants to remember either an easy or a hard password. To extend our investigation, we examine the effects by using a different proxy for cognitive resource manipulation—a concurrent task designed to limit consumers’ resources when they are making decisions. In addition, to further generalize the findings in licensing effects, we created an indulgent index with nine choices in different domains (e.g., saving and eating). Again, the overall design of the study was a 3 (emotion: authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. the control) × 2 (cognitive resource: high vs. low) between-subjects design, with both factors being manipulated.

Method

Participants. A total of 167 MTurk users (60 females, M_age: 37.78, range: 18 to 73) participated in this study in exchange for monetary compensation.

Procedure. Participants were informed that the survey involved two separate and unrelated studies: a memory study (writing a story) and a consumer decision-making study. The memory study included an emotion manipulation task. The decision-making study included a cognitive resource manipulation and a measure of indulgence.

The manipulation of pride was similar to study 1, except that we changed the control condition to make it parallel with the pride conditions. Specifically, participants in the authentic pride condition were asked to write a brief story about themselves using the following four
words: successful, confident, fulfilled and productive. Participants in the *hubristic* pride condition were asked to write a brief story about themselves using the following four words: snobbish, conceited, arrogant and smug. Participants in the *control* condition were asked to write a brief story about themselves using the following four words: quiet, calm, relaxed and peaceful. We used the remaining three items from the AHPS scale as a manipulation check ("accomplished," “like I am achieving,” and “like I have self-worth,” $\alpha = .86$ for authentic pride; and “egotistical,” “pompous,” and “stuck-up,” $\alpha = .87$ for hubristic pride). We also measured participants’ positive and negative emotions using the PANAS scale after the AHPS scale. A positive emotion index ($\alpha = .95$) was formed by averaging 10 positive emotions from the PANAS scale, and a negative emotion index ($\alpha = .94$) was formed by averaging 10 negative emotions from the PANAS scale.

After the emotion manipulation checks, participants were asked to complete a decision-making task, where we manipulated cognitive resources through a co-current task and measured licensing effects at the same time. Each participant was presented with nine choices in random order. In order to manipulate cognitive resources, we asked participants to either count the number of times the letter “o” appeared in each choice (low cognitive resources), or to simply count the number of choices they made (high cognitive resources). In the low cognitive resource conditions, participants were informed of the following: “Many times while consumers make choices, they are distracted by other things. To make this decision-making environment realistic, we will ask you to keep track of the total number of letter “o” s (not zero) which appear in the green area of each choice. The goal of this task is to accurately count the number of times the letter “o” appears in the green area, not to carefully select the option you prefer. After you are done with all the choices, we will ask you to write down the total number of letter “o” s in all the
green areas.” In the high cognitive resource conditions, participants were informed of the following: “Many times while consumers make choices, they are distracted by other things. To make this decision-making environment realistic, we will ask you to count the number of choices you make. Each choice is highlighted in green. The goal of this task is to carefully select the option you prefer, not to accurately count the number of choices you make.” After reading the instructions, participants were asked to make 9 choices in total, and each choice appeared on the screen separately. We selected the choices with the following criteria: (1) there is a trade-off between luxuries and necessities (e.g., a $50 voucher to redeem at a nice restaurant; a pair of designer jeans; and a $50 voucher to redeem at a grocery store; a vacuum cleaner) (Khan and Dhar 2006; Kivetz and Simonson 2002b); (2) or there is a trade-off between immediate pleasure and long-term interest (e.g., a $10 Amazon gift card valid immediately; a piece of rich, delicious chocolate cake; and a $15 Amazon gift card valid after one week; a low-calorie, seasonal fruit salad) (May and Monga 2014; Shiv and Fedorikhin 1999). Consistent with the literature on licensing effects, we used these choices as a measure of licensing effects (Khan and Dhar 2006). These choices facilitate either more non-hedonic goals or hedonic goals (e.g., *Time Magazine* could provide knowledge, and *Time Out Magazine* could provide entertaining, immediate pleasure) (Kivetz and Zheng 2006), which allowed us to test licensing effects via indulgent choices.

One pretest (N = 59 MTurk users) was conducted to verify that the selected stimuli were considered hedonic and utilitarian options. Participants first received definitions of hedonic and utilitarian products, which were adopted from the work of Strahilevitz and Myers (2010) and Khan and Dhar (2006). Participants were informed of the following: “We want to ask your opinions about the choices you have made. We define a utilitarian, or a necessary item as one
that is mainly desired to fulfill a basic need or to accomplish a functional or practical task. And a hedonic, or a luxury, item as one mainly desired to fulfill a desire for pleasure, fantasy, and fun.”

Then participants were asked to rate nine choices on nine-point scales (1 = “utilitarian,” 9 = “hedonic”) separately. The nine utilitarian items were averaged into a utilitarian index ($\alpha = .66$), while the nine hedonic items were averaged into a hedonic index ($\alpha = .77$). Results confirmed that hedonic choices were considered by participants to be primarily hedonic ($M = 7.11$, $SD = 1.30$), compared to utilitarian choices ($M = 3.15$, $SD .96$; $t(58) = 20.58$, $p < .001$).

After completing the decision task, participants were asked two questions to check the manipulation of cognitive resources: “How distracted were you while making the choices?” and, “How hard was it for you to make the choices?” on a seven-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely). Their responses to those two items ($\alpha = .70$) were averaged into a distraction index. After completing the manipulation checks, participants were asked to indicate their involvement in writing the stories at the beginning of the study, based on three items (involved, interested and engaged) on a seven-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely). Participants were also asked to rate their ability to resist temptation (“I am good at resisting temptation”) on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

Results and Discussion

*Pride Manipulation Checks.* The manipulation of pride was successful. As expected, participants in the authentic pride condition reported greater authentic pride ($M = 4.42$, $SD = .74$) than participants in the hubristic pride condition ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.28$, $t(167) = 6.74$, $p < .0001$), and in the control condition ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.00$, $t(167) = 5.06$, $p < .0001$). Participants in the
hubristic pride condition ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.28$) experienced less authentic pride than those in the control condition ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.00$, $t(167) = -2.15$, $p = .03$). In addition, participants in the hubristic pride condition reported greater hubristic pride ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 1.49$) than participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 1.89$, $SD = .91$, $t(167) = 3.69$, $p = .0003$) and the control condition ($M = 1.38$, $SD = .80$, $t(167) = 6.34$, $p < .0001$). Participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 1.89$, $SD = .91$) experienced more hubristic pride than those in the control condition ($M = 1.38$, $SD = .80$, $t(167) = -2.74$, $p = .006$).

**PANAS scale.** Participants in authentic pride condition ($M = 4.22$, $SD = .77$) experienced more positive emotions when compared to the hubristic pride condition ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.41$, $t(167) = 7.46$, $p < .001$) and the control condition ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .93$, $t(167) = 4.62$, $p < .0001$). In addition, participants in the hubristic pride condition ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.41$) experienced less positive emotions when compared to the control condition ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .93$, $t(167) = 3.37$, $p < .001$). Participants in the hubristic pride condition reported greater negative emotions ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 1.10$) than participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 1.48$, $SD = .62$, $t(167) = 3.69$, $p = .0003$) and the control condition ($M = 1.34$, $SD = .75$, $t(167) = 6.34$, $p < .0001$). Participants in the authentic pride condition reported similar amount of negative emotions when compared to the control condition ($t(167) = .97$, $p = .33$, NS).

**Cognitive Resource Manipulation Checks.** The manipulation of cognitive resources was successful. We tested cognitive load manipulation by submitting the distraction index to a pride (authentic pride vs. hubristic pride vs. the control) × cognitive resource (high vs. low) ANOVA analysis. As expected, the main effect of cognitive resource was significant, such that participants in the low cognitive resource condition ($M_{\text{low}} = 3.23$, $SD = 1.74$) indicated that they
were more distracted than those in high cognitive resource condition ($M_{\text{high}} = 1.97$, $SD = 1.74$, $F(1, 166) = 27.94, p < .0001$). No other effects were observed (all $ps > .60$).

**Indulgence.** To calculate each participant’s level of indulgence, we computed an indulgent choice index that coded each indulgent choice as 1 and each non-indulgent choice as 0, then summed these choices across the 9 decisions. The ANOVA analysis on the indulgent index revealed a significant interaction between emotion and cognitive resources ($F(2, 161) = 4.20, p = .016$), such that when cognitive resources were available, participants in the authentic pride condition ($M = 3.82$) were more likely to choose indulgent options than those in the hubristic pride condition ($M = 2.68, t = 2.40, p < .01$) and the control condition ($M = 2.98, t = 2.16, p < .05$). There was no difference between the hubristic ($M = 2.68$) and control conditions ($M = 2.98, t = .64, p = .51, NS$).

However, when cognitive resources were limited, participants in the hubristic pride ($M = 4.22$) condition were more likely to choose indulgent options than those in the authentic pride condition ($M = 3.50, t = 1.63, p = .10$). There was no difference between the authentic pride ($M = 3.50$) and control conditions ($M = 3.69, t = .43, p = .667, NS$), or the hubristic pride ($M = 4.22$) and control conditions ($M = 3.69, t = 1.19, p = .23, NS$). The ANOVA also revealed that cognitive resources had a significant effect on the participants’ indulgent choice, such that people were more likely to choose indulgent options when they were distracted ($M = 3.81$) than when they were not ($M = 3.19, t = 2.52, p < .01$) (see fig. 6).

-----------------------------
Insert Figure 6 about here
-----------------------------
The Mediating Role of Resisting Temptation in Indulgence. Taken together, the results suggest that when cognitive resources are available, licensing in indulgence is higher among individuals primed with authentic pride than hubristic pride. To test our prediction that the participants’ perception of their ability to resist temptation mediated this effect, we followed the mediation analysis recommended by Preacher, Rucker and Hayes (2007), using Process SAS, Model 4. We used mean centering and bootstrapping procedures, which generated a sample size of 5,000 to assess the regression models (Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes 2007). First we selected data in the high cognitive resource condition, where we coded authentic pride as 0, and hubristic pride as 1. The regression model predicted indulgent choice (DV) with manipulated pride (IV), and resisting temptation (mediator). The first part of the model regressed manipulated pride with resisting temptation, and the results showed that manipulated pride was a significant predictor of resisting temptation, such that feeling authentic pride decreased the rating of resisting temptation ($b = 1.40, t = 3.29, p = .0019$). The second part of the model regressed resisting temptation on indulgent choice. The results showed that resisting temptation was a significant predictor of indulgent choice, such that resisting temptation decreased indulgent choice ($b = -.31, t = -2.38, p = .02$). The third part of the model regressed manipulated pride on indulgent choice, and the results showed that manipulated pride was a significant predictor of indulgent choice, such that authentic pride increased indulgent choice ($b = -.31, t = -2.38, p = .0216$). Finally, the direct effect of manipulated pride on indulgent choice was reduced to nonsignificance when resisting temptation was included in the model ($b = -.87, t = -1.91, p = .06, NS$). A bootstrap analysis showed that a 95% confidence interval for the size of the indirect effect, excluding zero, was $[-.78, -.01]$. Thus, the analysis suggests that resisting temptation was, indeed, a mediator. The
same analysis did not show a mediation effect in the low cognitive resource conditions: a 95% confidence interval for the size of the indirect effect, including zero, was [-.25, .06].

Discussion. The results show that feelings of authentic pride lead to more indulgence than hubristic pride when cognitive resources are available, but when resources are limited, hubristic pride leads to more indulgence, which we measured with the hedonic choice index. In summary, Study 5 provides another demonstration of the hypothesized pride and cognitive resources on licensing effects. We further demonstrate how resisting temptation mediates indulgence licensing.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In this research, we found evidence of the effect of pride on licensing effects, and that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride (studies 1-2), especially when cognitive resources are available (studies 3-5). However, when cognitive resources are limited, hubristic pride leads to more indulgence than authentic pride (studies 3-5). We further found that perceived resistance to temptation mediates these effects (study 5). When cognitive resources are available, people who feel authentic pride indulge themselves more than those who feel hubristic pride, because those primed with authentic pride believe they are better at resisting temptation.
than those primed with hubristic pride. Those feeling hubristic pride may feel that they do not
deserve such kinds of luxury goods, but when resources are limited, neither those feeling
authentic pride, nor those feeling hubristic pride have the resources to ruminate about whether
they deserve to indulge. As a result, the effects of authentic pride on licensing will be
suppressed, and hubristic pride effects will be enhanced.

This paper has theoretical implications for scholars and practical implications for
companies and public policymakers. In terms of theoretical contributions, our paper contributes
to the literature on emotion and licensing effects in the following three ways:

First, this paper extends research on the effects of pride on licensing effects. Previous
consumer research in pride has examined the role of pride on indulgent consumption choice
(Wilcox et al. 2011), persuasion in a cross-cultural context (Aaker and Williams 1998a), self-
control (Patrick et al. 2009), and preference for advertisements (Katzir et al. 2010). The present
research examines the interesting, but largely unexamined effects of hubristic and authentic pride
on licensing effects. It adds to the literature in licensing effects by adopting different methods to
measure licensing effects. Specifically, we used the choice between a movie ticket or a gas card
in studies 1 and study 4; willingness to pay for luxury products in studies 2A and 2B; willingness
to pay for school logo items in study 3; and in study 5 we created an indulgence choice index,
which was a composite of nine different choices. Across these studies, we found a robust pattern
that authentic pride leads to more licensing effects than hubristic pride when cognitive resources
are available, and the reverse pattern when the cognitive resources are limited.

Second, while past work demonstrates that authentic pride and hubristic pride have
different effects on consumer decision-making, our research is the first to our knowledge to
examine the boundaries of authentic pride on indulgence. We do so by identifying an important
moderator, cognitive resources. McFerran et al. (2014) suggest that authentic pride leads to a heightened desire for luxury products, but they did not examine whether this result holds if consumers do not have enough cognitive resources. Wilcox et al. (2011) demonstrated that pride leads to indulgence when a sense of achievement is salient, but their manipulation of pride does not distinguish between the two types of pride. Furthermore, Huang et al. (2014) demonstrated that feeling effortful pride leads to less uniqueness seeking, but their manipulation of pride focuses on effort and trait pride instead of on authentic and hubristic pride (accomplishment pride vs. arrogance pride) (Huang, Dong, and Mukhopadhyay 2014). Although the finding of our research is consistent with past work, showing that authentic pride leads to more indulgence, we show that cognitive resources moderate this effect.

Third, we further make a contribution to the literature of emotion by showing that not all positive emotions have the same effect on consumer decision-making. Results from the first study confirm that although authentic pride, hubristic pride and happiness are all positive emotions, they have distinct effects on indulgence, such that authentic pride leads to more indulgence than hubristic pride and happiness.

This research also has implications for practice. Depending on the objective (motivating consumers to adhere to long-term goals versus prompting hedonic decisions), companies may want to induce different types of pride through advertising and through good customer programs. This research indicates that marketers may want to consider what types of pride they want to induce, given that cognitive resources play a significant role in influencing the effects. For example, managers might want to induce authentic pride when consumers have enough time to focus their attention on a decision; however, managers might want to induce hubristic pride
when consumers are distracted or inattentive to commercials. Thus, this research provides unique and important suggestions regarding what kinds of pride marketers might want to induce.

Directions for Future Research

Our current work points to several possible directions for future research. For instance, future research could examine the role of self-awareness in influencing the effects of authentic and hubristic pride on licensing effects. Self-awareness theory suggests that people pay attention either to the environment or to one’s self, but not to both (Carver and Scheier 1981; Scheier and Carver 1985). Some situations can cause people to focus on themselves. For example, gazing into a mirror, standing in front of an audience, and videotaping increase self-awareness (Goukens, Dewitte, and Warlop 2009; Pham et al. 2010). When self-awareness is high, people are more concerned with the appropriateness of their actions. Self-focused people have a higher motivation to reduce the discrepancy between a standard ideal and current undesired behavior. Previous research has found that higher levels of self-awareness increase self-regulation. For example, self-awareness decreases consumer choice for French fries (Wilcox et al. 2011), reduces the likelihood of cheating on an exam (Beaman et al. 1979), reduces the consumption of unhealthy food (Patrick et al. 2009), and increases people’s willingness to help. Moreover, self-awareness causes people to behave in ways that are more consistent with their own personal preferences (Goukens et al. 2009). High self-awareness motivates the self to avoid temptation, and to act consistently with long-term goals or internal standards (Duval and Silvia 2002; Heine et al. 2008; Silvia and Phillips 2004).
Self-awareness plays an important role in moderating the effects of pride on indulgent choice. Wilcox (2011) found that when participants were made more self-aware by being videotaped, they were less likely to make indulgent choices when they were primed with pride versus a control. Furthermore, participants primed with pride were more likely to choose an indulgent choice when their self-awareness was low versus high, which highlights the important role of self-awareness in consumer decision-making. We predict that self-awareness moderates the effects of authentic and hubristic pride on licensing effects. To be specific, when self-awareness is low, authentic pride will lead to higher licensing effects, compared to when self-awareness is high. This effect will disappear, for both hubristic and control conditions.
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### TABLE 1 (STUDY 1)
MANIPULATION CHECKS OF PRIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTHENTIC PRIDE CONDITION</strong></td>
<td>Authentic pride</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hubristic pride</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUBRISTIC PRIDE CONDITION</strong></td>
<td>Authentic pride</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hubristic pride</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL CONDITION</strong></td>
<td>Authentic pride</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hubristic pride</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** Participants’ responses to the Authentic and Hubristic Pride Scales (Tracy & Robins, 2007) were scaled into composite measures of authentic and hubristic pride ($\alpha = .97$ and .94, respectively).
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WTP (log-transformed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authentic Pride</th>
<th>Hubristic Pride</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTP (log-transformed)</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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![Bar graph showing the effects of pride and cognitive resources on indulgent choice index. The graph compares authentic pride, hubristic pride, and control conditions under high and low cognitive resources.]
FIGURE 7 (STUDY 5)
MEDIATION ANALYSIS

Note. 95% CI for the bootstrap estimate of the indirect effect = -.27, [-.78, -.01].
APPENDIX A

EXAMPLES OF AUTHENTIC PRIDE STORIES WRITTEN BY PARTICIPANTS (STUDY 1)

In high school I was a competitive cheerleader and we had 3 to 4 hour long practices 6 days a week during season. Doing that almost every night was very tiring and almost every year I was injured in some way. My junior year we were working extremely hard because we wanted to get a trophy at state. Midway through the season I injured my ankle but I just put on a brace and worked hard to get back on the competition floor. A week before state my coach let me rejoin the routine and we qualified for state at sectionals. We even placed first at sectionals. When we got to state I knew that I had to give it all I had and fight through my ankle pain. After the first day at state we qualified for finals on the following day. At finals we ended up placing 5th in the state and I knew that my efforts paid off.

A time that I felt proud because I succeed through hard work was last semester in my financial accounting course. I put many hours into the course each week which involved completing learn smart, connect, and paper homework. The reason I felt proud was because through my hard work I was able to achieve my goal of getting an A in the course. I was able to achieve this by preparing myself for each exam and then adjusting how I study for the next exam based on the results. On the first exam I was able to beat the average by a decent amount but didn't get as high of a score as I was looking for. In preparation for the second exam, I dedicated a lot more time to getting myself ready and mastering the material. When the scores of the second exam came out I couldn't believe what I saw. I received the highest grade in the class out of more than 700 students. I was a proud as I could possibly be and it was all due to my hard work and effort.

During high school I knew I wanted to play soccer in college. I worked as hard as I could to reach my goal, and hopefully get a scholarship to a university. After a lot of hard work I got a call from a Division 1 school. I was very excited and proud of myself that my hard work was finally paying off. Eventually a few more schools started calling and I realized that I actually has some options. Throughout this process I knew this was my proudest moment because I lived for soccer. I played it my whole life and to finally be rewarded because of it was a great feeling. Eventually, I found a school that I thought was right for me and they rewarded me with a scholarship. I couldn't believe that my 10 plus years of soccer were finally being recognized. In all, I came to the conclusion that if you truly work hard at something you will be rewarded at some point down the line.
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF HUBRISTIC PRIDE STORIES WRITTEN BY PARTICIPANTS (STUDY 1)

I was back in high school in a "regular" class when I normally am an honors student. Being with a mix of every type of student from my grade made me feel like a know it all and that I was really smart. We were studying Spanish and there were a few kids who were struggling to understand what we were learning. I was asked to help them and I was very stuck-up when trying to teach them. It had clicked for me right away when learning it, what was their problem? I just kept making mean and rude comments under my breath because they were having a hard time and it was really frustrating. It definitely made me feel important that the teacher had asked me and only me to help these students on my own while everyone else had to keep learning and doing practice examples.

Last year I would play a video game called FIFA 12. I was extremely good at it, so much so that I was almost unbeatable. Every game I played against my roommates would be an easy win. Playing the game itself was fun, but as I played and scored I could not help but smile, while the person I was playing against would have a frown and be frustrated. While I didn't like to make my friends angry, I also couldn't bring myself to let them win. That even sounds pretentious just saying it, but again I was unbeatable. I was proud of my abilities at the game, yet every time I won I would feel as though the smile I had throughout the game was arrogance.

When I got on the Dean's list at Kirkwood repeatedly I felt pretentious and arrogant. I rarely studied and thought I was top of the world and everybody should know how amazing I was that I could do so well in classes that most people would complain about being difficult. I would brag about how awesome I am at school and that it just comes naturally to me. My friends would congratulate me, but in reality I could see their envy. The truth was that some classes came naturally to me and some I had to put in a lot of hours every week in order to do really well or good enough to pass with good grades. I'm usually not arrogant, I think I'm just really excited to be a student at my age and competing with all the younger students and holding my own. I'm the first person in my family to go to college and feel pretty proud of myself for doing good because I care and apply myself in things I care about.