

COLLECTIVE NARCISSISM AND INTERGROUP HOSTILITY: THE DARK SIDE OF
'IN-GROUP LOVE'.

Agnieszka Golec de Zavala
Middlesex University, London

Word count: 4830

Abstract word count: 144

Abstract

This paper addresses the relationship between ‘in-group love’ and ‘out-group hate’ and integrates findings of psychology of intergroup relations with findings regarding psychological outcomes of narcissism. It reviews current research on intergroup consequences of collective narcissism – an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief in exaggerated greatness of an in-group - which indicates that the differentiation between narcissistic and genuine positive group regard uncovers the potential of genuine ‘in-group’ love to motivate positive out-group attitudes and intergroup tolerance. It also sheds new light on these aspects of positive group attachment that inspire intergroup hostility. Narcissistic idealization of an in-group is contingent on external validation and underlain by internal doubts. Collective narcissists are never fully satisfied with external acknowledgment of the in-group and they are sensitive to anything that may undermine the in-group’s exaggerated image. Collective narcissism is reliably related to defensive and retaliatory intergroup hostility.

Key words: collective narcissism, intergroup hostility, intergroup threat, collective self-esteem, patriotism

“He who loves not his country, can love nothing” George Byron

"It is always possible to bind together a considerable number of people in love, so long as there are other people left over to receive the manifestations of their aggressiveness"

Sigmund Freud

In his Letter to the American People, Osama Bin Laden calls for moral betterment of Western civilization under the guidance of fundamentalist Islam and warns:

“If the Americans refuse to listen to our advice and the goodness, guidance and righteousness that we call them to, then be aware that you will lose this Crusade Bush began (...)” .

The whole letter expresses Bin Laden’s belief in moral superiority of the social group he represents that entitles this group not only to guide and dominate other groups but also to punish those who do not recognize its extraordinary characteristics. From this perspective, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 can be seen as retaliation in response to humiliating lack of regard for the superior group. They are among many examples of atrocities committed in the name of a belief that the greatness of a social group is not recognized by others because they do not submit to the group’s demands for privileged treatment. The Nazis believed their group was threatened because their right for better living space and pure blood was not properly appreciated by other nations. This belief legitimized aggressive war and genocide (e.g. Adorno, 1951).

Inflated beliefs in one’s own superiority and entitlement contingent on continuous external validation are characteristic of narcissism (e.g. Crocker & Park, 2004; Emmons, 1987; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Individual narcissism predicts retaliatory aggressiveness in response to ego-threat such as criticism or lack of recognition. Narcissism is also a reliable predictor of interpersonal anger and an inability to forgive past offences accompanied by a tendency to seek vengeance (e.g. Baumeister, Smart & Boden,

1996; Brown, 2004; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Exline, Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell & Finkel, 2004; Raskin, Novacek & Hogan, 1991; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Ruiz, Smith & Rhodewalt, 2001).

We claim that individual narcissism has a counterpart at the social level of self. The proposition that narcissism can be collective has been articulated in several different ways. For example, it has been argued that whole societies can become narcissistic because of the relentless spread of narcissistic characteristics and behaviors among individuals (Campbell, Miller & Buffardi, 2010; Twenge & Campbell, 2009). It has been also proposed that groups can have narcissistic features (e.g. grandiose self-image) and act in narcissistic ways (e.g. aggress against subjectively threatening others; Adorno, 1951; Baumaister, 2002). It has been also argued that narcissism can be expressed at a group level as a specific form of out-group derogation such as racism, sexism or nationalism (Emmons, 1987).

We define collective narcissism as an individual's emotional investment in an unrealistic belief in the exaggerated greatness of an in-group (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson & Jayawickreme, 2009). Inasmuch as people can idealize the self, they can idealize social groups to which they belong and differ with extend they do so (see also, Bizman, Yinon, & Krotman, 2001; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Hornsey, 2003).

Narcissistic idealization of an in-group is contingent on its external recognition and involves hypersensitivity to threats to the in-group's image. Collective narcissists react to such threats with out-group hostility. Our studies indicate that collective narcissism represents an exaggerated in-group preference that is reliably accompanied by out-group negativity in the context of perceived intergroup threat. Importantly, collective narcissism is related to derogation of other groups *only* when these groups are perceived as threatening the in-group's image. At the same time, collective narcissism increases the likelihood that an intergroup situation will be interpreted as threatening.

Assessing collective narcissism

The extent to which people hold narcissistic beliefs about their in-groups is assessed by the means of the Collective Narcissism Scale used in all studies discussed below (see Table 1). The items of the Collective Narcissism Scale were generated based on the existing inventories of individual narcissism (e.g. Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI); Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988¹). Items corresponding to self-absorption, authority, exceptionality, deservingness and superiority of the self that could be meaningfully translated onto a group level were selected. Items which referred to physical attractiveness or individual performance that could not be meaningfully converted into group characteristics or actions were not included. For selected items, beliefs about the self were replaced with beliefs about a social group. In all studies collective narcissism has been assessed with reference to a particular social group. Participants were instructed which group to think about while responding to the items of the scale².

The construct of collective narcissism and the items selected to measure it were discussed with experts in the fields of political and social psychology, clinical psychology, political science and conflict resolution practitioners. After this discussion the wording of some items was adjusted to better reflect the crucial aspects of the concept of collective narcissism. The reliability, one-factorial structure and divergent, convergent and predictive validity of the scale were confirmed through psychometric analyses including Confirmatory and Exploratory Factor Analyses in 4 different samples. The initial scale including 23 items was shortened to contain only 9 best fitting items (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009).

Table 1. Items of the Collective Narcissism Scale (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009).

Please think about (...) as your group when you respond to the statements below. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with these statements using the following scale:

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

1. I wish other groups would more quickly recognize the authority of my group.
2. My group deserves special treatment.
3. I will never be satisfied until my group gets all it deserves.
4. I insist upon my group getting the respect that is due to it.
5. It really makes me angry when others criticize my group.
6. If my group had a major say in the world, the world would be a much better place.
7. I do not get upset when people do not notice achievements of my group. (reversed)
8. Not many people seem to fully understand the importance of my group.
9. The true worth of my group is often misunderstood.

We expect that different people can hold narcissistic beliefs about different social groups, and the same people can be narcissistic about certain groups (or just one group) but not necessarily about all social groups they belong to. Expressed levels of collective narcissism are also likely to be, at least to some extent, affected by characteristics of particular intergroup contexts or temporary situational factors. Recent studies confirm that collective narcissism increases after the negative evaluation of an in-group or when people feel temporarily insecure as group members, especially when they regard the group as important (Golec de Zavala, 2010). For example, levels of collective narcissism (but not collective self-esteem or national identification) increased in Poland after the “Smolensk tragedy” of 10th of April, 2010: the airplane crash that killed Polish president, his wife and

over 50 other Polish officials. The “Smolensk tragedy” is regarded the largest national tragedy since World War II and produced strong feelings of collective uncertainty and lack of control (Cichocka, Golec de Zavala & Olechowski, 2011).

Collective narcissism and inter-group hostility

Collective narcissism reliably predicts intergroup hostility in the context of intergroup threat. It predicts intergroup negativity over and above such other robust predictors as social dominance orientation, right wing authoritarianism, or different forms of ‘destructive’ positive regard for an in-group such as nationalism, blind patriotism or national in-group glorification. Collective narcissism predicts out-group hostility for different reasons than social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. There is also a qualitative difference between collective narcissism and other forms of exaggerated group esteem (e.g. Golec de Zavala, 2007; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011a, b; Imhoff, Erb & Wohl, 2010).

Collective narcissism and other predictors of intergroup violence

Studies show that the relationship between collective narcissism and out-group hostility is mediated by the perception of the actions of the out-group as threatening the in-group’s image (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011b). The protection of the in-group’s idealized image is, however, only of partial importance for people high in social dominance orientation (e.g. Jost & Thompson, 2000; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) and it is even less vital for authoritarians, preoccupied primarily with safety and order than with the in-group’s image (e.g. Duckitt, 2006)³.

For example, in a study conducted in USA in 2005, American collective narcissism predicted support for military aggression against Iraq along with social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. However, only the effects of collective narcissism were mediated by the belief that the greatness of the national in-group was threatened by external aggression (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009; Study 1). Even more clearly, the role of narcissistic concern with the in-group's image was demonstrated in a study conducted in Mexico. The study was conducted shortly after the US began constructing a wall along the American-Mexican border in order to reduce illegal immigration. Collective narcissism (but not social dominance orientation or authoritarianism) predicted the perception of the construction of the wall as an insult to Mexico and Mexicans. This perception mediated the relationship between Mexican collective narcissism and support for destructive actions such as boycotting American firms on the Mexican market or attempts to physically destroy the wall. These actions were not supported by Mexicans high in social dominance orientation who saw the US as an ally helping Mexico to achieve a world-leading position, or authoritarians who perceived the wall as a matter of protection from terrorist threat (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009; Study 5). This study, in particular, demonstrated that collective narcissists tend to interpret ambiguous actions of an out-group as threatening the in-group's image.

Another study that confirms this tendency was conducted in Poland. It was designed around the publication of a book entitled "*Fear: Anti-Semitism in Poland after Auschwitz. An essay in historical interpretation*" authored by Jan Tomasz Gross, an American historian and sociologist of Polish-Jewish origin. This book reports experiences of Polish Jews returning home after the World War II. It examines the aspects of Polish-Jewish relations in which Poles were perpetrators rather than victims (as maintained in the nationalistic narrative) of intergroup violence. Polish collective narcissists agreed that this book was "*malignant*" and "*insulting to Poles and Poland*". Moreover, this perception of the book mediated the

relationship between Polish collective narcissism and hostile intentions towards the author of the book and negative emotions towards Jews.

These relationships were independent of the positive association between collective narcissism and enduring anti-Semitic prejudice in Poland. It is pertinent that studies show that the relationship between Polish collective narcissism and anti-Semitism is driven by the stereotypical perception of Jews as threatening Polish identity and national pride and the perception of national group as vulnerable to external threats (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011b).

Experimental studies confirm that collective narcissists react with retaliatory hostility towards other groups whose actions or opinions undermine the in-group's idealized image. After the role of collective narcissism is accounted for, social dominance orientation, authoritarianism, collective self-esteem, positive in-group identification or individual narcissism do not increase chances of hostile response to the in-group's image threat in any significant way. In addition, narcissistic hostility in response to group image threat is direct, retaliatory and not displaced. It targets only the out-group whose members criticized or otherwise threatened the positive image of the in-group. Importantly, such moderating effects of collective narcissism are found in the context of a national group, but also other, more mundane social groups such as college peers (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011a).

In one study, undergraduate students were exposed to a negative opinion about their university expressed by students of another university, comparable in status and prestige. Only those students who narcissistically identified with their university used a subsequent opportunity to harm the chances of the other university to win a contest for research funding. Acting as peer reviewers in an alleged inter-university contest, they suggested lower funding only for those contestants who represented the university whose students issued the negative opinion about their university but not for students representing other universities.

Importantly, this study demonstrated also that collective narcissists responded aggressively to the critical opinion about the in-group *because* they saw it as personally threatening (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011a; Study 3). Conceivably, thus, the collective narcissistic hostility functions to protect the self by restoring the threatened greatness of an in-group. Such interpretation of the psychological function of collective narcissism was proposed by Theodore Adorno in his analysis of the mechanisms of the Nazi regime rise to power (Adorno, 1951).

Collective narcissism and other forms of in-group preferential positivity

The concept of collective narcissism corresponds to the rich literature that looks at the sources of intergroup hostility in some form of ‘in-group love’: preferential positivity towards an in-group. Within this literature, the high regard for an in-group is considered detrimental for intergroup relations. However, the results of empirical studies are inconsistent. Reviews and meta-analyses indicate that the average relationship between the strength of in-group identification or in-group positivity and out-group derogation is close to zero (e.g. Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Jackson, Brown, Brown & Marks, 2001; Pehrson et al., 2009; see also Brewer, 1999).

Some authors differentiate between ‘destructive’ and ‘benevolent’ forms of national in-group positivity (e.g. Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Schatz, Staub & Lavine, 1999). More specifically, they suggest that only certain forms of positive national attachment (e.g. nationalism or blind patriotism) are reliably accompanied by hostility towards other groups, whereas others are not (e.g. constructive patriotism). The inconsistent results of previous studies may be, therefore, explained by the possibility that the different measures of positive in-group identification tap differently onto the overlap between constructive and destructive forms of positive group regard.

To our knowledge, the research on collective narcissism is the first one to demonstrate that the distinction between more and less ‘destructive’ forms on ‘in-group love’ can extend and generalize beyond the context of national groups⁴. Studies confirm that people can be narcissistic about different social groups. Apart from national group, collective narcissism was assessed and examined with reference to an ethnic group⁵, college peers, and ideological organizations such as political party or religious group (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka & Bilewicz, 2011).

More importantly, above and beyond describing yet another ‘belligerent’ form of in-group attachment, studies and theorizing on collective narcissism offer an insight into the psychological mechanism underlying the relationship between narcissistic in-group positivity and hostility towards out-groups. In this important regard, the concept of collective narcissism advances our knowledge about the capacity of positive group esteem to inspire intergroup hostility. Collective narcissism is also the only deprived from of ‘in-group love’ that, somewhat paradoxically, expands our understanding of predictors of intergroup tolerance and openness. It reveals the neglected possibility that genuine positive regard for one’s in-group may create foundations for development of *positive* attitudes towards out-groups.

Differentiation of narcissistic ‘in-group love’ and attitudes towards out-groups

The concept of collective narcissism allows us to describe a form of ‘in-group love’ that is reliably related to retaliatory intergroup hostility and generalizes beyond the context of a national in-group. Studies indicate that when the narcissistic aspect of in-group positivity is accounted for, the potential of positive regard for an in-group to inspire positive attitudes towards out-groups emerges. In other words, narcissistic aspect of in-group positivity suppresses the relationship between non-narcissistic positive regard for an in-group and

tolerance and openness towards out-groups. Noteworthy, this effect concerns attitudes towards realistic out-groups with whom the in-group shares a common history hardly ever entirely smooth and peaceful⁶. The same suppression effect was demonstrated for positive in-group regard conceptualized as collective self esteem, in-group identification, positive in-group affect, high centrality of the in-group to the self and strong ties with the in-group, or constructive patriotism. It was found in different cultural contexts, among students as well as in a representative sample of adults, in the context of national group identification and positive attachment to one's university. The results indicate that positive in-group regard may promote positive intergroup relations in and of itself but that it is often conflated with narcissistic, exaggerated forms of group esteem that inspire negative attitudes towards out-groups (Golec de Zavala et al., 2011).

More specifically, our studies have demonstrated that when the overlap between narcissistic and non-narcissistic group positivity is taken into account and statistically controlled, narcissistic and non-narcissistic in-group positivity have independent and *opposed* relationships with out-group derogation (Golec de Zavala et al., 2011). Partialling out the relationship collective narcissism has with different forms of in-group positivity significantly strengthens the relationship between collective narcissism and negative attitudes towards the out-groups. Collective narcissism without the aspects of genuine, positive in-group regard is especially strongly related to derogation of the out-groups.

On the other hand, when its overlap with collective narcissism was not controlled for, the genuine positive in-group regard showed no consistent relation with negative attitudes towards the same out-groups, corroborating the results of previous reviews and meta-analyses. However, when the common variance between narcissistic and non-narcissistic in-group positivity was controlled, the association of genuine 'in-group love' and out-group negativity became significant and *negative*. Thus, there is something about non-narcissistic

in-group positivity that mitigates the relationship between collective narcissism and out-group negativity. On the other hand, narcissistic aspect of in-group positivity significantly suppresses its potential to inspire out-group positivity and tolerance.

Importantly, the positive relationship between genuine 'in-group love' and tolerant and positive attitudes towards out-groups was found *only* when narcissistic and non-narcissistic group regard were conceptually and empirically differentiated. The existing differentiations between more and less belligerent forms of positive national feelings do not systematically uncover the potential of constructive national feelings to predict positive attitudes towards national minorities and national out-groups (e.g. Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Schatz et al., 1999). In our studies, controlling the overlap between blind and constructive patriotism was not sufficient to reveal the significant negative relationship between constructive patriotism and out-group negativity. Only after the overlap between collective narcissism and constructive patriotism was also partialled out, did a negative and significant relationship between constructive patriotism and out-group negativity emerge (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2011). Thus, the concept of collective narcissism seems to cover a particularly important aspect of the belligerent form of group attachment in comparison to the glorifying national in-group blind patriotism or high national identification.

Collective narcissism as fragile 'in-group love'

Reasons for narcissistic intergroup hostility lie in the very nature of narcissistic beliefs about the in-group. Studies of individual narcissism suggest that narcissistic self-esteem is an insecure assertion of privileged status of the self that requires constant external admiration and recognition (e.g. Locke, 2009). Narcissists are motivated to seek external validation of their inflated self-image because their high self-esteem is accompanied by suppressed feelings of shame and low self-regard. The inflated narcissistic ego is, in fact, constantly

threatened by more or less acknowledged self-doubts (e.g. Jordan, Spencer, & Zanna, 2005) and narcissistic exaggerated self-esteem is unstable (e.g. Kernis, Grannemann, & Barclay, 1989; for review and discussion of existing controversies, see Bosson et al., 2008). Empirical findings confirm that also at the group level, collective narcissism is not simply just a more positive evaluation of the in-group.

Our studies indicate that collective narcissism is predicted by high regard for an in-group and a belief that others do not appreciate the in-group sufficiently. Collective narcissism is predicted by the interaction of high private collective self-esteem (a high opinion about one's in-group) and low public collective self-esteem (a belief that others do not hold the in-group in high regard) and an interaction of a belief in in-group's superiority and a belief that the in-group is unfairly treated and unappreciated by others (Golec de Zavala, 2007; Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009). In addition, collective narcissism is highest among people who explicitly assert high regard for their in-group but do not prefer their group over other groups on the level of automatic evaluative associations (assessed by a means of the Implicit Associations Test). In other words, collective narcissism is predicted by high explicit and low implicit regard for the in-group (Golec de Zaval et al, 2009, Study 4). Thus, the narcissistic, exaggerated in-group's image seems to be inherently fragile, shadowed by internal doubts and vulnerable to threat. Therefore, collective narcissists rarely view the in-group's acknowledgement by others as satisfactory. They quickly develop "tolerance" to known sources of support for exaggerated in-group's image and are constantly vigilant for new signs of anything undermining the group.

The above account is in line with, but also goes beyond previous findings indicating that intergroup hostility is predicted by high personal self-esteem in its fragile, threatened or unstable form (e.g. Fein & Spencer, 1997; Kernis, Grannemann & Barclay, 1989; Jordan, Spencer & Zanna, 2005). These findings can be explained by the overlap between collective

narcissism and fragile and narcissistic, personal self-esteem (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009). However, collective narcissism, rather than personal self-esteem, is a more accurate predictor of attitudes and behaviors at the intergroup level. The concept of collective narcissism also helps explain why the research on the role of collective self-esteem in intergroup relations has brought mixed findings, variably indicating positive, negative, or non-significant relationships between collective self-esteem and out-group negativity (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1991; Hunter et al., 2004; Hunter et al., 2005; Long & Spears, 1998; Long, Spears & Manstead, 1994; for a review, see Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). The differentiation between fragile and stable collective self-esteem seems important for better understanding of the effects of positive group regard on out-group negativity (see Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Rhodewalt & Petersen, 2009).

The consequences of the differentiation between collective self-esteem and collective narcissism should be analyzed similarly to the ramifications of the distinction between genuine and narcissistic personal self-esteem. Narcissism and genuine self-esteem overlap in their generally positive opinion about the self. However, they function as mutual suppressors reducing the association each has with interpersonal aggressiveness and antisocial behaviour. When their common variance is accounted for, they independently and reversely contribute to self-reported interpersonal anger and aggressiveness and anti-social behaviour among adults (Locke, 2009; Paulhus, Robins, Trzesniewski & Tracy, 2004), as well as a self-reported tendency to externalize problems through aggressiveness and delinquent behaviour among adolescents (Barry, Grafeman, Adler & Pickard, 2007; Donellan, Trzesniewski, Robins, Moffitt & Caspi, 2005). Narcissism is positively, while non-narcissistic self-esteem is negatively, related to interpersonal hostility and delinquency.

Concluding remarks

It has been the intuition of romantic poets, writers and philosophers that mature love of one's nation should inspire appreciation for other nations. This proposition has been neglected by empirical studies in psychology of intergroup relations. We propose that by conceptually and empirically differentiating between narcissistic and genuine in-group favoritism we can advance our understanding of the complex nature of the relationship between in-group positivity and out-group attitudes. Our research suggests that genuine 'in-group love' is often conflated with narcissistic need for admiration and recognition of the in-group that is related to *negative* out-group attitudes. Existing conceptualizations and operationalizations oftentimes capture both narcissistic and non-narcissistic components of in-group positivity. The existing conceptualizations and measurements of exaggerated or dangerous group attachments provide valuable direction and insights but do not tap precisely the nature of the psychological mechanism driving this relationship. Only when narcissistic aspect of in-group love is theoretically and empirically distinguished we can begin to understand how in-group positivity can inspire out-group tolerance.

The practical question to be considered is how we can untangle narcissistic and genuine positive group regard in real life-settings. One approach would be to define situations that increase chances of narcissistic in-group identification and identify conditions in which it can become normative. Our studies indicate that collective narcissism serves a defensive function compensating for loss of cognitive control over in-group's fate and feeling of insecurity as the in-group member. Further studies examining the social conditions in which narcissistic beliefs about an in-group become socially acceptable and 'contagious' *versus* conditions in which narcissistic identification with an in-group is discouraged and marginalized, will be a valuable extension of our understanding of conditions leading to intergroup violence *versus* intergroup harmony.

References

- Adorno, T. (1951). Freudian theory and the pattern of fascist propaganda. In M. Bernstein (Ed.), *Culture Industry* (pp. 132-158). New York: Routledge.
- Barry, C. T., Grafeman, S. J., Adler, K. K., & Pickard, J. D. (2007). The relations among narcissism, self-esteem, and delinquency in a sample of at-risk adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 30*, 933-942.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The Holocaust and the Four Roots of Evil. In L. S. Newman & R. Erber (Eds.), *Understanding genocide: The social psychology of the Holocaust*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., & Campbell, W. K. (2000). Self-esteem, narcissism, and aggression: Does violence *result* from low self-esteem or from threatened egotism? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*, 26-29.
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J.M. (1996). Relation of Threatened Egotism to Violence and Aggression: The Dark Side of High Self-Esteem. *Psychological Review, 103*(1), 5-33.
- Baumeister, R. F. , & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Narcissism as addiction to esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 206-209.
- Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Kreuger, J. I. & Vohs, K.D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyle? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4*, 1-44.
- Bizman, A., Yinon, Y., & Krotman, S. (2001). Group-based emotional distress: An extension of self-discrepancy theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1291–1300.
- Bizumic, B., & Duckitt, J. (2008). “My group is not worthy of me”: Narcissism and ethnocentrism. *Political Psychology, 29*, 437-453.

Bizumic, B., Duckitt, J., Popadic, D., Dru, V., & Krauss, S. (2008). A cross-cultural investigation into a reconceptualization of ethnocentrism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 871-899.

Bosson, J. K., Lakey, C. E., Campbell, W. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Jordan, C. H., & Kernis, M. H. (2008). Untangling the links between narcissism and self-esteem: A theoretical and empirical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 1415–1439.

Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 641-657.

Brewer, M.B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 429-444.

Brown, R. (2000) Social Identity Theory: past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 745-778.

Brown, R. (2004). Vengeance is mine: Narcissism, vengeance, and the tendency to forgive. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 576–584.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 219-229.

Byron, G. (1822). *Two Foscari. An historical tragedy*. Paris: Galignani.

Campbell, W. K., Miller, J. D. & Buffardi, L. E. (2010). The United States and the “Culture of Narcissism”: An examination of perceptions of national character. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*, 222-229.

Cichocka, A., Golec de Zavala, A. & Olechowski, M. (2011, January). *Defensive and genuine group identification in the face of collective trauma*. Poster accepted for the 12th Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, Texas.

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*, 392-414.

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 60-67.

de Figueiredo, R. J. P., & Elkins, Z. (2003). Are patriots bigots? An inquiry into the vices of ingroup pride. *American Journal of Political Science, 47*, 171–188.

Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T.E., & Caspi, A. (2005). Low self-esteem is related to aggression, antisocial behavior, and delinquency. *Psychological Science, 16*, 328 - 335.

Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of Right Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from competitiveness to outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 684-696.

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 11–17.

Exline, J. J., Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2004). Too proud to let go: Narcissistic entitlement as a barrier to forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 894– 912.

Fein, S., & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 31–44.

Golec de Zavala, A. (2007). *Collective narcissism and its social consequences*. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of International Society of Political Psychology, Portland, USA.

Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A. K., Eidelson, R., & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism as and its social consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 1074-1096.

Golec de Zavala, A., & Cichocka, A. (2011a). *Collective narcissism moderates the effect of threat to in-group's image on intergroup hostility*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Golec de Zavala, A., & Cichocka, A. (2011b). *Collective narcissism and Anti-Semitism in Poland*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2011). *The Paradox of In-group Love: Narcissistic and Genuine In-group Positivity and Out-group Attitudes*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Golec de Zavala, A. (2010). *Situations that increase narcissistic in-group love*. Research repost prepared for the completion of the British Academy Small Research Grant (SG090532).

Gramzow, R. H., & Gaertner, L. (2005). Self esteem and favoritism toward novel in-groups: The self as an evaluative base. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 801-815.

Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.) *Social Identity Theory. Constructive and critical advances*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hornsey, M.J. (2003). Linking superiority bias in the interpersonal and intergroup domains. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143, 479-491.

Hunter, J., Cox, S., O'Brien, K., Springer, M., Boyes, M., Banks, M., et al. (2005). Threats to group value, domain-specific self-esteem and intergroup discrimination amongst minimal and national groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 329–353.

Hunter, J., Kypri, K., Boyes, M., Stokell, N. M., O'Brien, K. S., & K. McMenamin. (2004). Social identity, self-evaluation and ingroup bias: The relative importance of particular domains of self-esteem to the ingroup. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 59-81.

Imhoff, R., Erb, H-P., & Wohl, M. (2010). *Just a matter of history? The impact of ongoing consequences of the past on collective guilt*. Manuscript in preparation.

Jackson, J. S., Brown, K. T., Brown, T. N., & Marks, B. (2001). Contemporary immigration policy orientations among dominant-group members in Western Europe. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 431–456.

Jackson, J.W. & Smith, E. R. (1999). Conceptualizing social identity: A new framework and evidence for the impact of different dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 120-135.

Jordan, C. H., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2005). Types of high self-esteem and prejudice: How implicit self-esteem relates to ethnic discrimination among high explicit self-esteem individuals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 693–702.

Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 209–232.

Kernis, M. H., Grannemann, B. D., & Barclay, L. C. (1989). Stability and level of self-esteem as predictors of anger arousal and hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 1013–1022.

Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology, 10*, 257–274.

Locke, K.D. (2009). Aggression, narcissism, self-esteem, and the attribution of desirable and humanizing traits to self versus others. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 99–102.

Long, K. M., & Spears, R. (1998). Opposing effects of personal and collective self-esteem on interpersonal and intergroup comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 913–930.

Long, K. M., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1994). The influence of personal and collective self-esteem on strategies of social differentiation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 313–329.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302-318.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 177–196.

Paulhus, D.L., Robins, R.W., Trzesniewski, K.H., & Tracy, J. L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioral research*, 39, 303-328.

Pehrson, S., Brown, R., Zagefka, H. (2009). When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist ingroup definitions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 61-76.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.

Raskin, R., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 911– 918.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-component analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890–902.

Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1995). Self and interpersonal correlates of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory: A review and new findings. *Journal of Research in Personality, 29*, 1–23.

Rhodewalt, F., & Sorrow, D. L. (2003). Interpersonal self-regulation: Lessons from the study of narcissism. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 519–535). New York: Guilford Press.

Rhodewalt, F., & Petersen, B. (2009, in press). The self and intergroup attitudes: Connecting “fragile” personal and collective self-concepts. In J. P. Forgas, J. Cooper & W. Crano (Eds.), *The psychology of attitudes and attitude change*. New York: Psychology Press.

Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory’s self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*, 40-62.

Ruiz, J. M., Smith, T. W., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Distinguishing narcissism and hostility: Similarities and differences in interpersonal circumplex and five factor correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 76*, 537–555.

Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology, 20*, 151–174.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York: Free Press.

Endnotes

¹ Empirical analyses indicate that collective and individual narcissism are positively related (the relationship ranges from $r = .15$ to $r = .27$; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Importantly, collective narcissism predicts intergroup bias and hostility that individual narcissism does not account for, whereas individual narcissism predicts interpersonal anger and aggressiveness that are not related to collective narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009; Studies 2 and 3). In addition, collective, but not individual narcissism moderates the hostile responses to group-based criticism (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011a).

² The extensive and detailed description of the construction and validation of the Collective Narcissism Scale can be found elsewhere (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Since its construction the Collective Narcissism Scale has been translated to Polish, Spanish, German, Chinese and Tamil and used in studies conducted in USA, UK, Poland, Mexico, Germany, China, Sri Lanka. It was used and tested on samples of students, representative samples of adults as well as specific samples such as Tamil Tigers detainees in Sri Lanka.

³ Collective narcissism and social dominance orientation are positively correlated. The strength of this relationship varies across samples: from insignificant $r = .08$ in a Mexican sample to high $r = .43$ in American samples (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009). More detailed analyses indicate that it is the social dominance orientation's concern of in-groups greatness, not its concern for group based hierarchy that has the unique relationship with collective narcissism (Golec de Zavala, 2007; see also Jost & Thompson, 2000). The relationship between collective narcissism and authoritarianism is positive but also varies across samples: from insignificant $r = .02$ in a Mexican sample to $r = .38$ in an American sample (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009).

⁴ Collective narcissism is positively related to blind patriotism ($r = .55$ to $r = .58$; Golec de Zavala et al, 2009; Golec de Zavala et al, 2011), nationalism ($r = .38$; Golec

de Zavala, 2007) and national in-group glorification ($r = .63$ in German and American sample; Golec de Zavala, 2007; Imhoff, et al, 2010). National collective narcissism and blind patriotism overlap in the uncritical approach towards the national group and a concern about protection of the in-group's positive image. However, unlike blind patriotism and in-group glorification that avoid criticism, collective narcissism is preoccupied with it. Collective narcissists are on the constant look out for criticism and threat to in-group's image. Collective narcissism and nationalism share the belief in the nation's inherent superiority. However, narcissistic superiority can be based on any distinguishing characteristics of the in-group not only its greater power and dominant position. Unlike nationalistic, narcissistic aggressiveness is defensive and retaliatory. It does not serve the purpose of achieving a dominant in-group position.

⁵ Ethnic collective narcissism may bear some similarity to the recently proposed reconceptualization of ethnocentrism as ethnic group self-importance and group-centeredness (Bizumic & Duckitt, 2008; Bizumic, et al. 2009). Collective narcissism is an exaggerated group-esteem underlain by internal doubts and contingent on external validation. Thus, while group self-importance and centeredness are part of collective narcissism, the narcissistic positive image of the in-group is excessive and difficult to sustain. Moreover, the internal fragility of narcissistic group-esteem motivates negativity and exclusion of only those out-groups that are perceived as threatening, rather than all other ethnic groups. Finally, the concept of collective narcissism helps not only to predict out-group negativity, but also to explain the mechanism beyond this link.

⁶ The relevance of the concept of collective narcissism to minimal groups has been discussed in more detail elsewhere (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009). People are more likely to be narcissistic about realistic social groups, rather than groups created ad hoc. On the other

hand, once the in-group attachment is formed it can quickly assume narcissistic form. In our studies, collective narcissism is assessed in the context of realistic social groups (e.g. a national group or university peers) and attitudes towards ‘meaningful’ out-groups are measured (e.g. ethnic minorities, neighbouring nations, competing universities). There are theoretical and empirical reasons to think that collective narcissists perceive such groups as threatening (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009). Lasting intergroup relations are hardly ever entirely peaceful and smooth. However, collective narcissists exaggerate and do not forgive or forget past offences against their in-groups. Thus, they are more likely to perceive ‘known’ out-groups as threatening. On the other hand, collective narcissism does not predict negative attitudes towards other groups that are not typically regarded as *out*-groups. Collective narcissism predicts hostility towards those groups only when intergroup threat is experimentally introduced e.g. by presenting participants with alleged in-group criticism coming from members of those groups (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2011a).