

Social Norms in Cinema: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of *Shame*, *Pride* and *Prejudice*

Sunny Rai¹, Khushang Jilesh Zaveri², Shreya Havaladar¹, Soumna Nema²,
Lyle Ungar¹, and Sharath Chandra Guntuku¹

¹Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania.

²École Centrale School of Engineering and Sciences, Mahindra University.

{sunnyrai, shreyah, ungar, sharathg}@seas.upenn.edu,

{khushang20ucam017, soumna20ucam035}@mahindrauniversity.edu.in

Abstract

Social emotions such as *shame* and *pride* reflect social sanctions or approvals in society. In this paper, we examine how *expressions of shame and pride* vary across cultures and harness them to extract unspoken normative expectations across cultures. We introduce the first cross-cultural shame/pride emotions movie dialogue dataset, obtained from 5.4K Bollywood and Hollywood movies, along with over 10K implicit social norms. Our study reveals variations in expressions of social emotions and social norms that align with known cultural tendencies observed in the United States and India – e.g., Hollywood movies express shame predominantly toward *self* whereas Bollywood movies express shame predominantly toward *others*. Similarly, Bollywood shames non-conformity in gender roles, and takes pride in collective identity, while Hollywood shames lack of accountability, and takes pride in ethical behavior. More importantly, women face more prejudice across cultures and are sanctioned for similar social norms.

1 Introduction

Normative expectations¹, a category of social norms that refer to others’ beliefs about *how we ought to behave* (Bicchieri, 2005). It reveals attitudes and values that influence social actions across cultures. For instance, hesitancy toward seeking mental help could exist because *others expect an individual not to seek help* or because *the individual believes that others do not seek help*. The former reveals the attitude of society, whereas the latter indicates an individual’s lack of awareness. Capturing diversity in cultural beliefs is paramount to building socially aligned AI models for diverse users

¹Bicchieri (2005) uses the term *normative expectations*, Lahti and Weinstein (2005) use *moral norms*, and many social psychologists (Cialdini et al., 1990) use *injunctive norms*. We use the terms social norms and normative expectations interchangeably.

Look, Alok is in love with me and I love him too. Shameless one! Have you lost all your shame? **What is there to be ashamed in this?** Don’t sisters love their brothers in this vicinity?

⇒ **Incestuous relationship evoke shame.**

Sister-in-law! Congrats, sister-in-law! Big brother has started working!

Really?

Now you will have a place of pride in this family!

Yes, please!

⇒ **Employed husband evokes pride**

Table 1: Excerpts of dialogues expressing explicit social emotions shame and pride indicating actions and social approval.

(Talat et al., 2021; Atari et al., 2023), for inducing collective behavior change (e.g., overcoming stigma against mental health disorders) and several other social applications.

Prior works crowd-sourced social norms from Q&A style social media posts (such as Reddit) (Jiang et al., 2021; Nahian et al., 2020) or prompted large language models (LLMs) (Fung et al., 2022) without distinguishing between normative and empirical expectations. However, social media platforms^{2,3} are skewed toward Western demographics (i.e., young white male) and the reliance on a small cohort of annotators typically located in Western countries further enforces Anglocentric beliefs when collecting socially acceptable behaviors (Ziems et al., 2022). LLMs with sophisticated capabilities such as GPT-4 are increasingly used to extract social norms; however, Havaladar et al. (2023a) illustrated their lack of cross-cultural understanding.

The overarching question we ask in this paper

²Twitter Statistic: <https://blog.hootsuite.com/twitter-statistics/>

³Reddit Statistic: <https://www.enterpriseappstoday.com/stats/reddit-statistics.html>




Figure 1: An overview of our approach comprising two key steps (a) Vocabulary approach and (b) Prompting a pre-trained LLM.

is, *how* and *what* social behaviors are sanctioned or encouraged across cultures. Shame and pride are *social emotions* experienced across cultures on violating or adhering to normative expectations in society (Tracy and Robins, 2004). Notably, the function of shame (i.e., social regulation) is consistent across cultures (Goetz and Keltner, 2007; Fessler, 2007; Schaumberg and Skowronek, 2022). Examining situations evoking *shame* and *pride* can thus reveal unspoken social norms specific to a culture (See Table 1).

In this paper, we (a) **examine cross-cultural variations in linguistic expressions of shame and pride**, and (b) **propose a cross-cultural social emotion-based approach for norm discovery**. The appraisals and expressions of shame and pride vary across cultures and is a research question of great significance to understand society and self-regulation (Wong and Tsai, 2007; Lewis et al., 2010; Wegge et al., 2022). We chose two top-grossing movie industries, i.e., Hollywood and Bollywood, to analyze how social emotions and norms differ across cultures. Hollywood primarily depicts social situations from the USA, an individualist society that values competency and autonomy (Triandis, 1989, 1988) whereas Bollywood depicts India, a collectivist society where one’s sense of self is interwoven with community beliefs. The cultural dichotomy between India and the USA (i.e., *collectivism* vs. *individualism*) thus presents a rich ground for understanding variations in their beliefs and values.

We release a large cross-cultural dataset of social emotions-related dialogues with 10K social norms. Using a blend of psychology-informed language

analysis and LLM-powered approach to mine implicit information, we demonstrate cross-cultural variations in how and why these emotions are expressed. In parallel, we examine how social sanctions are attributed to men and women across cultures influencing their social behaviors; women are less assertive across cultures to avoid negative attribution (Amanatullah and Morris, 2010; Ferguson and Eyre, 2000) and ask for less during negotiation than men (Arnold and McAuliffe, 2021). We hypothesize that women are more subjected to social sanctions than men across cultures.

2 Movies Subtitles Corpora

Movies provide life-like depictions of social situations to study how and why these emotions are expressed. They are influenced by and/or, known to influence real lives (Adkins and Castle, 2014; Kubrak, 2020). In contrast, social media Q&A posts are (a) skewed to social situations specific to tech-savvy young demographic groups, and (b) are second-hand reports that do not reveal fully the social dynamics of how these emotions are expressed in natural conversations, for instance, between a boss and an employee or among family members at a Christmas table.

For our study, we collected English subtitles for 5,435 Hollywood and Bollywood movies that were released post-1990 by auto-crawling websites that host or link movie subtitles (See Table A2 for data distribution). The year of release for movies was verified by either parsing subtitle file names having a release year or checking Wikipedia entries. The year mapping was performed to ensure a similar period for collected movies.

2.1 Extracting Shame and Pride related Expressions

The expressions of shame and pride could be implicit (as indicated by lowered shoulders, avoiding eye contact, etc.), and explicit (See Table 1). Detecting implicit social emotions in textual discourse is an innately complex task requiring socio-cultural knowledge that may not be evident to outsiders or third-party annotators. Below is one such example:

“Actor 1: Liza, Alice! Come away from that window this minute. I think it’s disgusting, standing there where they can see you.

Actors 2,3 (Liza, Alice): I notice that you peek out often enough when you think no one’s looking.

Actor 1: I never!

Actors 2,3 (Liza, Alice): I saw you! So did I.”

Here, it is difficult to determine if *shame* is evoked and/or experienced by actors in this discourse. A third-party annotation will reveal their beliefs and attitudes, which could introduce bias in our analysis. Adopting a high precision-low recall strategy, we focus on explicit mentions of *shame* and *pride* to learn about occurrences of shame and pride *as determined by the characters*. We extracted dialogues having the word *shame* or *pride* or their variations (See Appendix A1), along with the previous and the next two lines for situational context (See Table 1). In the case of short dialogues, which could be the case due to monosyllabic responses in spoken conversations, an extra previous and next line was appended to context.

Manual Screening One author manually checked the entire dataset of shame and pride-related dialogues to filter out dialogues unrelated to social sanctions/approvals e.g., phrases such as “*what a shame*”, “*it’s a shame*”, “*proudly presents*”. Below is an example of such dialogue.

“...His music is sad all of the time. It’s really a shame. He’ll never be allowed to go up to heaven. But you will, won’t you, Johan? Oh yes. I’ll get there.”

Similarly, the phrase “proudly presents” is used while introducing an event or an artist in Hollywood movies.

Final Dataset: We created four sets of dialogues: (a) shame-related dialogues in Bollywood, (b) shame-related dialogues in Hollywood, (c) pride-related dialogues in Bollywood and (d) pride-related dialogues in Hollywood. Cross-cultural differences also exist in speaking styles across cultures and we thus formed a control set of dialogues

unrelated to *shame* and *pride* for both movie industries to remove the variations in language markers owing to culture-specific speaking styles (See Table A2 for dialogue distribution).

3 Approach

Fig. 1 illustrates our study design comprising a blend of two key approaches (a) a psychosocial vocabulary approach to measure how expressions of shame and pride differ and (b) *prompting Large Language Model* approach to extract reasons behind them and how they differ between India and the U.S.A.

3.1 Vocabulary Approach: LIWC

Linguistic Inquiry of Word Count (LIWC) (Boyd et al., 2022) is a corpus analysis tool widely used in psychology to identify psychological categories of words such as “self-focus” (e.g., I, my, mine) and “other-focus” (e.g., you, yours, theirs) which are of great significance for examining social behaviors such as self-regulation and conformity.

To understand cross-cultural linguistic variations in the manifestation of shame and pride, we computed the normalized distribution of psycho-social categories from the dialogues and examined their correlation with shame and pride compared to the control set. The search keywords used for building social emotions corpus (See Table A1) were removed from the LIWC dictionary to prevent over-estimation of shame- (e.g., negative emotion) and pride-related categories (e.g., achievement).

3.2 Pretrained LLM: GPT-4 Chat

LLMs such as GPT-4 exhibit superlative English language understanding and are more reliable than human annotators on platforms such as MTurk (Pan et al., 2023; Törnberg, 2023). We used GPT-4 chat in two-shot setting (See Tables A5 and A6 for prompts) to seek answers to the following questions:

- who is <being shamed/feeling proud> in the given movie discourse, and what is their gender?
- What is the reason behind <the feeling of shame/pride>?

Since there are at least two characters in a discourse, the first question orients the LLM to focus on the *person experiencing the social sanction or approval* and then identify their gender. The output

Hollywood: LIWC Category (Top-5 words)	<i>r</i>	Bollywood: LIWC Category (Top-5 words)	<i>r</i>
Moral (<i>wrong, excuse, decent, honest, duty</i>)	0.110	2 nd person pronouns (<i>you, your, you're, yourself, you've</i>)	0.161
1 st person sing. pronouns (<i>i, me, i'm, my, i'll</i>)	0.102	Social References (<i>you, your, he, her, him</i>)	0.148
Sadness (<i>crying, cry, sob, lonely, sad</i>)	0.096	Moral (<i>wrong, innocent, duty, decent, excuse</i>)	0.102
2 nd person pronouns (<i>you, your, you're, yourself, you've</i>)	0.080	Female (<i>her, she, girl, she's, mom</i>)	0.060
Past focus (<i>was, did, were, been, didn't</i>)	0.069	Family (<i>son, married, uncle, dad, mom</i>)	0.055
All or none (<i>no, all, nothing, never, yes</i>)	0.055	Sexual (<i>chaste, lust, sex, sexy, pimp</i>)	0.051
Family (<i>son, dad, baby, mom, mama</i>)	0.054	Conflict (<i>kill, killed, accusing, killing, cruel</i>)	0.024
Social References (<i>you, your, we, he, you're</i>)	0.050	Swear words (<i>hell, bloody, idiot, damn, ass</i>)	0.024
Anxiety (<i>fear, afraid, worry, terrified, scared</i>)	0.042	Anger (<i>mad, angry, hate, cruel, argue</i>)	0.022
Illness (<i>sick, pain, pains, flu, sickly</i>)	0.038	Present focus (<i>is, are, don't, i'm, aren't</i>)	0.021

Table 2: Pearson *r* for LIWC categories significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) with **shame** for Hollywood and Bollywood after Benjamini-Hochberg p-value correction (See Appendix for confidence intervals and p values). Note the contrast that is, Self-centered shame vs Other-centered shame; Past focus vs Present focus in Hollywood vs Bollywood. See Table A7 and A9 for the complete set of correlations.

for the second question serves as the implicit *social norm* in the culture. Asking for "reason" leading to the expression of social emotion encourages LLMs to retrieve norm from provided context, mitigating potential Anglocentric tendencies.

Thematic Analysis of Social Norms To capture overarching themes in reasons behind expressing shame and pride in Indian and American societies, we performed agglomerative clustering after embedding unique shame and pride-related social norms using SBERT embeddings (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019). Unlike movie dialogues, social norms extracted from GPT-4 chat are short phrases (See Table 4) and are devoid of culture-specific language style markers (i.e., Indian English vs American English) thus, no control for culture is needed.

4 Results

4.1 How do expressions of shame/pride vary across cultures?

Shame is associated with negative emotions, power, and morality in both movie industries (See Table 2), however, significant cultural nuances exist in its manifestation. In Hollywood, shame is more I-focused with remorse (e.g., *sadness, anxiety*) and past-focused language, whereas in Bollywood, it is more You-focused with frequent social references and present-focused language. In Bollywood, psycho-social categories associated with shame reveal a larger social context (note the contrast in *family* i.e., nuclear family in Hollywood vs extended family in Bollywood) and social situations (i.e., *anger, swear, conflict*). Categories *female* and *sexual* are exclusively correlated with shame in Bol-

lywood potentially indicating an honor system in collectivist societies (Caffaro et al., 2014) whereas it is *illness* that is uniquely correlated with shame in Hollywood indicating social sanctions around incapability.

A similar dichotomy is observed for **Pride** related interactions (See Table 3). Pride in Hollywood interactions is more centered on *family* (note, family in Bollywood is male-centric and comprises extended family (such as *uncle*)) and self-centered (e.g., I am proud of __) whereas it is *achievement/power* focused and "We"-centered in Bollywood movies (with othering (us vs they)-See Appendix). Male references are more strongly associated with pride than females in Hollywood whereas the female category has an insignificant ($p > 0.05$) correlation with pride in Bollywood. Ethnicity-related pride is expressed in both movie industries but political category is exclusively correlated to Bollywood. Pride is more positive (see POSEMO in Table 3) in Hollywood whereas in Bollywood, it reflects honor (e.g., *protecting family's pride, bringing pride to family*).

4.2 How do reasons behind shame/pride vary across cultures?

Cross-Cultural Norms Dataset For the Bollywood set, GPT-4 chat predicted reasons (also implicit social norms) for 5321 (98.4%) shame-related dialogues out of 5409, and 2237 (74.6%) pride-related dialogues out of 2999. For the Hollywood set, GPT-4 chat predicted a reason for 1156 (94.6%) shame-related dialogues out of 1221 and 1731 (61.7%) pride-related dialogues out of 2805. Upon manual analysis, we found that pride is also

Hollywood: LIWC Category (Top-5 words)	<i>r</i>	Bollywood: LIWC Category (Top-5 words)	<i>r</i>
Social References (<i>you, your, we, he, you're</i>)	0.131	Drive (<i>we, our, us, sir, work</i>)	0.122
Family (<i>son, dad, baby, mom, mama</i>)	0.121	Achieve (<i>work, better, win, best, try</i>)	0.098
1 st person sing. pronouns (<i>i, i'm, me, my, i'll</i>)	0.095	Power (<i>sir, own, respect, kill, power</i>)	0.091
2 nd person pronouns (<i>you, your, you're, you've, yourself</i>)	0.091	Social References (<i>you, your, he, we, our</i>)	0.085
Male References (<i>he, his, him, man, son</i>)	0.084	Moral (<i>wrong, duty, brave, arrogant, useless</i>)	0.075
Drive (<i>we, our, us, we're, dad</i>)	0.076	Reward (<i>win, won, glory, success, successful</i>)	0.071
Ethnicity (<i>American, Irish, Chinese, German, Christian</i>)	0.052	Political (<i>nation, army, sultan, president, dynasty</i>)	0.064
Reward (<i>win, won, winner, successful, earned</i>)	0.048	1 st person pl. pronouns (<i>we, our, us, we'll, let's</i>)	0.060
Achieve (<i>work, better, best, trying, try</i>)	0.045	Family (<i>son, papa, married, dad, uncle</i>)	0.059
Power (<i>sir, own, war, strong, mighty</i>)	0.044	Ethnicity (<i>Indian, Indians, British, Hindi, caste</i>)	0.054

Table 3: Pearson *r* for LIWC categories significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) with **pride** for Hollywood and Bollywood after Benjamini-Hochberg p-value correction (See Appendix for confidence intervals and p values). Note the contrast, Achievement-related pride in Bollywood, Self-centered pride vs We-centered pride, Family in Hollywood vs Family in Bollywood See Tables A8 and A10 for all significantly correlated categories.

Bollywood
eavesdropping on private conversation
expressing love for a man
Incestuous relationship
giving birth to a girl child
Poor academic performance
Hollywood
not living up to expectations
hiding/avoiding confrontation
not returning calls after intimacy
mistreatment of a woman
offering poor quality goods for sale

Table 4: A subset of reasons extracted from movie dialogues expressing shame. A total of 4604 unique reasons (Bollywood-3660, Hollywood-944) were extracted.

used to express affection, specifically toward close family members such as sons - therefore, a lower number of norms is associated with pride compared to shame. GPT-4 chat predicted a total of **10,445 social norms** (See Table A3 for norm distribution). Prompting "reasons" behind shame and pride allowed us to capture high specificity in cultural norms (See Tables 4 and 6 for examples).

4.2.1 Manual Evaluation

Two volunteers manually verified the predicted gender for "the person experiencing shame/pride" and the predicted "reason" in a randomly sampled set of 100 dialogues each from Hollywood and Bollywood. The annotator who labeled the Bollywood set is an Indian, aware of social roles and expecta-

Gender Evaluation		
	Incorrect	Ambiguous
Bollywood	8	15 (3 Female)
Hollywood	5	10 (3 Female)
Social Norms/Reason Evaluation		
	Incorrect	Ambiguous
Bollywood	11	9
Hollywood	2	1

Table 5: Manual Evaluation of predicted gender and reasons for randomly sampled 100 samples each from Bollywood and Hollywood.

tions in Indian society. Likewise, the annotator for the Hollywood set is an American with a nuanced understanding of the social norms of the U.S.A.

For Bollywood, 8% of predicted gender and 11% of predicted reasons were incorrect where it was 5% and 2% respectively for Hollywood (See Table 5). There were 20 cases where gender (15) and/or reason (9) were ambiguous whereas, for Hollywood, there were 11 (gender=10, reason=1) such samples.

4.2.2 Thematic Analysis

Twenty-five clusters for shame-related norms and 13 for pride-related norms were formed using agglomerative clustering (See Tables A13 and A14 for clustering parameters). The clusters were manually assigned a theme (as depicted on the Y-axis of Fig. 2 and 3) after analyzing the ten closest samples based on cosine distance within the cluster (See Table A11 and A12 for examples). We

Bollywood

mastering a trick
fulfilling father's dreams
provide care for old parents
fiancee's physical appearance
his wealth

Hollywood

for being a hard worker regardless of the task
being a brilliant student
winning olympic gold
achievements and growth
coming out as queer

Table 6: A subset of reasons extracted from movie dialogues expressing pride. A total of 3163 unique reasons (Bollywood-1589, Hollywood-1574) were extracted.

computed the relative association for each cluster with Bollywood and Hollywood using eq. 1 and performed the Barnard-Exact Test (Barnard, 1947) with the Yates Correction (Yates, 1934) to test if the possibility of observing norms related to pre-assigned themes is statistically different across movie industries.

$$\vec{\Delta} = \forall_{t_i \in \text{themes}} \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\text{bollywood}_i}}{\mathcal{D}_{\text{bollywood}}} - \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\text{hollywood}_i}}{\mathcal{D}_{\text{hollywood}}} \quad (1)$$

Here, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{industry}_i}$ represents dialogues to $\text{industry} \in \{\text{holly}, \text{bolly}\}$ and $t_i \in \text{themes}$ (as depicted on Y-axis in Fig 2 and 3).

Shame-related social norms Themes such as *lack of accountability* and *poverty* are more common in Hollywood whereas norms related to *sexual behavior* and *gender roles* are more prevalent in Bollywood (See Fig. 2). As expected, collectivist factors such as non-conformity in *gender roles*, disrespect, and deviation from *family norms* are strongly associated with shame in Bollywood whereas individualistic attributes such as *poverty*, poor *social etiquette* and *incompetence* evoke shame in Hollywood.

Pride-related social norms *Duty*, *doing the "right" thing*, and, *achievement* are associated with pride in Hollywood whereas *Ethnolinguistic identity*, *family honor*, and *son's success* are associated with pride in Bollywood (See Fig. 3).




Figure 2: Relative association (Δ) of Bollywood and Hollywood to themes obtained from agglomerative clustering performed on shame-related norms. * indicates insignificant difference i.e., $p > 0.05$




Figure 3: Relative association (Δ) of Bollywood and Hollywood to themes obtained from agglomerative clustering performed on pride-related norms. * indicates insignificant difference i.e., $p > 0.05$

4.2.3 Gender differences in Social Emotions

For the Bollywood set, GPT-4 predicted 1541 targets as female and 3949 as male. For the Hollywood set, GPT-4 predicted 482 targets as female and 1367 as male. Across all combinations (shame vs pride x Bollywood vs. Hollywood in Table A3), there are more male targets than females in line with the findings of Geena Davis Inclusion Quotient⁴.

⁴https://about.google/intl/ALL_us/main/gender-equality-films/




Figure 4: Relative association (Δ) of emotions *pride* and *shame* gender-wise in Hollywood and Bollywood dialogues. A higher positive score indicates a stronger association of gender with pride.

Using predicted gender, we computed the gender-wise attribution to emotions "shame" and "pride" using eq. 2. A positive score indicates a higher association of gender groups with pride, whereas a negative score reflects a higher association with shame. A null score indicates no preference.

$$\vec{\Delta}_g = \forall_{g \in \{male, female\}} \frac{\mathcal{D}_{pride_g} - \mathcal{D}_{shame_g}}{\mathcal{D}_g} \quad (2)$$

Here, \mathcal{D}_{pride_g} represents movie dialogues having pride-related word where the target of pride is $g \in \{male, female\}$, \mathcal{D}_{shame_g} represents movie dialogues having shame-related word where the target of shame is $g \in \{male, female\}$ and \mathcal{D}_g represents total movie dialogues grouped based on gender. As depicted in Fig. 4, Hollywood movies are pride-oriented, whereas Bollywood movies are shame-oriented. Females are attributed more shame, and the difference (male-female) in the expression of pride and shame is 0.16 for Hollywood and 0.21 for Bollywood.

Normative expectations evoking shame are similar for females across movie industries (See Fig. A1). Sexuality (e.g., *promiscuity*, *immodesty*) is the dominant theme for women in both movie industries whereas males are shamed for *incompetency* in both industries. Women across movie industries express more pride in *family roles*. Men-pride in Bollywood is centered on *justice*, *winning* and *bravery* whereas it is *duty*, *self-identity* and *winning* in Hollywood (See Fig. A2).

5 Discussion

Detecting social emotions We release a cross-cultural dataset of shame (6477 samples) and pride (3968 samples) related discourse with over 10K

social norms. To the best of our knowledge, the only other corpus having samples related to social emotions is GoEmotions dataset (Demszky et al., 2020) with 817 samples for embarrassment and 452 samples for pride. Detecting social emotions, and recognizing how appraisals and expressions of such emotions vary will improve human-computer communications, specially in domains of AI powered mental health therapy (Kim et al., 2011), cross-cultural intent translation⁵.

Cross-cultural variations in expressions of social emotions

Shame is a highly undesirable *self-focused* emotion in the U.S. emphasizing incompetency and failures and is rarely used (Cohen, 2003; Boiger et al., 2013). Notably, we also observe its infrequent use in Hollywood movies and self-focus (reflecting internal shame) (See Table A2 and 2). In contrast, shame is considered interdependent in collectivist communities (Wong and Tsai, 2007). Our empirical analyses reveal You-focused (e.g. You, social references) or public nature of shame in Bollywood movies (See Table A7). Moreover, the contrasting tenses coupled with varying emotions, i.e., past + sadness in Hollywood vs. present + anger in Bollywood, reflect their varying goals, i.e., remorse for past failures/losses vs enforcing conformity (Wong and Tsai, 2007). Pride-related discourse in Hollywood is duty and achievement-focused, in line with prior findings underlining the increasing significance of "success" with growing individualism (Cohen, 2003), whereas in Bollywood, pride is centered around collective achievement (*we*, *achievement*, *prosocial*). It is also interesting to note linguistic markers such as *determiner* (used with objects/nouns) in Bollywood indicating more materialistic pride, compared to personal pronouns and social references in Hollywood reflecting more personal pride (See Tables A8, A10).

Cross-cultural variations in social sanctions and approvals

Eliciting reasons leading to social emotions shame and pride revealed socially sanctioned behaviors across cultures. We observed high specificity in extracted social norms revealing cultural subtleties (e.g., *desire for a son*, *parents' duty to marry off their daughter* in Bollywood vs. *honesty in business*, *returning calls after date night* in Hollywood as in Table 4). We acknowledge that the excerpts explicitly expressing shame and

⁵DARPA Computational Cultural Understanding: <https://www.darpa.mil/program/computational-cultural-understanding>

pride from movie subtitles may have led to the over-representation of certain social situations (e.g., son’s achievement and daughter’s wedding in India vs duty and competence in America). A natural next step would be to capture situations with implicit shame and pride. The pipeline in Fig. 1 could be adapted to first detect self-conscious emotion in a given discourse and then identify the reason for advanced computational cultural understanding of the text. For this purpose, our dataset of shame/pride-related situations will be useful.

To tease apart ways in which cultures differ, we first considered mapping social norms to Schwartz’s Theory of Values (Schwartz, 2012). However, a social norm can have contrasting values depending on the culture. Consider "refusing to marry", an instance of non-conformity in Indian society, whereas it is an instance of self-direction in a Western context. Of course, society is evolving and we acknowledge that urbanized regions of India may also consider this an instance of self-direction. However, the diachronic shift in the underlying values of social norms is out of the scope of this paper. To effectively understand the cross-cultural variations in social norms, we performed hierarchical clustering and empirically picked the distance after manually analyzing the quality and granularity of clusters. The situations (i.e., poverty, inappropriate behavior, incompetence) connected to shame in the U.S. society vs situations (i.e., gender roles, disrespect, family norms) in Indian society as evident in Fig 2 align with known cultural tendencies of both nations. Likewise, pride is strongly associated with duty and achievement in Hollywood whereas with collective achievement (e.g., Ethnolinguistic identity) in Bollywood. While the clustering was performed on the reasons extracted from movie conversations, the cluster themes are very similar to patterns seen during LIWC analysis, supporting the use of social emotions for overcoming cultural bias in LLMs.

Women face more social sanctions than men

Shame, a self-conscious emotion expressing devaluation, is targeted towards women more than men, whereas pride, a positive valence emotion expressing value, is used for more men than women in movies. It is also surprising to see the similarity in normative expectations associated with genders *male* and *female* in Indian and American societies. Our analysis reveals that women are more frequent targets of social sanctions than men. It is thus im-

portant to characterize the source and acquired social norms before their use for achieving pluralistic values in LLMs otherwise we risk social bias.

6 Background

The vision of safe and accountable AI is centered on LLMs’ moral and value alignment. SOCIAL-CHEM-101 (Forbes et al., 2020), SCRUPLES (Lourie et al., 2021), SOCIAL BIAS FRAMES (Sap et al., 2019), MORAL INTEGRITY CORPUS (Ziems et al., 2022), and VALUE PRISM (Sorensen et al., 2023) are a few datasets developed to teach socially aligned interactions to LLMs. The dominant approach for norm discovery involves prompting LLMs, sometimes coupled with a verification step such as an entailment test or underlying emotion (negative emotion → norm violation) (Jiang et al., 2021; Fung et al., 2022; CH-Wang et al., 2023). However, most of the social situations in these datasets and the human annotators employed to label those situations reflect English beliefs and ethics. Additionally, language models prompted to identify "social norms" are known to reflect the values and beliefs of WEIRD nations (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) (Havaladar et al., 2023b; Atari et al., 2023).

7 Conclusion

We introduce an emotion-based approach to extract and analyze social norms across cultures. We create the largest known multi-cultural dataset of self-conscious emotions and relevant underlying norms. Our post hoc analysis of social norms demonstrates (a) cross-cultural linguistic differences in self-conscious emotions (shame and pride), (b) cultural dichotomy in normative expectations in India and the U.S.A., and (c) more "social sanctions" and fewer "social benefits" to the female gender in movies.

Future work can utilize our dataset to better align LLMs to various cultures. Additionally, our analysis of self-conscious emotions is the first of its kind; we hope future NLP researchers will build upon this work to investigate social norms in LLMs from a multicultural, emotion-based perspective.

Social Impact and Ethics Statement

Social norms discovery is a crucial component in programs⁶ designed for social and behavioral

⁶ALIGN-<https://www.alignplatform.org/learning-collaborative>

change to promote equity, social justice, and well-being (Mauduy et al., 2022; Bonan et al., 2020). Further work explores style as a product of norm differences (Havaladar et al., 2023a). Social psychology investigates social norms (descriptive vs injunctive) to design experiments for understanding behaviors such as self-regulation, persuasion (Cialdini et al., 1990) and decision-making (Gavrilets, 2020; Bhanot, 2021) to promote collective-level change in societies.

Relatedly, Kimbrough and Vostroknutov (2023) showed people’s tendency to choose self-serving social norms using a dictator-recipient setup, emphasizing the need for dedicated research efforts to understand morality and belief distortion in different contexts. The norms and cultural preferences learned from movies that often showcase stereotypical behaviors of society may induce pluralistic ignorance and, more importantly, lead to discrimination and biases in LLMs when used for training. We hope that this paper will encourage scrutiny of source corpora and derived norms before their use for fine-tuning LLMs.

Limitations

Social norms mutate as society evolves. We acknowledge that our dataset of movies (released post-1990) may reflect social norms that are less characteristic of contemporary society. Moreover, countries like India and America contain a mix of cultures. The captured norms may not reflect the cultural variations, for example, between regions (e.g., East Coast vs West Coast in the U.S.A or North India vs South India). Movies also exaggeratedly depict the world around us (e.g., weddings, criminal activities, sexual abuse, etc.), and we caution against stereotyping cultures based on movie-based norms.

The dominant language in Bollywood movies is Hindi and our analysis is based on their English translations which may not always be accurate, especially when the discourse is about concepts native to a culture. Relatedly, the LIWC may not have high coverage for such concepts. We did not compare the movie genre and acknowledge that situational/unrealistic norms (e.g., science fiction, comedy, etc.) could exist. Regardless, social norms associated with shame and pride are still relatable and reflect the target audience’s beliefs. It is also worth noting that gender norms in movies may not fully reflect the norms of today’s society. This

study is conducted over a thirty-year long period and thus, the aggregated norms may not reflect the current trends.

The prompts ("You study Indian society" vs "You study Western society" described in Tables A5 and A6) used to elicit norms may have induced unwanted bias (Cheng et al., 2023; Lucy and Bamman, 2021) and it is worth investigating the variations if any, in extracted norms due to different prompt designs.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the use of ChatGPT, an AI language model developed by OpenAI, for its assistance in writing and refining this manuscript.

References

- Todd Adkins and Jeremiah J Castle. 2014. Moving pictures? experimental evidence of cinematic influence on political attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(5):1230–1244.
- Emily T Amanatullah and Michael W Morris. 2010. Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women’s fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 98(2):256.
- Sophie H Arnold and Katherine McAuliffe. 2021. Children show a gender gap in negotiation. *Psychological Science*, 32(2):153–158.
- Mohammad Atari, Mona J Xue, Peter S Park, Damián Blasi, and Joseph Henrich. 2023. Which humans?
- GA Barnard. 1947. Significance tests for 2×2 tables. *Biometrika*, 34(1/2):123–138.
- Syon P Bhanot. 2021. Isolating the effect of injunctive norms on conservation behavior: New evidence from a field experiment in california. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 163:30–42.
- Cristina Bicchieri. 2005. *The grammar of society: The nature and dynamics of social norms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Michael Boiger, Simon De Deyne, and Batja Mesquita. 2013. Emotions in “the world”: cultural practices, products, and meanings of anger and shame in two individualist cultures. *Frontiers in psychology*, 4:867.
- Jacopo Bonan, Cristina Cattaneo, Giovanna d’Adda, and Massimo Tavoni. 2020. The interaction of descriptive and injunctive social norms in promoting energy conservation. *Nature Energy*, 5(11):900–909.

- Ryan L Boyd, Ashwini Ashokkumar, Sarah Seraj, and James W Pennebaker. 2022. The development and psychometric properties of liwc-22. *Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin*, pages 1–47.
- Federica Caffaro, Federico Ferraris, and Susanna Schmidt. 2014. Gender differences in the perception of honour killing in individualist versus collectivistic cultures: Comparison between Italy and Turkey. *Sex roles*, 71(9):296–318.
- Sky CH-Wang, Arkadiy Saakyan, Oliver Li, Zhou Yu, and Smaranda Muresan. 2023. Sociocultural norm similarities and differences via situational alignment and explainable textual entailment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14492*.
- Myra Cheng, Tiziano Piccardi, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Compost: Characterizing and evaluating caricature in LLM simulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11501*.
- Robert B Cialdini, Raymond R Reno, and Carl A Kallgren. 1990. A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 58(6):1015.
- Dov Cohen. 2003. The American national conversation about (everything but) shame. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 70(4):1075–1108.
- Dorottya Demszky, Dana Movshovitz-Attias, Jeongwoo Ko, Alan Cowen, Gaurav Nemade, and Sujith Ravi. 2020. Goemotions: A dataset of fine-grained emotions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00547*.
- Tamara J Ferguson and Heidi L Eyre. 2000. Engendering gender differences in shame and guilt: Stereotypes, socialization, and situational pressures.
- D Fessler. 2007. From appeasement to conformity. *Self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*, pages 174–193.
- Maxwell Forbes, Jena D Hwang, Vered Shwartz, Maarten Sap, and Yejin Choi. 2020. Social chemistry 101: Learning to reason about social and moral norms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.00620*.
- Yi R Fung, Tuhin Chakraborty, Hao Guo, Owen Rambow, Smaranda Muresan, and Heng Ji. 2022. Normsage: Multi-lingual multi-cultural norm discovery from conversations on-the-fly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08604*.
- Sergey Gavrillets. 2020. The dynamics of injunctive social norms. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 2:e60.
- Jennifer L Goetz and Dacher Keltner. 2007. Shifting meanings of self-conscious emotions across cultures. *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*, pages 153–173.
- Shreya Havaldar, Matthew Pressimone, Eric Wong, and Lyle Ungar. 2023a. [Comparing styles across languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6775–6791, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shreya Havaldar, Sunny Rai, Bhumika Singhal, Langchen Liu, Sharath Chandra Guntuku, and Lyle Ungar. 2023b. Multilingual language models are not multicultural: A case study in emotion. In *WASSA’2023, ACL*.
- Liwei Jiang, Jena D Hwang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Maxwell Forbes, Jon Borchardt, Jenny Liang, Oren Etzioni, Maarten Sap, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Delphi: Towards machine ethics and norms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07574*.
- Sangmoon Kim, Ryan Thibodeau, and Randall S Jorgensen. 2011. Shame, guilt, and depressive symptoms: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 137(1):68.
- Erik O Kimbrough and Alexander Vostroknutov. 2023. A theory of injunctive norms. *Available at SSRN 3566589*.
- Tina Kubrak. 2020. Impact of films: Changes in young people’s attitudes after watching a movie. *Behavioral sciences*, 10(5):86.
- David C Lahti and Bret S Weinstein. 2005. The better angels of our nature: Group stability and the evolution of moral tension. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26(1):47–63.
- Michael Lewis, Kiyoko Takai-Kawakami, Kiyobumi Kawakami, and Margaret Wolan Sullivan. 2010. Cultural differences in emotional responses to success and failure. *International journal of behavioral development*, 34(1):53–61.
- Nicholas Lourie, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Scruples: A corpus of community ethical judgments on 32,000 real-life anecdotes. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 13470–13479.
- Li Lucy and David Bamman. 2021. Gender and representation bias in gpt-3 generated stories. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Narrative Understanding*, pages 48–55.
- Maxime Mauduy, Daniel Priolo, Nicolas Margas, and Cécile Sénémeaud. 2022. When combining injunctive and descriptive norms strengthens the hypocrisy effect: A test in the field of discrimination. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13:989599.
- Md Sultan Al Nahian, Spencer Frazier, Mark Riedl, and Brent Harrison. 2020. Learning norms from stories: A prior for value aligned agents. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 124–130.
- Alexander Pan, Jun Shern Chan, Andy Zou, Nathaniel Li, Steven Basart, Thomas Woodside, Hanlin Zhang, Scott Emmons, and Dan Hendrycks. 2023. Do the

- rewards justify the means? measuring trade-offs between rewards and ethical behavior in the machiavelli benchmark. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26837–26867. PMLR.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992.
- Maarten Sap, Saadia Gabriel, Lianhui Qin, Dan Jurafsky, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Social bias frames: Reasoning about social and power implications of language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03891*.
- Rebecca L Schaumberg and Samuel E Skowronek. 2022. Shame broadcasts social norms: The positive social effects of shame on norm acquisition and normative behavior. *Psychological Science*, 33(8):1257–1277.
- Shalom H Schwartz. 2012. An overview of the schwartz theory of basic values. *Online readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1):11.
- Taylor Sorensen, Liwei Jiang, Jena Hwang, Sydney Levine, Valentina Pyatkin, Peter West, Nouha Dziri, Ximing Lu, Kavel Rao, Chandra Bhagavatula, Maarten Sap, John Tasioulas, and Yejin Choi. 2023. [Value kaleidoscope: Engaging ai with pluralistic human values, rights, and duties.](#)
- Zeera Talat, Hagen Blix, Josef Valvoda, Maya Indira Ganesh, Ryan Cotterell, and Adina Williams. 2021. A word on machine ethics: A response to jiang et al.(2021). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04158*.
- Petter Törnberg. 2023. Chatgpt-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political twitter messages with zero-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06588*.
- Jessica L Tracy and Richard W Robins. 2004. " putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model". *Psychological inquiry*, 15(2):103–125.
- Harry Triandis. 1988. Collectivism v. individualism: A reconceptualisation of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In *Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes and cognition*, pages 60–95. Springer.
- Harry C Triandis. 1989. The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological review*, 96(3):506.
- Maximilian Wegge, Enrica Troiano, Laura Ana Maria Oberlaender, and Roman Klinger. 2022. Experiencer-specific emotion and appraisal prediction. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science (NLP+CSS)*, pages 25–32.
- Ying Wong and Jeanne Tsai. 2007. Cultural models of shame and guilt. *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*, 209:223.
- Frank Yates. 1934. Contingency tables involving small numbers and the χ^2 test. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1(2):217–235.
- Caleb Ziems, Jane A Yu, Yi-Chia Wang, Alon Halevy, and Diyi Yang. 2022. The moral integrity corpus: A benchmark for ethical dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03021*.

A Appendix

A.1 Search Keywords

Search keywords defined in Table A1 were used to extract shame- and pride-related dialogues from Bollywood and Hollywood movie subtitles.

Lemma	Word forms
shame	shame, shamed, shameful, ashamed
pride	proud, prouder, proudly, pride

Table A1: List of search keywords for extracting dialogues.

	Movies	Total Tokens	#shame	#pride	#control
Bollywood	2738	22.62M	5409	2999	8303
Hollywood	2697	20.78M	1221	2805	4385
	5435	43.3M	6583	5804	12688

Table A2: Data Distribution. #shame indicates the number of dialogues with the word "shame" or its derivative form (e.g., ashamed, shameless). Similarly, #pride indicates the number of dialogues with the word pride or its derivative form (e.g., proud). Control is the group of dialogues without words shame, pride, and their derivatives.

A.2 Examining Implicit shame:

A.3 Norms Distributions

Over 10k reasons (or norms) were extracted using GPT-4. The distribution of norms and gender of targets is provided in Table A3.

	Bollywood		Hollywood	
Gender	shame	pride	shame	pride
male	2690	1259	591	776
female	1215	326	246	236
Not clear	1416	652	319	719
total	5321	2237	1156	1731

Table A3: Norm and Gender distribution (with duplicates) for dialogues for which GPT-4 predicted *male* or *female*. The duplicate norms are not removed as their frequency reflect their prevalence and is useful for estimating gender association.

A.4 Annotation

The annotation guidelines to verify the gender predicted by GPT-4 and the correctness of the reason are provided in Table A4. The annotators for Bollywood set and Hollywood set were Indian and American respectively. Both annotators were female, proficient in English language, and well-versed with social norms. During annotation, if the gender or the reason is unclear, the annotators were asked to label "not explicit". We only considered the cases where the gender was predicted to be either male or female. The task is objective and inter-annotator agreement was not computed. The annotators volunteered for the task and were not provided monetary compensation.

A.5 Prompts

The prompts designed to extract the subject experiencing self-conscious emotions, their gender and the reason behind the emotions are provided in Tables A5 and A6.

Guidelines for Manual Evaluation

1. Read the conversation and identify the person feeling ashamed (or being shamed) or proud.
 2. Identify the gender. Check gender markers such as Mr/Mrs., s/he, him/her, etc. If the name is provided in the conversation, check if the name is likely to be a male name or female. If not clear, mark "not explicit".
 3. Read the reason behind shame/pride. Compare with conversation and determine if the provided reason is the cause for shame/pride.
-

Table A4: Guidelines for Annotation

Prompts for norm discovery in *Bollywood* movie dialogues

"You are an experienced social scientist and you study Indian society. Your task is to interpret the given movie dialogues spoken by multiple characters and identify

1. Who is **feeling proud**? Provide the gender. If agent or gender is not explicit, use the pronouns, name, and salutations to guess agent and gender.

2. Identify the reason behind feeling proud. If not explicit, return NA.

The answer should be short and in below CSV format. <who_proud, gender, reason>

Input: Your mother had already given up on me because I was useless hopeless But you were the apple of her eye My child will make me proud look after me He'll support in my old-age But this kid left her all alone.

Output: mother, male, provide care for old parents

Input: I've heard there's a promising young student in your school What's his name? He's made us proud in long jump, we are here to felicitate him Call him Show yourself, Raju Tempre

Output: authority, NA, Sports achievement"

"You are an experienced social scientist and you study Indian society. Your task is to interpret the given movie dialogues spoken by multiple characters and identify

1. Who is **being shamed**? Predict the gender. If gender is not explicit, use the pronouns, name, and salutations to guess gender.

2. Identify the primary reason for shaming

The answer should be short and in CSV format. <shamed, gender, reason>

Input: And should we bow before others begging....them to marry our daughters? This shall not happen. Neither will the girls be alive here nor shall....we be ashamed of ourselves. You cannot kill the life which God has given. I won't let you commit the sin.

Output: girl's parent, NA, not able to marry off their daughters

Input: Black marketers are now in the open. And the thieves too Politics is in a great mess Shame on this system. There's no democracy Get rid of these politicians The gong has struck.."Our hearts are swaying to it's beats"

Output: System, NA, poor law and regulations"

Table A5: Bollywood: Prompts for norm discovery using GPT-4 Chat. The temperature was set to 0 to minimize randomness.

A.6 LIWC Correlation Results

Tables A7, A8, A9 and A10 contain the significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) LIWC categories, the most frequent five words for each category, pearson r and 95% confidence interval.

A.7 Clustering Results

Tables A13 and A14 contain the manually annotated Cluster Theme, the total number of samples in each cluster, and Bollywood vs Hollywood distribution. The distance was set to 5 and the duplicates were removed. The theme and top three examples demonstrating its meaning are provided in Tables A11 and A12.

Prompts for norm discovery in *Hollywood* movie dialogues

"You are an experienced social scientist and you study Western society. Your task is to interpret the given movie dialogues spoken by multiple characters and identify

1. Who is **feeling proud**? Provide the gender. If agent or gender is not explicit, use the pronouns, name, and salutations to guess agent and gender.
2. Identify the reason behind feeling proud? If not explicit, return NA.

The answer should be short and in below CSV format. <who_proud, gender, reason>

Input: I want to go to Worlds and win gold. I want to go to the 88 Olympics in Seoul and win gold. Good! I'm proud of you. Are you getting the support that you need? What do you mean sir?

Output: Sir, male, winning olympic gold

Input: Yes. Yes, I did. I promise, this time I really got the promotion. - I'm proud of you, son. - Thank you, sir. Excuse me. Hi, sweetheart.

Output: father, male, for getting the promotion"

"You are an experienced social scientist and you study western societies. Your task is to interpret the given movie dialogues spoken by multiple characters and identify

1. Who is **being shamed**? Predict the gender. If gender is not explicit, use the pronouns, name, and salutations to guess gender.
2. Identify the primary reason for shaming.

The answer should be short and in CSV format. < shamed, gender, reason, prevalence >

Input: You still owe me 100. Remember? You stiffed Donny for 100 bucks? Cheapskate. Shame on you. Pay this man his C-note. Now I know why they call you the Snake.

Output: NA, male, not returning borrowed money

Input: You prey on your own people. You steal from your own people. Have you no shame!? - Huh? - Well, we're still here. Man: Mr. Markopolos, it's all yours.

Output: Snake, male, stealing and preying on people"

Table A6: Hollywood: Prompts for norm discovery using GPT-4 Chat. The temperature was set to 0 to minimize randomness.

LIWC Categories	Top-5 words	<i>r</i>	p-value	95% CI
Negative emotions (EMO_NEG)	(bad, mad, scared, worry, fear)	0.330	0.000	[0.315, 0.344]
Negative tone (TONE_NEG)	(lost, kill, wrong, bad, hit)	0.249	0.000	[0.233, 0.265]
POWER	(sir, respect, own, kill, poor)	0.198	0.000	[0.182, 0.214]
EMOTION	(love, good, bad, happy, crazy)	0.168	0.000	[0.152, 0.185]
YOU	(you, your, you're, yourself, you've)	0.161	0.000	[0.145, 0.178]
Social references (SOCREFS)	(you, your, he, her, him)	0.148	0.000	[0.132, 0.165]
FEELING	(feel, touch, feeling, felt, hard)	0.133	0.000	[0.117, 0.150]
DRIVES	(we, our, us, sir, married)	0.115	0.000	[0.098, 0.132]
SOCIAL	(you, your, he, her, him)	0.110	0.000	[0.094, 0.127]
MORAL	(wrong, innocent, duty, decent, excuse)	0.102	0.000	[0.085, 0.118]
AFFECT	(love, good, keep, respect, well)	0.078	0.000	[0.062, 0.095]
NEGATE	(not, don't, no, aren't, won't)	0.065	0.000	[0.049, 0.082]
FEMALE	(her, she, girl, she's, mom)	0.060	0.000	[0.043, 0.077]
Personal Pronouns (PPRON)	(you, i, me, your, my)	0.058	0.000	[0.041, 0.075]
FAMILY	(son, married, uncle, dad, mom)	0.055	0.000	[0.039, 0.072]
Preposition (PREP)	(to, of, in, for, on)	0.053	0.000	[0.037, 0.070]
SEXUAL	(chaste, lust, sex, sexy, pimp)	0.051	0.000	[0.034, 0.067]
PRONOUN	(you, i, me, your, my)	0.040	0.000	[0.023, 0.057]
AUXVERB	(is, are, have, be, don't)	0.029	0.001	[0.013, 0.046]
CONFLICT	(kill, killed, accusing, killing, cruel)	0.024	0.007	[0.007, 0.041]
SWEAR	(hell, bloody, idiot, damn, ass)	0.024	0.007	[0.007, 0.041]
Anger (EMO_ANGER)	(mad, angry, hate, cruel, argue)	0.022	0.015	[0.005, 0.039]
FOCUSPRESENT	(is, are, don't, i'm, aren't)	0.021	0.018	[0.005, 0.038]

Table A7: Psychosocial categories significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) with *shame* in Bollywood dialogues. p-values were corrected using Benjamini-Hochberg correction. The categories are arranged in decreasing order of correlation.

LIWC Categories	Top-5 words	<i>r</i>	p-value	95% CI
DRIVES	(we, our, us, sir, work)	0.122	0.000	[0.104,0.140]
Determiner (DET)	(the, a, my, your, that)	0.101	0.000	[0.082,0.119]
ACHIEVE	(work, better, win, best, try)	0.098	0.000	[0.080,0.116]
POWER	(sir, own, respect, kill, power)	0.091	0.000	[0.072,0.109]
Social References (SOCREFS)	(you, your, he, we, our)	0.085	0.000	[0.067,0.103]
Preposition (PREP)	(of, to, in, for, with)	0.084	0.000	[0.066,0.103]
MORAL	(wrong, duty, brave, arrogant, useless)	0.075	0.000	[0.057,0.093]
Conjunction (CONJ)	(and, but, so, if, as)	0.075	0.000	[0.056,0.093]
REWARD	(win, won, glory, success, successful)	0.071	0.000	[0.052,0.089]
Positive tone (TONE_POS)	(love, good, thank, well, great)	0.064	0.000	[0.046,0.082]
POLITIC	(nation, army, sultan, president, dynasty)	0.064	0.000	[0.045,0.082]
WE	(we, our, us, we'll, let's)	0.060	0.000	[0.042,0.079]
SOCIAL	(you, your, he, we, our)	0.060	0.000	[0.041,0.078]
FAMILY	(son, papa, married, dad, uncle)	0.059	0.000	[0.041,0.078]
AFFILIATION	(we, our, us, dear, we'll)	0.059	0.000	[0.041,0.077]
FEELING	(feel, feeling, hard, felt, sense)	0.055	0.000	[0.036,0.073]
ETHNICITY	(indian, indians, british, hindi, caste)	0.054	0.000	[0.036,0.072]
MALE	(he, his, him, son, sir)	0.054	0.000	[0.036,0.072]
CULTURE	(indian, nation, army, car, indians)	0.044	0.000	[0.026,0.062]
AFFECT	(love, good, thank, well, great)	0.040	0.000	[0.021,0.058]
ARTICLE	(the, a, an, that)	0.039	0.000	[0.021,0.058]
Personal Pronouns (PPRON)	(you, i, my, your, me)	0.036	0.000	[0.017,0.054]
PROSOCIAL	(thank, please, sorry, respect, gift)	0.032	0.001	[0.014,0.051]
FUNCTION	(you, the, i, of, to)	0.032	0.001	[0.013,0.050]
YOU	(you, your, you're, you've, you'll)	0.030	0.003	[0.011,0.048]
THEY	(they, their, them, they're, they'll)	0.029	0.003	[0.011,0.048]
CERTITUDE	(really, real, surely, proved, actually)	0.021	0.041	[0.002,0.039]
Positive Emotion (EMO_POS)	(love, good, happy, happiness, smile)	0.020	0.049	[0.001,0.038]

Table A8: Psychosocial categories significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) with *pride* in Bollywood dialogues. p-values were corrected using Benjamini-Hochberg correction. The categories are arranged in decreasing order of correlation.

LIWC Categories	Top-5 words	<i>r</i>	p	95% CI
Negative emotions (EMO_NEG)	(sick, pain, fear, bad, afraid)	0.425	0.000	[0.403, 0.446]
Negative tone (TONE_NEG)	(lost, wrong, sick, pain, poor)	0.355	0.000	[0.331, 0.377]
EMOTION	(good, love, sick, pain, bad)	0.290	0.000	[0.266, 0.314]
POWER	(own, sir, poor, killed, war)	0.263	0.000	[0.238, 0.287]
AFFECT	(well, good, love, help, damn)	0.168	0.000	[0.142, 0.193]
DRIVES	(we, us, our, work, we're)	0.152	0.000	[0.127, 0.178]
FUNCTION	(you, i, the, to, of)	0.131	0.000	[0.105, 0.157]
Personal Pronouns (PPRON)	(you, i, me, i'm, my)	0.111	0.000	[0.085, 0.137]
MORAL	(wrong, excuse, decent, honest, duty)	0.110	0.000	[0.084, 0.136]
I	(i, me, i'm, my, i'll)	0.102	0.000	[0.076, 0.128]
Sadness (EMO_SAD)	(crying, cry, sob, lonely, sad)	0.096	0.000	[0.070, 0.122]
NEGATE	(no, not, don't, nothing, never)	0.090	0.000	[0.063, 0.116]
Preposition (PREP)	(to, of, in, for, on)	0.089	0.000	[0.062, 0.115]
PRONOUN	(you, i, that, it, me)	0.088	0.000	[0.062, 0.114]
YOU	(you, your, you're, yourself, you've)	0.080	0.000	[0.054, 0.106]
Auxiliary verb (AUXVERB)	(be, i'm, is, was, have)	0.077	0.000	[0.051, 0.103]
FOCUSPAST	(was, did, were, been, didn't)	0.069	0.000	[0.043, 0.096]
SOCIAL	(you, your, we, he, you're)	0.060	0.000	[0.033, 0.086]
Conjunction (CONJ)	(and, so, but, if, when)	0.056	0.000	[0.030, 0.082]
LINGUISTIC	(you, i, the, to, of)	0.056	0.000	[0.030, 0.082]
ALLNONE	(no, all, nothing, never, yes)	0.055	0.000	[0.029, 0.081]
FAMILY	(son, dad, baby, mom, mama)	0.054	0.000	[0.028, 0.081]
Social references (SOCREFS)	(you, your, we, he, you're)	0.050	0.000	[0.024, 0.077]
Anxiety (EMO_ANX)	(fear, afraid, worry, terrified, scared)	0.042	0.004	[0.015, 0.068]
ILLNESS	(sick, pain, pains, flu, sickly)	0.038	0.010	[0.012, 0.064]
FEELING	(feel, felt, pain, feeling, hard)	0.035	0.020	[0.008, 0.061]
Anger (EMO_ANGER)	(hate, hated, mad, angry, hates)	0.033	0.026	[0.007, 0.059]
DIFFER	(not, but, if, didn't, or)	0.033	0.027	[0.007, 0.059]
Discrepancy (DISCREP)	(should, can, would, can't, want)	0.032	0.029	[0.006, 0.059]
COGNITION	(no, not, all, know, but)	0.032	0.033	[0.005, 0.058]

Table A9: Psychosocial categories significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) with *shame* in Hollywood dialogues. p-values were corrected using Benjamini-Hochberg correction. The categories are arranged in decreasing order of correlation.

LIWC Categories	Top-5 words	<i>r</i>	p-value	95% CI
Personal Pronouns (PPRON)	(you, i, i'm, me, my)	0.135	0.000	[0.113,0.158]
Social References (SOCREFS)	(you, your, we, he, you're)	0.131	0.000	[0.108,0.154]
FAMILY	(son, dad, baby, mom, mama)	0.121	0.000	[0.099,0.144]
Conjunction (CONJ)	(and, so, but, as, if)	0.114	0.000	[0.091,0.137]
SOCIAL	(you, your, we, he, you're)	0.102	0.000	[0.079,0.125]
FUNCTION	(you, i, the, of, to)	0.100	0.000	[0.077,0.123]
I	(i, i'm, me, my, i'll)	0.095	0.000	[0.072,0.118]
YOU	(you, your, you're, you've, yourself)	0.091	0.000	[0.068,0.114]
MALE	(he, his, him, man, son)	0.084	0.000	[0.061,0.107]
DRIVES	(we, our, us, we're, dad)	0.076	0.000	[0.053,0.099]
Positive tone (TONE_POS)	(good, well, thank, great, love)	0.072	0.000	[0.049,0.095]
PRONOUN	(you, i, i'm, that, it)	0.072	0.000	[0.048,0.095]
Auxiliary Verb (AUXVERB)	(i'm, be, is, was, have)	0.071	0.000	[0.048,0.094]
Positive Emotion (EMO_POS)	(good, love, happy, hope, wonderful)	0.070	0.000	[0.047,0.093]
Preposition (PREP)	(of, to, in, for, on)	0.070	0.000	[0.047,0.093]
AFFILIATION	(we, our, us, we're, dad)	0.054	0.000	[0.031,0.078]
EMOTION	(good, love, happy, hope, bad)	0.052	0.000	[0.029,0.075]
ETHNICITY	(american, irish, chinese, german, christian)	0.052	0.000	[0.029,0.075]
REWARD	(win, won, winner, successful, earned)	0.048	0.000	[0.025,0.071]
ACHIEVE	(work, better, best, trying, try)	0.045	0.000	[0.022,0.068]
POWER	(sir, own, war, strong, mighty)	0.044	0.001	[0.021,0.067]
AFFECT	(good, well, thank, great, love)	0.041	0.001	[0.018,0.064]
MORAL	(wrong, excuse, hero, brave, dignity)	0.040	0.002	[0.017,0.064]
FEMALE	(her, she, she's, girl, ladies)	0.034	0.009	[0.011,0.057]
CULTURE	(american, car, president, nation, mayor)	0.033	0.012	[0.009,0.056]
FOCUSPAST	(was, did, been, were, had)	0.032	0.013	[0.009,0.055]
SHEHE	(he, his, him, her, she)	0.031	0.016	[0.008,0.054]
WORK	(work, job, school, deal, company)	0.028	0.033	[0.005,0.051]

Table A10: Psychosocial categories significantly correlated ($p < 0.05$) with *pride* in Hollywood dialogues with 95% confidence intervals. p-values were corrected using Benjamini-Hochberg correction. The categories are arranged in decreasing order of correlation.




Figure A1: Gender-wise differences in themes associated with normative expectations from shame-related discourse in Bollywood and Hollywood. $\Delta(Female, Male)$ is the difference between normalized dialogues attributed to females under a theme and to males under the same theme (as in eq. 1 but for dimension gender). * indicates insignificant difference i.e., $p > 0.05$

Theme	Examples from cluster
Stealing	shamelessness and taking money, lying and misusing money, Stealing and bribery
Poverty	not having money, being poor, living in poor conditions
Incompetence	not fulfilling responsibilities, not meeting expectations or making a mistake, Failure or perceived incompetence
Promiscuity	being promiscuous, Having a love affair, shameless behavior and expressing love
Inappropriate behavior	not living up to someone's expectations, being disloyal, Being rude and ungrateful
Disobedience	not upholding cultural values, disobedience or lack of respect, being disloyal
Parent-related	not standing up for his mother, not taking care of his father, not taking responsibility for his son
Marriage-related	refusing to marry, being forced into marriage, not accepting the proposed marriage
Immodesty	Wearing inappropriate clothes, inappropriate behavior nudity in public, behaving indecently in public
Gender Roles	not behaving as per her husband's expectations, behaving inappropriately in front of her daughter, going against her husband
Sexual Harrassment	assaulting a girl, physical assault on women, sexual assault
Cowardice	lack of courage, cowardice and inability to stand up for oneself, lack of pride and integrity
Alcoholism	excessive drinking, inappropriate behavior due to alcohol, drinking and irresponsible behavior
Non-conformity	not conforming to gender norms, breaking gender norms, behaving inappropriately according to societal norms
Illegal activities	engaging in criminal activities, Being a criminal, committing illegal acts
Betrayal	Betrayal or dishonesty, betrayal and infidelity, Deception/Betrayal
Lack of accountability	not taking responsibility and blaming others, wrongdoing without remorse, not acknowledging wrongdoing
Disrespect	disrespecting others, disrespecting an authority figure, Disrespectful and inappropriate behavior
Harm	causing harm to others, committing harmful deeds, causing trouble and endangering others
Lying/Deception	lying and hiding information, Lying or deceit, Deception/Not being truthful
Inappropriate sexual behavior	inappropriate advances and comments, inappropriate behavior towards a young girl, inappropriate language and behavior
Social Etiquette	Being humiliated in public, being disrespected and belittled, being mocked and treated shamefully
Privacy-related	invading personal space, invading someone's privacy, intrusion of personal space, trespassing/invading personal space
Accusation	accused of wrongdoing, being accused of something, being accused of infidelity
Family norms	Disrespecting family, causing harm and shame to family, causing difficulty and shame to family

Table A11: Themes and top-3 examples for clusters obtained after agglomerative clustering of shame-related dialogues from Bollywood and Hollywood.

Theme	Examples from cluster
Achievement	being a brilliant student, working hard and achieving a spectacular result, professional achievement
Family Roles	raising their child, having an unselfish mother, having a simple and good daughter
Self-identity	being a man, being a woman, being gay
Duty	fulfilling duty, Accomplishing something great, saving the world
Bravery & Nation	bravery and sacrifice, bravery and service to nation, bravery and selflessness
Doing the "right" thing	for doing the right thing, for being heroes, for having courage
Son's success	son's success and progress, son's hard work and achievement, son's determination
Family Honor	maintaining dignity and pride, taking care of family pride, saving family's pride
Justice	standing up for justice, fighting for justice, bringing justice
Marriage-related	marrying with pride and respect, sister's marriage, daughter's marriage into a reputed family
Appearance & Assets	his manhood, his wealth and beautiful wife, his knowledge and power
Resilience	resilience and determination, overcoming struggles, enduring hardships without complaint
Ethnolinguistic Identity	being Indian, defending the pride of Rajputs, being a Maharashtrian

Table A12: Themes and top-3 examples for clusters obtained after agglomerative clustering of pride-related dialogues from Bollywood and Hollywood.

Theme (Shame-related norms)	Total Samples	Hollywood	Bollywood
Accountability	802	185	617
Accusation	70	0	70
Alcoholism	98	18	80
Betrayal	262	26	236
Cowardice	209	51	158
Disobedience	216	49	167
Disrespect	246	26	220
Family norms	203	24	179
Gender roles	221	17	204
Harm	225	64	161
Illegal activities	253	27	226
Immodesty	311	58	253
Incompetence	342	83	259
Lying/Deception	222	53	169
Marriage-related	179	25	154
Non-conformity	208	28	180
Parent-related	263	34	229
Poverty	414	108	306
Privacy-related	102	14	88
Promiscuity	595	89	506
Sexual behavior	407	33	374
Sexual Harassment	232	24	208
Social Etiquette	417	97	320
Stealing	351	49	302
Total	6848	1182	5666

Table A13: Distribution of reasons (shame) across manually labeled clusters. A total of twenty-six clusters were generated with distance=5. Duplicates were removed for clustering. One cluster with generic reasons (such as phrases "lack of shame") was removed and two clusters with similar reasons (related to accountability) were merged. Finally, 24 clusters were considered. The total is slightly more than numbers in Table A3 since a norm could be mapped to multiple clusters.

Theme (Pride-related norms)	Total Samples	Hollywood	Bollywood
Achievement	332	174	158
Bravery	248	69	179
Doing the "right" thing	82	82	0
Duty	792	449	343
Ethnolinguistic Identity	148	7	141
Family Honor	263	77	186
Family Roles	356	156	200
Justice	255	109	146
Nation	216	57	159
Physical Appearance	106	49	57
Resilience	180	68	112
Self-identity	273	157	116
Son's Achievements	315	87	228
Wedding	120	23	97
Winning	411	205	206
Total	4097	1769	2328

Table A14: Distribution of reasons (pride) across manually labeled clusters. A total of fifteen clusters were generated with distance=5. Duplicates were removed for clustering. 'Achievement' and 'Winning' were merged to form 'Achievement' and, 'Bravery' and 'Nation' were merged to form 'Bravery & Nation'. Finally, 13 clusters were considered for analysis.




Figure A2: Gender-wise differences in themes associated with normative expectations from pride-related discourse in Bollywood and Hollywood. $\Delta(Female, Male)$ is the difference between normalized dialogues attributed to females under a theme and to males under the same theme (as in eq. 1 but for dimension gender). * indicates insignificant difference i.e., $p > 0.05$