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Abstract

The purpose of the presented studies is to examine social consequences of ‘collective narcissism’ – high but unstable and uncertain group esteem, grandiose image of an in-group combined with a desire to validate it because the inflated view is consistently (more or less consciously) doubted. The newly constructed Group Narcissism Scale was used in a social surveys conducted among 263 American students, 262 Polish students and among 202 Mexican students in order to examine predictors and consequences of the ‘group narcissism’. In the American sample the effects of the group narcissism in inter-group context were compared with effects of related variables: individual self esteem, collective self-esteem, social dominance orientation, blind and constructive patriotism, and in-group identification. Group Narcissism emerged as strong and independent predictor of perceived international threat, unforgiveness towards out-groups and preference for military solutions. The results from Polish sample indicate that the group narcissism can be predicted by strong in-group identification and negative implicit group esteem as well as high private and low public collective self-esteem. The results also show that group narcissism mediates the effects of blind patriotism on out-group negativity and deservingness. In the Mexican sample, the group narcissism emerged as a strong and independent of social dominance orientation predictor of preference for coercion in intergroup conflict. It also predicted perception of the out-group’s (the US) actions (construction of the wall on the border) as disrespectful towards Mexico. This perception mediated effects of the group narcissism on preference for destructive actions towards the US. On the other hand, SDO predicted positive perception of the US as help in Mexican economic growth. This perception mediated the effects of SDO on refusal of destructive actions towards the US.
Individual narcissism (i.e. an excessive self love or inflated, grandiose favorable view of oneself (Baumeister, et al., 1996)) is often a strong predictor of interpersonal aggression in situations perceived as threat to self or disrespect (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). The behavior of narcissists is motivated by a desire to constantly validate a grandiose self image and maximizing self esteem. The preoccupation with sustaining the inflated image of oneself results in extreme sensitivity to criticism or lack of proper acknowledgement that are to be met with punishment and aggression if only a possibility arouses (Baumeister et al, 1996; Kernis & Paradise, 2000; Morf & Rhodewalt 1993; Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991).

The purpose of the presented studies is to introduce and examine the effects of narcissism on group and inter-group levels. Therefore, a concept of ‘group narcissism’ is introduced: high but unstable and uncertain group esteem, grandiose image of an in-group combined with a desire to validate it because the inflated view is consistently (more or less consciously) doubted. The ‘group narcissism’ is understood as a specific type of identification with an in-group, that is related to emotional investment in unrealistic belief about greatness of one’s in-group. This strong in-group identification leads to excessive sensitivity to doubts and criticism voiced by others and a tendency to react with anger and aggression in response to all, even imagined, threats to the grandiose image of one’s in-group. The concept of the ‘group narcissism’ is supposed to parallel the concept of the individual narcissism in the group and inter-group context.

Numerous studies show that the beliefs that people hold about their selves, their relations with others have their corresponding equivalents in beliefs about their social selves, their in-groups and relations of their in-group with other groups. For example, Eidelson & Eidelson (2003; 2004) show that the deeply grounded ways of interpreting oneself and the surrounding reality i.e. the core ‘dangerous’ beliefs about oneself (i.e. own superiority, injustice from others, distrust towards others, own helplessness and vulnerability) that are responsible for a lot of anger and animosity in interpersonal relations, have their matching parallels in core beliefs about one’s in-group (i.e. ingroup’s superiority, vulnerability and helplessness and distrust towards other groups and belief about their injustice towards one’s in-group) that contribute to inter-group conflicts and misunderstandings. In similar vein, studies show that although individual self-esteem predicts reliably individual and
interpersonal attitudes and behavior, it is not a good predictor of group or inter-group attitudes and actions (Abrams & Hogg, 1987). Instead, collective self esteem (i.e. the aspect of self esteem that is related to one’s membership in social groups) is found to account for good amount of variance in group and inter-group attitudes and behaviors (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). Analogously, it is expected that the collective or group narcissism will have similar effects for the group and inter-group attitudes and behavioral predispositions that individual narcissism has on individual and interpersonal attitudes and actions.

It is assumed that one can be narcissistically attached to almost any social group, however, it is more likely that groups with greater entitativity, substance and real almost reified existence (e.g. national group, ethnic group, religious group or political party - Castano et al, 2003; Keller, 2005) will attract strongest narcissistic sentiments. The present studies aim at demonstrating the construct validity of the concept of the ‘group narcissism’ and its explanatory power over and above similar concepts such as the collective self-esteem, group identification, patriotism or social dominance orientation. Before the studies are presented in more detail, we will review the studies on individual narcissism and its effects as well as literature on variables predicting aggression on the inter-group level.

**Individual narcissism and its interpersonal effects**

‘Group narcissism’ is defined analogously to individual narcissism. Its object, however, is not individual self but a collective, a social group with which a person identifies. It is believed that understanding of the mechanisms and consequences of individual narcissism will help understanding the mechanisms of group narcissism. Narcissism as an individual difference variable is defined as an excessive self love or inflated, grandiose or unjustified favorable view of oneself (Baumeister, et al., 1996). Researchers stress also motivational and emotional underpinnings of narcissism defining it as emotional investment in establishing one’s superiority or passionately wanting to regard oneself as superior being (Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991; Morf & Rhodewalt (1993). The social behavior of narcissists is seen as motivated by a desire to validate a grandiose self image through maximizing self esteem. Narcissists, however, constantly doubt their inflated self-esteem and they demand its frequent confirmation and validation from other people (Brown & Bosson, 2000; Kernberg, 1970) and feel
entitled to special treatment from others. Thus, narcissists are preoccupied with defending their rights and position (Exline, Bushman, Baumeister, Campbell & Finkel, 2004; Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline & Bushman, 2004).

Individual narcissism is also conceptualized (or seen as closely related to such) as high but unstable (or insecure), fragile and vulnerable to threat and defensive self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1954; Horney, 1937 Harder, 1984; see also Baumeister, Bushman & Campbell, 2000). Kernis & Paradise (2000) show that individuals with high and unstable self-esteem tend to be also narcissistic and tend to respond to daily events more defensively and aggressively than individuals with high and stable self-esteem. Unstable self-esteem is also conceptualized as discrepancy between low implicit and high explicit self esteem. Some individuals harbor conscious positive self feelings that are accompanied by negative self-feelings on less conscious levels (evaluations of self that occur unintentionally and outside awareness). Jordan, Spencer, Zanna, Hoshino-Browne, and Correll (2000) show that high explicit self esteem and low implicit self-esteem predict individual narcissism and particularly strong defensiveness when the self-image is threatened (see also Bosson, Brown, Zeigler-Hill & Swann, 2002). One explanation of this effect is that implicit evaluation may become more conscious when cognitive resources are taxed (which is likely to happen under threat) (Koole, Dijksterhuis & van Knippenberg, 2001).

Regardless of how it was operationalized, individual narcissism was shown to be related to increased interpersonal aggressiveness and hostility (Baumeister et al., 1996; Raskin et al., 1991; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995), dominance tendencies (Ruiz, Smith, Rhodewalt, 2001), greater interpersonal violence, direct and retaliatory, rather than displaced, aggression in response to ego threat and proneness to feel angry in response to criticism (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Baumeister, Bushman & Campbell, 2000). It was also found to be related to extreme mood variability in response to social comparisons (esp. increased hostility caused by downward comparisons Bogart, Benotsch, & Pavlovic, 2004). Individual narcissism was also found to be related to inability to forgive (Exline, Bushman, Baumeister, Campbell & Finkel, 2004) accompanied by a tendency to seek vengeance (Brown, 2004).
Thus, we can conclude that on individual level narcissism is related to cognitive and emotional functioning that impairs interpersonal relations and is related to destructive social behavior, even tough it is also associated with subjective, individual well-being (Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro & Rusbult, 2004). Aggressiveness of individual narcissism seem to result from emotional investment in grandiose self image that is fragile and unconsciously questioned and makes narcissistic people more vulnerable to critique and ego threats and more likely to respond with violent vengeance.

Considering the possibility of parallel phenomena on individual and group level, thanks to research on individual narcissism we can make assumptions about functioning of the ‘group narcissism’. As mentioned above, the group narcissism can be defined as an investment in a grandiose image of an in-group accompanied with a desire to constantly validate that inflated image. It can be expected that the ‘group narcissists’ will be preoccupied with establishing one’s group’s superiority and constantly alert to indicators undermining its overly positive image. We may expect that people who emotionally invest in grandiose image of their in-groups are more defensive of them and more prone to inter-group aggression, especially when the positive image is threatened by critique or actions that can be understood as disrespect and lack of acknowledgement of own group’s greatness.

It can be expected that the ‘group narcissism’ will be underlined by complex and contradictory feelings and thoughts about one’s in-group. It is expected that it will be related to a strong in-group identification accompanied by unconscious negative feelings about the in-group that are then projected outside onto other groups that are perceived as doubting the greatness of in-group, not granting it the respect and privileges it deserves. Therefore, the group narcissism is expected to be related to high private but low public collective self-esteem (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Luthanen & Crooker, 1992) and beliefs about superiority of the in-group accompanied by beliefs about its unjust treatment by other groups (Eidelson & Eidelson, 2003).

Apart form assumptions about etiology of the ‘group narcissism’ the research on individual narcissism help make predictions about inter-group consequences of the group narcissism. It is assumed that the group narcissism will be related to greater feelings of deservingness and entitlement of one’s in-group and related feeling of group or fraternalistic deprivation (Runciman, 1966): a belief that one’s group in comparison to others gets less and less than it deserves. In addition, it can be
expected that the group narcissism will be related to related to inter-group negativity and aggressiveness particularly in situations when the actions of the out-groups can be perceived as disrespectful towards the in-group and its members. Therefore, the group narcissism is expected to predict violence and escalatory actions in escalating inter-group conflict and likelihood of perceiving inter-group situations as conflictual even before they turn into an open conflict. In an open conflict any action of the adversary can be interpreted as disrespectful. In a conflict situation that is not an open conflict yet, people who are sensitive to signs of disrespect and lack of proper acknowledgment are more likely to interpret ambiguous situations as threatening the grandiose and deserving assumptions about their in-group.

Thus, the introduction of a new theoretical concept i.e. ‘group narcissism’ is likely to help explain and understand the mechanisms of the peculiar in-group identification that is not necessarily related to love for the in-group but rather with an emotional investment in its positive image. Such an identification is likely to motivate behaviors aiming at protecting the positive image no matter what and all the time. The concept of group narcissism will help explain motivational mechanisms of several, on the first sight unrelated inter-group attitudes e.g. deservingness, unforgiveness and inter-group aggression. There are reasons to think that the concept of the group narcissism can help explain the differential inter-group consequences of national attitudes: nationalism and patriotism. For example, narcissistic sentiments towards one’s national in-group can be perceived as an element of blind rather than constructive patriotism (Schatz et al, 1999), nationalism rather than patriotism (Koesterman & Feshbach, 1989) and be responsible for nationalism or blind patriotism relation to out-group negativity and feelings of special entitlement that are not related to patriotic identification with one’s nation. As mentioned above, the concept of the ‘group narcissism’ can help explain why the ambiguous inter-group situation is interpreted in a way that makes inter-group conflict more likely. Before we proceed to presenting detailed hypotheses that were tested in a series of 4 studies, we will discuss how the group narcissism is similar to and different from related concepts such as blind and constructive patriotism (or nationalism and patriotism) and social dominance orientation.

**Group narcissism and blind and constructive patriotism**
A growing number of researchers agree that positive national attachment can be expressed in two qualitatively different sets of attitudes: patriotism – national love that is constructive for individual development and inter-group relations - and potentially destructive ethnocentrism (usually called nationalism) – love for one’s country followed by disrespect and derogation of other nations and countries (Bar-Tal, 1996; Blank & Schmidt, 2003; de Figueiredo & Elkins, 2003; Feshbach, 1994; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Sidanius, Pratto, Feshbach & Levine, 1997; Viroli, 1995). Within this theoretical framework, it is not patriotism but nationalism that is a culprit of socially destructive aspect of national sentiment (Worchel & Coutant, 1996). There are also interpretation that stress that the most important difference between constructive and destructive form of identification with and attachment to one’s nation lies not in the concern with the dominance of one’s nation over others that accompanies one attitude but not the other, but rather with openness to critical thinking and reflection on what does one nation represents. Thus, love for one’s country can be either uncritical idealization or mature feeling that is not afraid of criticism when the nation is not the best it can be. Schatz, Staub and Lavine (1999) propose differentiation between blind and constructive patriotism.

While both nationalism and patriotism and blind and constructive patriotism are based on subjective significance of national identity – a sense of positive emotional bond to a nation and its importance within a concept of self (Blank & Schmidt, 2003) - they result in different perceptions of social goals and inter-group attitudes: nationalism or blind patriotism is associated with desire for dominance in inter-group relations and rejection and discrimination of national out-groups, whereas constructive patriotism is associated with concern with cooperative and tolerant attitudes to other nations (Blank & Schmit, 2003; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Sidanius et al., 1997). Nationalism and blind patriotism are related to negativity towards ethnic minorities and immigrants (Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Kelly, 1993; Skarżyńska & Miśkiewicz, 2000); preference for hawkishness and coercion in international relations, acceptance of use of weapons of mass destruction along with conventional warfare (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Federico, Golec & Dial, 2004; Schatz & Staub, 1997; Sidanius et al., 1997). They are also related to out-group discrimination and in extreme forms is a source of racist and fascist attitudes (Heaven, Rajab & Ray, 1985; Dekker, Malova, & Hoogendoorn, 2003).
Nationalists as blind patriots tend to idealize their nation and believe it should dominate others (Schatz & Staub, 1997; Sidanius et al, 1997).

On the other hand, constructive patriotism is related to support for democratic principles and humanist values (Blank & Schmidt, 2003; Schatz & Staub, 1997). Since patriots do not idealize their nation they are able to take upon a critical attitude toward their nation if they believe that it does not protect these values. They accept that what the nation did and does can be seen from various points of view and evaluation of history and politics is a matter of discussion (Blank & Schmidt, 2003). Patriotism is also related to preference for peaceful coexistence of various nations and to constructive cooperative approach to political conflict or at least lack of coercive tendencies (Blank & Schmidt, 2003; Sidanius, et al. 1997).

Thus, blind and constructive patriotism as forms of attachment to the same national in-group result in quite different prescriptions for inter-group behavior. Constructive patriotism – is inclusive, holds potential for stimulating constructive inter-group relations and allows for formation of super-ordinate social identity as well as coexistence of various ‘sub-ordinate’ identities within a larger social whole. Blind patriotism, on the other hand, results in more dangerous attitudes – it is exclusive, negative and potentially hostile, likely to result in preference for inter-group aggression.

There are reasons to think that both patriotism and nationalism are related to a positive attachment to one’s national group. This attachment can be stable and result in mature love that is not afraid of criticism and necessity to change and that is not preoccupied with achieving a dominant position for one’s nation. On the other hand the national attachment can be unstable and inflated, underlined by national narcissism rather than mature love. In such cases national attachment will result in our-group negativity and aggression especially in situations in which the other groups question the greatness of one’s nation. Thus, there are reasons to think that blind patriotism may be underlined by group narcissism and that the group narcissism may mediate some of its effects in inter-group situations. It is important to remember that the concerns related to group narcissism are not necessarily the concerns with one’s national group’s dominant positions. These concerns should be independent of the group narcissism and they should be rather related to social dominance orientation (see below) that
is likely to underling blind patriotism as well. It can be predicted that the group narcissism and social dominance orientation can mediate inter-group effects of blind patriotism independently.

**Group narcissism and social dominance orientation**

The concept of the ‘group narcissism’ can be seen as similar to the social dominance orientation, a variable proposed by social dominance theory developed by Sidanius and Pratto (1999). Social dominance theory asks why human societies tend to be organized as group-based hierarchies. The universality of social inequality is explained by a cooperation of individuals and institutions in creating social hierarchies and legitimizing them with social ideologies, legitimizing myths that help to coordinate social actions of institutions and individuals. The acceptance of ideologies that legitimize inequality and behaviors that produce inequality is partly determined by people’s general desire for group-based dominance. This desire for group-based dominance is captured by a construct *social dominance orientation* (SDO). SDO defined as a “general desire for unequal relations among social groups, regardless of whether this means ingroup domination or ingroup subordination” (Sidanius, Levin, Federico, and Pratto (2001). Thus, the SDO expresses competitively driven motivation to maintain or establish group dominance and superiority. Therefore, it is predicted that people high in the SDO would dislike and devalue out-groups that aroused their competitiveness over inter-group status or power differentials (Duckitt, 2006).

The group narcissism similarly as the SDO is concerned with own in-group’s greatness. However, there are important differences between these two concepts: one pertains to the bases of the greatness and the other to its stability. For group narcissists, unlike for people high in the SDO, the greatness does not have to be based on power or economic dominance. Some groups may insist on its moral superiority and for example feel superior due to its martyrdom and humiliation. SDO is concerned with achievement of dominant position and will welcome help to do so. Collective narcissism is not concerned with dominance but rather with proving that own group is getting the respect that is due to it.
Secondly for the group narcissists; the assumed greatness is never stable, always threatened and endangered, no objective measures can calm down the preoccupations of the group narcissists with possible criticisms, disrespect or doubts.

It can be expected that the SDO will motivate aggressive inter-group behaviors when dominant position of one’s group is threatened but not when a particular out-group can enhance a position of the in-group even if the position of this out-group is higher. However, the group narcissism will predict inter-group aggressiveness in both situations: when the greatness of a group is threatened and when the situation is ambiguous and it might be threatened. It can be expected that the SDO and the group narcissism will predict preference for violence and escalatory actions in an on-going conflict where the stake is a dominant position and the positive image of an in-group.

However, there are situations in which the SDO and the group narcissism can have quite different predictions. It can be expected that the SDO will predict negativity towards out-groups that can endanger rather than enhance one’s in-group position (e.g. immigrants). However, the group narcissism will not predict negativity towards immigrants. The economic competition is not an important concern for group narcissists and influx of immigrants to their country confirms their conviction that it is the greatest country to live. The group narcissism will predict negativity towards groups whose actions seem to question the greatness of one’s group e.g. the neighboring country closing its border from ‘our’ citizens: like the US building the wall along Mexican and the US border or straightening its anti-immigrant laws. However, the SDO does not have to predict the interpretation of this inter-group situation as disrespect or competition, especially when alternative and closer to position and prestige concerns of SDO interpretations are available i.e. the US can be perceived by Mexicans as help to achieve higher economic and international position rather than a group that disregards Mexico and Mexicans through its anti-immigrant policies.

**Hypotheses**

In the present studies we tested several hypotheses related to predictors of and consequences of the group narcissism.
Hypothesis 1: the group narcissism will be predicted by an interaction of high in-group identification and negative implicit group esteem (Study 3).

It was assumed that the group narcissism is a form of a positive group identification that is underlined by more or less unconscious doubts about the positive image of the group. Thus it was assumed that the collective narcissism will be predicted by strong in-group identification and low implicit group self-esteem i.e. low positive implicit associations with one’s in-group as compared to other groups. Since the ‘group narcissism’ is understood as unstable and fragile high collective self-esteem can be also seen as related to discrepancy in explicit and implicit collective self-esteem (feelings and evaluations of national in-group). Implicit collective self-esteem can be measured by the IAT test in analogous way implicit self-esteem is measured (Bosson, Swan & Pennebaker, 2000; Farnham, Greenwald & Banaji, 1999). In this test participants typically categorize words into categories on two dimensions – pleasant vs unpleasant (evaluations) and related to myself vs not related (category, concept). In implicit collective self-esteem test with regards to national group, words related to category dimension would be related to one’s nation (rather than to self). The IAT effect is measured when participants are to classify words into one of two categories shown at the same time (either as pleasant or related to self – shorter reaction times indicate positive implicit self-esteem; or unpleasant or related to self – shorter reaction times indicate negative implicit self-esteem). We expected that interaction of explicit positive in-group identification and implicit negative group self esteem will predict ‘collective narcissism’: ‘collective narcissism’ should be highest among individuals with high explicit and low implicit collective self esteem.

Hypothesis 2: the group narcissism will be predicted by an interaction of high private and low public collective self esteem Luthanan & Crooker (1992) (Study 3).

It was also assumed that the group narcissism will be predicted by positive opinion about one’s in-group accompanied by preoccupation with other’s insufficient recognition of the in-group’s greatness.

Hypothesis 3: the group narcissism will be predicted by an interaction of belief in superiority of one’s in-group and belief in its unjust treatment by other groups (Study1). It was assumed
that greater collective narcissism will be predicted by an interaction of two core beliefs about
an in-group as identified by Eidelson & Eidelson (2003): about in-groups superiority and in-
groups greatness.

The new variable was identified and described in order to make better predictions for inter-
group behavior. It was assumed that the group narcissism will be an independent predictor of feelings
of group special entitlement and deservingness and out-group negativity and aggressiveness explaining
such negative effects of strong in-group identification.

- Hypothesis 4: the group narcissism will predict unforgiveness towards out-groups and support
  for violent actions against out-groups independently of individual self esteem, collective self
  esteem, in-group identification, blind and constructive patriotism and social dominance
  orientation (Study 1).

It was expected that the new concept will help explain negative inter-group effects of strong
positive in-group attachment in the context of national attitudes. The where effects of group narcissism
with respect to a national group were analyzed together with the effects of blind and constructive
patriotism.

- Hypothesis 5: the group narcissism will predict the feeling the in-group is treated unfairly but
  other groups; it will mediate the effects of blind patriotism on feeling of unjust treatment
- Hypothesis 6: the group narcissism will mediate negative effects of blind patriotism on out-
group negativity (Study 3).

The effects of the group narcissism were assumed to be different from the effects of social
dominance orientation i.e. a desire for the dominant position of one’s own group and hierarchical
arrangement of the social world (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The two variables are similar but there is a
clear distinction between them. SDO is concern with own group superiority and dominance. The group
narcissism is concerned with own group’s greatness and superiority that has not to be based on
dominance. It was assumed that the effect may be similar, however independent in certain situations
e.g. escalating conflict where strive for dominance and a desire to repay disrespect and gain the due
acknowledgment from the other groups can have similar predictions i.e. preference for destructive
actions. However, it was also assumed that in other cases inter-group situations may be perceived
differently by people high in SDO and high in group narcissism.

- Hypothesis 7: the SDO will motivate positive inter-group relations with an out-group that
  helps us to achieve better position (Study 4).
- Hypothesis 8: the group narcissism may motivate to perceive different aspect of the inter-
group situation – those that may indicate lack of respect for the in-group and therefore lead to
a preference of destructive actions (Study 4).

STUDY 1

METHOD

Participants

The study was conducted among 263 students of a large American university. Their age
ranged from 17 to 26 (M = 18.69; SD = .99; 2 persons failed to provide information about age). There
were 191 women and 72 men among the participants.

Measures

*Group Narcissism Scale (α = .86; M = 2.67 SD = .56).* The 23 items version of the scale was
constructed for the purpose of this study. After the psychometric analysis were performed the 9item
scale was constructed and further analyses were conducted with the short version of the Scale.

*Constructive (M = 4.00; SD = .55) and Blind (M = 2.17; SD = .65) Patriotism Scale.* The 25
items scale measuring two forms of patriotism as proposed by Schatz, Staub & Lavine (1999) was
used.

*Social Dominance Scale. (α = .85; M = 2.25; SD = .64).* The 16 items version of the scale was
used as proposed by Siduanius and Pratto (1999).

*Core Beliefs about a Group Scale* with subscales measuring beliefs about Superiority (M =
3.10; SD = .84) (e.g. ‘I believe my group is superior to other groups in many ways.’ Or ‘I believe my
group’s contributions to society are more valuable than those of other groups), Injustice (M = 2.84;
SD = .82) (e.g. ‘I believe other groups are often unfair to my group’; ‘I believe my group is criticized
by other groups more than it should be.’ Or ‘I believe that my group’s efforts often go unrewarded’),
Distrust (M = 3.07; SD = .73), Vulnerability (M = 3.29; SD = .71) and Helplessness (M = 2.28; SD = .67), as proposed by Eidelson & Eidelson (2003).

**Strength of Group Identification.** (M = 3.01 SD = .58).

**Negative View of Immigrants.** (α = .71; M = 2.53; SD = .65). The scale consisted of following items: (1) ‘US laws should further restrict immigration’; (2) ‘Immigrants to US are discriminated against’ (reversed); (3) ‘Immigrants to US strengthen country’ (reversed) and (4) ‘Immigrants to US are burden’.

**Unforgiveness towards Outgroups** (M = 2.73; SD = .61).

**Perception of Military Threat to the US.** (α = .73; M = 3.77; SD = .69). The scale consisted of following items: (1) ‘Islamic fundamentalism is critical threat to the US’; (2) ‘Unfriendly countries with nuclear weapons are critical threat to the US’ and (3) ‘International terrorism is critical threat to US’.

**US Military Important.** (α = .72; M = 2.30; SD = .63). The following items build up this scale: (1) ‘Military strength more important than economic strength’; (2) ‘Military strength more important than respect abroad’; (3) ‘US military spending should be increased’ and (4) ‘US should reduce overseas bases’ (reversed).

**Support for War in Iraq.** (α = .80; M = 2.49; SD = .73). The scale consisted of following items: (1) ‘I supported going to war against Iraq’; (2) ‘US made right decision going to war with Iraq’; (3) ‘Situation in Iraq is improving’; (4) ‘Most Iraqis want the US to leave’ (reversed) and (5) ‘Iraq gave support to Al Qaeda’.

RESULTS

The Group Narcissism Scale

The items for the Group Narcissism Scale were generated based on the definition of the variable and existing scales of individual narcissism and individual entitlement scales by four experts: political psychologist, clinical psychologist, political scientist and social psychologist. A primary version of scale of ‘collective narcissism’ used items of existing inventories of individual narcissism (Narcissistic Personality Inventory - Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988 and MMPI Narcissistic Personality Disorder Scale (NPD) and Psychological Entitlement Scale (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton,
Exline & Bushman, 2004). In selected items beliefs about self were subsisted with beliefs about one’s in-group (see. Eidelson & Plummer, 2005; Eidelson & Roccas, 2004). Items were selected and discussed by the competent judges for façade validity. The total number of 23 items were generated (see Table 1). The scale was constructed in which participants were asked to think about an in-group that is important to them and evaluate to what degree they agree with a given item where ‘1’ means ‘I totally disagree’ and ‘6’ means ‘I totally agree’. Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was performed on the data from the first study where the participants were asked to think about their national group while indicating their agreement with the items (N = 263). The scree plot analysis indicated one factor solution that explained 26% of the variance (eigenvalue = 5.91).

Table 1. Items of the Group Narcissism Scale with factors loading in Study 1 and Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items of the Group Narcissism Scale</th>
<th>Study1</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Polish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I wish other groups would more quickly recognize authority of my group.*</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My group deserves special treatment.*</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I will never be satisfied until my group gets all it deserves.*</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I insist upon my group getting the respect that is due to it.*</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It really makes me angry when others criticize my group.*</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If my group had a major say in the world, the world would be a much better place.*</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I do not get upset when people do not notice achievements of my group. (reversed)*</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Not many people seem to fully understand the importance of my group.*</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I love my group almost as much as I love myself.</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My group is extraordinary.</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My group is often misunderstood.*</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My group stands out positively among other groups.</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I like when my group is a center of attention.</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My group rarely fails.</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>People in my group are more attractive than others.</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I want my group to amount to something in the eyes of the world.</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My group has all predispositions to influence and direct others.</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>If it only wanted my group could convince other groups to do almost anything.</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nine factors were then selected based on face validity analysis of the items of the strongest factor loadings and strongest contribution to overall reliability of the Scale in both studies. The results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis performed with the use of AMOS statistical package indicate that the model with 9 items relating to one latent factor fits the data well in Study 1 (see Table 2). The same solution with one latent factor measured by nine items was confirmed in a Polish study with 401 students and British study with 47 students. In British study the participants were asked to think about their national group while responding to the items of the scale. In Polish study the participants were first asked to read the items of the scale and then decide whether they can think of any group to which these items apply and then respond to the items of the scale. In Polish sample the larges groups were: national group (Polish; n = 89); religious group (Catholics; n = .46), students (n = 92); professional (lower status jobs, teachers; n = 40). Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was performed on the data. In the Polish study it was only performed for participants who filled out the scale and indicated a group. In Polish data the one factor solution that explained 32% of the variance (eigenvalue = 5.10). In the British study the eigenvalue was 5.73 and the solution explained 36% of variance (see Table 1 for loadings of each item). The Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed on Polish data and it indicates a good fit of the model assuming 9 items scale and one latent factor (see Table 2). In both studies the nine items scale had high reliability (α = .74 in Polish study and α = .94 in British study).

**Group narcissism and core beliefs about in-group**

It was expected that group narcissists believe that their group is better than others (grandiose image of in-group) but at the same time they feel their group is not appreciated enough (entitlement and defensiveness). Thus, the group narcissism is grounded in a specific combination of basic beliefs people hold about their in-group. Five of core beliefs about in-group important for perception of an
inter-group context were described by Eidelson & Eidelson, (2003, 2004): superiority, vulnerability, injustice, helplessness, distrust. The belief about in-group greatness can be conceptualized in terms of superiority beliefs, whereas the belief that the greatness is not appreciated enough can be conceptualized in terms of injustice beliefs. The results of the first study indicate that the group narcissism is predicted by the belief about own group superiority over other social groups (b = .25; SE = .06; p < .000) and belief about unjust treatment of own group by other groups (b = .32; SE = .06; p < .000). Moreover, the main effect of these two sets of beliefs are qualified by their interaction. The analysis of the simple slopes for this interaction indicates that the level of group narcissism is the highest among people whose belief about own group superiority is strong and at the same time their belief about their unjust treatment of own group by others is also strong. The simple slopes were computed for the relationship between superiority belief and group narcissism at injustice beliefs one standard deviation above (high) and below (low) the variable’s mean, using Aiken and West’s (1991) method. These analyses indicated that the relationship between superiority belief and narcissism was significant and positive at high levels of injustice belief (b = .50; p < .004), but non-significant at low level of injustice beliefs (b = .09; p > .46).

Table 3. Group narcissism and core beliefs about in-group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injustice</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority*Injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (degrees of freedom): 17.52 (7,255)*** 16.17 (8,254)***
R^2: .325 .337
N: 262 262
The group narcissism is then underlined by a belief that own group does not receive all it deserves due to its special, superior status. The study 3 provides data that help explain the beliefs and feelings of group narcissism towards their group.

**Group narcissism, individual self-esteem, collective self esteem, blind and constructive patriotism and SDO as predictors of inter-group attitudes**

In order to test the validity of the Group Narcissism Scale the correlations were assessed with similar variables. Since in Study 1 participants were asked to think about their national group while filling out the Scale, the correlations with national in-group identification and two forms of patriotism were assessed. As expected, the group narcissism correlated highly and positively with identification with the US. Patriotism is a love for one’s country and belief about it greatness that can be blind or constructive (Schatz et al, 1999). It was expected that group narcissism will be related to blind rather than constructive patriotism. It was also expected that group narcissism will mediate effects of blind patriotism in inter-group context. The results indicate that the group narcissism correlated positively with blind patriotism but negatively with constructive patriotism (see Table 4). Regression analysis
indicates that the group narcissism is independently, positively related to blind patriotism (b = 55; SE = .05; p < .000) and not related to constructive patriotism (b = 08; SE = .06; p > .16).

It was expected that the group narcissism will share common variance with social domination orientation since both variables assume the perception of ones in-group as greater than others and desire privilege treatment. There was a strong positive correlation between the two variables (see Table 4). However, the two variables are not redundant. The group narcissism, SDO and blind patriotism have similar effects on attitudes in the inter-group context. They independently predicted support for importance of American military power and support for invasion on Iraq (see Table 5). In both cases effects of the group narcissism are the strongest. Constructive patriotism has opposite effects. Both SDO and group narcissism mediate effects of blind patriotism on unforgiveness towards out-groups and perception of the US military as important (see Figure 2 and 3). However, the group narcissism as the only of the variables does not predict negativity towards immigrants and as the only variable predicts the perception that major threats to the US are from foreign aggression. The group narcissism mediates the effects of blind patriotism at perceived threat from external aggression (see Figure 1).

Table 4. Correlations of group narcissism, patriotism and SDO with attitudes in in-group and inter-group context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group narcissism</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Patriotism</td>
<td>.577**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual self esteem</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>-.147*</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Group Identification (U.S.)</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforgivingness Toward Outgroups military power is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, we may infer that differently than in case of the SDO, the aggressiveness of group narcissism is aggressiveness stemming from fear and threat that cannot be forgiven rather than from a tendency to dominate other groups.
Figure 2. Blind patriotism, group narcissism and perceived threat from foreign aggression

*age, gender and constructive patriotism controlled

Figure 3. Group narcissism, blind patriotism, SDO and unforgiveness towards outgroups.
*age, gender and constructive patriotism controlled

![Diagram showing the relationship between Group narcissism, Blind patriotism, SDO and support for the US militarism.](image)

Figure 4. Group narcissism, blind patriotism, SDO and support for the US militarism

*age, gender and constructive patriotism controlled

**STUDY 2**

**Participants**

The study was conducted among 262 students of a large Polish university. Their age ranged from 19 to 53 (M = 24.96; SD = 5.72). There were 239 women and 22 men among the participants.

**Measures**

The study was conducted online using the HouseLab. Participants were asked to login into the research page. First, they were asked to perform the Implicit National Self-Esteem Test. Subsequently, the participants answered questionnaires containing several scales measuring attitudes towards a national in-group and feelings towards typical national out-groups (Jews, Germans and Russians).

**Implicit National Self-Esteem Test.** This was a web version of IAT test that measured positive vs negative associations with Polish symbols vs symbols of other, difficult to identify and mostly unknown to typical Polish student countries (e.g. Korea, Indonesia etc). The test was constructed
analogously to the implicit self-esteem IAT used by earlier studies where words associated with self (e.g. me, I, mine) were contrasted with words signifying unidentified others (Bosson, Swan & Pennebaker, 2000; Farnham, Greenwald & Banaji, 1999). The reaction times were measured when the Polish national symbols vs foreign symbols were combined with pleasant vs unpleasant words (see Greenwald et al, 1992). The D coefficient was conducted according to the algorithm provided by (Greenwald et al, 2003) (M = .14; SD = .26). The greater the D the greater implicit national self-esteem it indicates.

*Group Narcissism Scale* (α = .84; M = 3.21; SD = .75).

*Group Identification Scale* (M = 2.88; SD = .85) A measure proposed by Tropp & Wright (2001) was used. Participants were asked to indicate the relationship between self and the national group as described by a series of circles from separate (1 - no identification at all) through degrees of overlap until full overlap (7 - total identification)

*Blind* (α = .83; M = 2.52; SD = .83) and *Constructive Patriotism Scale* (α = .89; M = 4.40; SD = 1.10). The Polish translation of the scale proposed by Schatz, Staub & Lavine (1999) was used.

*Collective Private* (α = .85; M = 4.99; SD = 1.22) and *Public Self Esteem Scale* (α = .79; M = 4.03; SD = 1.04). The Polish translation of the subscales of the Collective Self Esteem scale proposed by Luthanen & Crooker (1992) was used.

*Outgroup negativity* (M = 3.82; SD = 1.11). The participants were asked to indicate their feelings towards typical outgroups – Jews, Germans and Russian using 6 semantic differentials describing 6 emotions (e.g. cold – warm, unfriendly – friendly) (see Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Wright, et al, 1997; Butz et al 2007). The higher scores indicated greater out-group negativity.

*Unjust Treatment from the European Union* (α = .83; M = 3.44; SD = .99). This scale measured how unfairly Polish participants feel their national group is treated by European Union. This scale consisted of the following items: (1) ‘How fairly is the EU treating Poland now?’ (1 – totally unfairly to 7 – totally fairly) (reversed); (2) ‘How fairly are the economic resources distributed between other countries of European Union and Poland?’ (1 – totally unfairly to 7 – totally fairly) (reversed); (3) ‘How fair are the benefits Poland draws from belonging to the EU?’ (1 – totally unfair to 7 – totally fair) (reversed); (4) ‘Polish benefits from the EU are higher than Polish inputs’ (1-
not true to 7 – true) (reversed); (5) ‘The EU treats Poland unfairly’ (1 – totally disagree to 7 – totally agree); (6). ‘Poles are discriminated by European laws that do to give them equal rights to work’; (7) ‘The EU cannot be just if it does not treat Poland justly’ and (8) ‘Just treatment of Poland by the EU is the historic necessity’. The higher the score the higher perceived injustice it indicated.

RESULTS

Group narcissism and collective self esteem and group identification and implicit group self esteem

It was predicted that group narcissism will be high among participants strongly identifying with their national in-group and at the same time having negative implicit national self-esteem i.e. having more negative implicit associations with Polish symbols as compared with foreign symbols. The Polish data confirms that the group narcissism is a form of uncertain group self-esteem. It can be seen as strong group identification underlined by uncertainty about the group worth and own identification of one’s own group as positive and worthy. The group narcissism was predicted by strong identification with Polish national group which was qualified by an interaction of the identification and implicit national self-esteem.

Table 6. National identification and implicit national self esteem as predictors of group narcissism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind patriotism</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National identification</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit national self esteem</td>
<td>-.07+</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National id*implicit self esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.149**</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (degrees of freedom)</td>
<td>33.04 (5,248)**</td>
<td>29.00 (6,247)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to probe the significant interaction, we computed simple slopes for the relationship between national identification and narcissism at implicit national self esteem one standard deviation above (high) and below (low) the variable’s mean, using Aiken and West’s (1991) method. These analyses indicated that the relationship between national identification and narcissism was significant and positive at low levels of implicit national self esteem ($b = .24; p < .000$), but non-significant at high levels of implicit national self esteem ($b = .12; p > .10$). Thus, the group narcissism is highest among people who strongly identify with Polish national group and at the same time have rather negative implicit associations with Polish national symbols as compared to foreign symbol which indicates low national implicit self-esteem.

The results also indicate that the group narcissism is predicted by collective self esteem. Interestingly, it is predicted by high private collective self esteem (i.e. own positive feelings and thoughts about the national in-group) and low public self esteem (i.e. a belief that others do not think highly about the national in-group. Moreover, the main effects are qualified by the interaction of the two aspects of the collective self esteem. In order to probe the significant interaction, we computed simple slopes for the relationship between national identification and narcissism at implicit national self esteem one standard deviation above (high) and below (low) the variable’s mean, using Aiken and
West’s (1991) method. These analyses indicated that the relationship between national identification and narcissism was significant and positive at low levels of implicit national self esteem ($b = .36; p < .001$), but non-significant at high levels of implicit national self esteem ($b = .27; p > .10$). Thus, the group narcissism is highest among people who think positively and highly about their in-group and at the same time think others do not think highly about it.

Table 7. Public and private collective self esteem as predictors of group narcissism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02+</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19+</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public collective self esteem</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private collective self esteem</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public*private self esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ (degrees of freedom)</td>
<td>17.04 (4, 262)***</td>
<td>15.96 (5, 261)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td></td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Group narcissism as predicted by private and public collective self esteem.

Group narcissism and blind and constructive patriotism
In Polish sample group narcissism is independently related to both constructive (b = .25; SE = .04; p < .000) and blind patriotism (b = 38; SE = .05; p < .000). It totally mediates the effects of blind patriotism on out-group negativity. After narcissism is put into the equation the relationship between blind patriotism and out-group negativity is reduced to non-significance and the negative relationship between constructive patriotism and out-group negativity emerges. Group narcissism fully mediates the effects of blind patriotism on out-group negativity. Thus, narcissistic aspect of blind patriotism is responsible for out-group negativism. Group narcissism is a suppressor variable that changes the prediction value of constructive patriotism. Narcissistic aspect of positive national attitude suppresses the positive reactions of constructive patriots to national out-groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive patriotism</td>
<td>-10.</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind patriotism</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.663</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (degrees of freedom)</td>
<td>3.92 (2, 258)*</td>
<td>7.04 (3, 257)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$(\Delta F_{1, 257} = 12.91, p<.000)$
The Sobel test (Baron & Kenny, 1986) was used to test the significance of the indirect effect of blind patriotism via group narcissism on the out-group negativity. The indirect effects were computed by multiplying the path from blind patriotism to the group narcissism by the path from the group narcissism to out-group negativity. These results indicate that the effects of blind patriotism are fully mediated by group narcissism (IE = .16, z = 2.35, p<.02).

**Group narcissism and perception of European Union injustice**

It was predicted that the group narcissism would lead to feelings of special entitlement and deservingness of the own group and perceived insufficient recognition form other groups. In case of Poland this can be observed in perception of the relationship between Poland and the European Union and perceived fairness of treatment of Poland by the EU and perceived fairness of Polish costs and benefits from the integration. Nationalistic attitudes were shown to be related to distrustful attitudes towards European integration and perception of greater costs than benefits for Poland (Skarzynska & Golec de Zavala, 2006). It was predicted that the group narcissism underlying Polish nationalism will

---

**Figure 7.** Relationship between blind patriotism, group narcissism and out-group negativity.
be responsible for such perceptions. The results indicate that group narcissism partially mediates effects of blind patriotism on perceived unfairness of the EU. After the group narcissism is put into the equation the relationship between blind patriotism and perception of EU as unjust towards Poland is reduced and the relationship between constructive patriotism and perceived benefits and just treatment from EU emerges. Narcissistic aspect of positive national attitude suppresses the positive reactions of constructive patriots to European Union. Narcissistic aspect of blind patriotism is responsible for the deservingness attitudes and perception of treatment of Poland by the EU as unjust.

Table 9. Group narcissism predicts deservingness (perception of EU treatment of Poland as unjust) better than blind patriotism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive patriotism</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind patriotism</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant                 2.348     258     1.647     .262
F (degrees of freedom)    18.75 (2, 257)*** 29.08 (3, 256)***
R²                      .127     .254     .259     .259
N                      259     259

(ΔF(1,256) = 43.54, p<.000)

Table 10. Correlations of group narcissism, patriotism, out-group negativity and perception of the EU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Narcissism</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind patriotism</td>
<td>.550***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>.515***</td>
<td>.353 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriotism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unjust EU</td>
<td>.470***</td>
<td>.357 ***</td>
<td>.130*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup negativity</td>
<td>.210**</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.230***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDY 3

Participants

The study was conducted among 203 students of a large Mexican university. Their age ranged from 17 to 33 (M = 20.10; SD = 2.21). There were 147 women and 56 men among the participants.

Measures
The participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire containing following measures:

*Group Narcissism Scale* $(\alpha = .70; \ M = 3.85 \ SD = .77)$. The short, 9 version of the scale translated to Spanish was used.

*Social Dominance Scale*. $(\alpha = .87; \ M = 2.64; \ SD = .72)$. The 14 items version of the scale proposed by translated to Spanish was used (Pratto, et al., 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

*Preference of escalatory* $(\alpha = .77; \ M=3.16, \ SD= 1.25)$ *over cooperative* $(\alpha = .60; \ M = 4.73; \ SD = 1.22)$ *actions in a domestic political conflict* $(M = -1.57 \ SD = 2.04)$. The Questionnaire measuring preferences for actions in inter-group conflict proposed by Golec de Zavala (2005) translated to Spanish was used. The participants were presented with a description of a domestic conflict that took place in Mexico during the time the study was conducted (rebellious APPO in the state of Oaxaca demonstrating and street fighting against the Mexican government and its police). Strategy preference ratings were made on 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (*highly unlikely*) to 7 (*highly likely*).

*Preference for actions towards the US in response to the construction of the wall over the American – Mexican border*. The following items were analyzed: (1) ‘Mexicans should try to destroy the wall’ (1 – totally disagree to 7 – totally agree) $(M = 5.07 \ SD = 1.90)$ and (2) ‘Mexicans should boycott American companies and products on the Mexican market $(M=4.57; \ SD= 2.27)$.

*Perception of the construction of the wall as disrespectful* $(\alpha = .86; \ M = 5.52; \ SD = 1.61)$. The following items were used to construct this measure: (1) ‘The construction of the wall along Mexican-American border by the US is offensive for Mexico and Mexicans’; (2) ‘The construction of the wall indicates the lack of respect of the Americans fro Mexicans; (3) ‘The construction of the wall demonstrates American arrogance’ and (4) ‘The construction of the wall demonstrates the prejudice American have against Mexicans’.

*Perception of the US as helpful to Mexico’s growth*. One item was used: (1) ‘Thanks to the US Mexico can export and grow’ $(M=3.32, \ SD= 1.89)$.

**RESULTS**

*Group narcissism, SDO and out-group aggressiveness*
The results of the study indicate that the group narcissism predicts preference for fighting over cooperating with an outgroup in a domestic conflict as strongly as SDO and independently of SDO (see Table 11).

Table 11. SDO and group narcissism as predictors of preference for escalatory over cooperative actions in domestic conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-4.31**</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (degrees of freedom)</td>
<td>3.11 (4, 192)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.65 (5,192)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controlling for age, gender and research conditions (ΔF(1,191) = 10.21, p<.002)

Group narcissism, SDO and preferred actions towards an out-group dependent on perception of the inter-group relations

The results show that the group narcissism and SDO predict differently the perception of an inter-group situation i.e. the construction of the wall along the Mexican- American border. The group narcissism predicts perception of the wall as lack of respect from the out-group. SDO predict disagreement with this perception (see Table 12). Further analysis reveals that SDO is related to perception of Mexican-American relations as serving Mexican economy (see Table 13).

SDO and group narcissism predict preference for different actions towards the US. The group narcissism predicts a tendency to use destructive actions to deal with the out-group (see Table 15), whereas SDO predicts rejection of boycotting of American companies as a response to the construction of the wall (see Table 16). The preferred actions are mediated by different perceptions of the inter-group situation generated by high group narcissism and high SDO. Among the group narcissists the tendency to prefer destructive actions towards the US (destruction of the wall or boycotting the American companies) is partially mediated by perception of the actions of the out-group as disrespectful (see Figures 5 and 6). People high in SDO perceive the US as help in national growth and they oppose actions against the US especially in the economic domain (see Figure 7).
Table. 12. SDO and group narcissism as predictors of perception of construction of the wall on Mexican and the US border as disrespect to Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant 5.704 1.318
F (degrees of freedom) 3.00 (5, 191)**
R² .073
N 196

Controlling for age, gender and research conditions

Table. 13. SDO and group narcissism as predictors of perception of the US as supporting economic growth of Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant 3.30 .77
F (degrees of freedom) 3.52 (5, 191)*
R² .034
N 196

Controlling for age, gender and research conditions

Table. 15. SDO and group narcissism as predictors of support for destructive actions towards the US (destroy the wall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant .11 1.54
F (degrees of freedom) 2.56 (5, 197)*
R² .061
N 202

Controlling for age, gender and research conditions

Table. 16. SDO and group narcissism as predictors of opposition towards the boycott of American companies in response to the wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group narcissism</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant 4.15 1.90
F (degrees of freedom) 2.23 (5, 197)*
R² .054
N 202

Controlling for age, gender and research conditions
The Sobel test (Baron & Kenny, 1986) was used to test the significance of the indirect effect via perception of construction of the wall on the Mexican-American border as disrespectful towards Mexico. The indirect effects were computed by multiplying the path from group narcissism to the mediator by the path from the mediator to action preference conservatism. These results indicate that group narcissism, over and above its significant direct effect ($b = .45; SE = .17; p < .001$), has an indirect effect on preference for destructive actions via perception of the construction of the wall ($IE = .13, z = 2.15, p < .03$). Similar indirect effect was found for the boycott of American companies in Mexico. Here, the direct effect of group narcissism on the preference for boycott was reduced to non-significance and the indirect effect is significant ($IE = .24; z = 2.43; p < .02$).
Figure 9. Relationship between group narcissism, perception of the situation and preferred actions (boycott).
Figure 10. Relationship between SDO, perception of the situation and preferred actions (boycott).

The indirect effect of SDO was also found for the boycott of American companies in Mexico. The direction of the effect is different. High SDO is related to perception of a role of the US as positive, stimulating economic growth of Mexico. Through this perception the negative effect of SDO on support for the boycott is fully mediated. The direct effect of SDO narcissism on the preference for boycott is reduced to non-significance and the indirect effect is marginally significant (IE = -.06; z = -1.72; p < .06).

Table. 17. Correlations of the SDO, group narcissism, inter-group attitudes and perceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexico grows thanks to the US</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans should boycott american companies and products in response to the Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.153*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans should try to destroy the wall</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.400***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the way is a sign disrespect towards Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.439***</td>
<td>.300***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for escalation over cooperation in conflict with government SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.248***</td>
<td>.407***</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for escalation over cooperation in conflict with government Group narcissism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>-.124+</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.222**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.225**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The concept of the group narcissism

The present paper introduces a new concept – ‘group narcissism’ defined as high but unstable and uncertain group esteem, grandiose image of an in-group combined with a desire to validate it because the inflated view is consistently (more or less consciously) doubted. The scale to measure the group narcissism was constructed based on the definition of the concept and earlier measurements of narcissism on individual level, regarding self rather than a group. The
results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses conducted on data collected from three studies conducted in the US (N = 262), Poland (N=401) and the UK (N=47) confirm that the factorial structure of the Group Narcissism Scale. They provide one factorial solution, with nine items loading on one latent factor. All loadings of the items on the factor are greater than .500. The solution explains about 30% of variance. The scale has satisfactory (.70 in Mexican sample) to high (.86 in American sample, .84 in Polish sample) internal reliability.

Group narcissism as uncertain high collective self esteem

The results of the present studies provide evidence that confirms the complex and unstable nature of group feelings underlying the group narcissism. The results of study 1 indicate that the group narcissism is predicted by a specific combination of beliefs about one’s group: belief in the group’s superiority and belief in injustice done to the group by others. The group narcissism is then underlined by a belief that own group does not receive all it deserves due to its special, superior status. The results of the Polish data confirm this interpretation. They show that the group narcissism is highest among people who think positively and highly about their in-group and at the same time think others do not think highly about it. The group narcissism is predicted by an interaction of public and private collective self esteem that indicate that group narcissists have high private collective self esteem (i.e. think about their in-group highly) and low public self-esteem (i.e. at the same time they assume that others do not think about their in-group well enough).

The Polish data provide some more interesting insight as to the nature of the group self-esteem. They confirm that the group narcissism is a form of uncertain group self-esteem. It can be seen as strong group identification underlined by uncertainty about the in-group’s worth or uncertainty about own feelings towards the in-group. The group narcissism was predicted by strong identification with Polish national group which was qualified by an interaction of the identification and implicit national self-esteem (negative rather than positive associations with group symbols as measured by the IAT test). It might be that the own uncertainty about the own in-group’s worth is not acknowledged and is then projected outside and perceived and condemned in others. Thus, the group narcissist may
think about their group highly but they are not certain of that greatness which is indicated by their low
implicit group self esteem. They do not acknowledge this uncertainty but project it to other groups
that are perceived as treating the in-group unfairly (not as it deserves due top its greatness) and do not
think about it highly enough.

Group narcissism and group identification and patriotism

In order to test the validity of the Group Narcissism Scale the correlations were assessed with
similar variables. The results of presented studies indicate that the group narcissism is not related to
individual self-esteem but it is related to strong in-group identification and high collective self-esteem
although, as mentioned earlier this positive image is rather unstable underlined by own unconscious
uncertainty about the greatness of the in-group and fear of lack of proper appreciation from other
groups. The national narcissism is related to patriotism i.e. positive affect and attachment towards
one’s nation. Most importantly, in the American the group, it is related only to the blind patriotism i.e.
unconditional love for one’s country and nation, with no reflection about the meaning and
consequences of its actions and their evaluation according to universal principles, blind belief that
everything the nation does is good and laudable. Among Americans constructive patriotism i.e.
reflective and mature love for one’s nation that does not exclude possibility for criticism that is aiming
at improving it - is not related to the national narcissism. Thus, in American sample, the grandiose but
uncertain and unstable image of one’s nation is related to uncritical adoration of its greatness and
rejection of mature reflection and criticism. In Polish sample, the group narcissism is independently
related to both blind and constructive patriotism. The image of Poland as great but unfairly treated by
other nations throughout history is deeply grinded into Polish patriotism. Poland has been seen as the
‘Christ of nations’ whose sacrifice (during partition times - XIX century - and WWII) brought about
the positive changes in Europe. Thus, the unnoticed and unappreciated greatness of Poland is an
element of constructive patriotism that is not necessarily related to deservingness and negativity
related to blind patriotism among Poles. Removing the narcissistic aspect from Polish patriotism
brings about the positive association between constructive patriotic love for one’s nation with positive
feelings towards other nations and perception of the membership in the EU as great benefit to Poland.
On the other hand, narcissistic aspect of blind patriotism are responsible for the effects of blind patriotism on out-group negativity and the attitude of deservingness towards the EU.

**Group narcissism and social dominance orientation**

The group narcissism is a strong predictor of out-group negativity and preference for destructive actions in inter-group conflict. Its predictions when it comes to group behavior in an inter-group conflict are often similar to those of the social dominance orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). There is an overlap between social these two variable but they tap different aspect of the positive attitude towards one’s in-group. The social dominance orientation pertains to strive for one’s n-group dominance over other groups especially in the domain of economy and political power. The negativity toward other groups associated with the SDO stems from competitiveness (Dukkit, 2006). The strive for dominance and competitiveness are not necessarily an important aspect of the group narcissism. Competence may assume existence of objective criteria based on which the groups can be evaluated and compared. However, the group narcissism is not about objective comparisons. It is underlined by a need to see others as doubting the greatness of one’s in-group since they do not want to acknowledge that the doubts may be their own. The perceived greatness of one’s in-group does not have to stem from its dominant position, either. Some groups can find their greatness in their humiliation (see Polish example). The results confirm that the effects of the SDO and the group narcissism in inter-group context are independent predictors and sometimes quite different.

In certain contexts the SDO and the group narcissism seem to motivate different perceptions of inter-group relations and different inter-group attitudes. In the Mexican study, the group narcissism leads to preference for aggressive actions towards the out-group because the actions of the out-group are perceived as disrespectful. SDO, on the other hand, lead to refusal of destructive actions, especially in economic domain (boycotting of American companies) because people high in the SDO see the out-group i.e. the US as contributing to growing economic and political position of Mexico. Mostly due to this perception the negative actions towards the US in economic sphere are rejected.

However, SDO was not related to lower aggressiveness in general. On the contrary, together with, although independently of the group narcissism, it predicted the preference for escalatory, destructive strategies on behalf of rebellious APPO towards the Mexican government. In the real-life
conflict that was presented to participants of the Mexican study, the organization created from protesting labor union i.e. the APPO was struggling for dominance in already escalated conflict. The participants were asked to identify with APPO when choosing preferred strategies of action in this conflict. Both the SDO and the group narcissism predicted choice of escalatory, coercive strategies of action in already escalating conflict.

The Mexican data provide the illustration of the nature of the aggressiveness resulting from the group narcissism. While the Polish data showed that the group narcissism is related to greater negativity towards traditional out-group, the Mexican data provide further explanation of this negativity. These data show that the group narcissism is related to greater preference for destructive measures against the opponent in inter-group conflict. The aggressiveness is mediated by perception of the actions of the other group as offensive and disrespectful.

The group narcissism emerges as an important variable that accounts for big percentage of variance in inter-group behavior and attitudes independently of other psychological variables and sometimes differently than these variables. Most of all, the group narcissism helps explain the negative inter-group consequences of blind and nationalistic identification with one’s nation. Further studies are needed to differentiate the effects of individual and group narcissism. Experimental studies are needed in order to test the theoretical prediction that the group narcissism is the best predictors of inter-group violence when there is a threat to an honor or good name of an in-group when situation can be interpreted in terms of lack of respect and appreciation for the in-group.
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