Collective Narcissism: Concept, Research, and Reflection

Authors: Xu Buxiao, The input "白洁" is a Chinese name, not an academic paper with LaTeX commands, citations, or

tags. In academic contexts, Chinese names should be transliterated rather than translated.

Bai Jie

If this refers to a specific academic author or context, please provide the full text with proper formatting (including

tags, LaTeX equations, etc.) as specified in the translation requirements., Li Ye, Guo Yongyu, Yongyu Guo

Date: 2022-02-15T00:35:26+00:00

Abstract

Collective narcissism is a classic construct that extends narcissism to the group level, currently defined as the belief that "one' s own group is exceptional and deserving of privileged treatment, yet not sufficiently recognized by others." Existing research has found it to possess strong explanatory power for intergroup hostility, as collective narcissists exhibit high sensitivity to threats against the ingroup' s image, status, or identity, tend to overestimate such threats, and harbor suspicion toward outgroups, while lack of self-worth and sense of control constitute important antecedents of collective narcissism. Given that extant research generally presupposes the vulnerability and negativity of collective narcissism—while its attributes are not necessarily so—future studies should explore both its negative and positive consequences on the basis of fully clarifying the meaning and structure of collective narcissism, reveal its multiple causes and intervention methods, and advance cross-cultural research.

Full Text

Collective Narcissism: Concept, Research, and Reflections

XU Buxiao[1],[2], **BAI Jie**[3], **LI Ye**[4], **GUO Yongyu**[3]
[1] Department of Psychology, Shaoxing University, Shaoxing 312000, China

[2] Center for Brain, Mind and Education, Shaoxing University, Shaoxing 312000, China
[3] School of Psychology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210097, China
[4] School of Psychology, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China

Abstract: Collective narcissism represents a classic construct that extends narcissism to the group level and is currently defined as the belief that "one' s own group is exceptional and entitled to privileged treatment, yet not sufficiently recognized by others." Existing research demonstrates that collective narcissism has considerable explanatory power for intergroup hostility, as collective narcissists exhibit heightened sensitivity to threats against their ingroup' s image, status, or identity, tend to overestimate threats and suspect outgroups, and suffer from low self-worth and diminished sense of control. Given that most current research presupposes the fragility and negativity of collective narcissism —attributes that are not necessarily inherent—future studies should first clarify its conceptualization and structure, then explore both its negative and positive consequences, reveal its multiple causes and intervention methods, and advance cross-cultural research.

Keywords: collective narcissism, group narcissism, collective self-esteem, group identification, intergroup conflict
Classification Code: B848

1 Introduction

Narcissism is a timeless and ever-relevant topic that has consistently attracted scholarly and public attention due to its rich connotations and connection to everyday life (Campbell & Crist, 2020; Sedikides, 2021; Yu et al., 2019). As research in this domain has expanded and deepened, investigators have not only distinguished various manifestations of narcissism—such as grandiose versus vulnerable narcissism (e.g., Miller et al., 2011), agentic versus communal narcissism (Gebauer et al., 2012), and admirative versus rivalrous narcissism (Back et al., 2013)—but have also turned their attention to narcissism expressed at the group level, namely collective narcissism, and begun investigating its effects at the intergroup level (e.g., Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Currently, collective narcissism has garnered active interest among scholars in personality psychology, social psychology, and political psychology internationally (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019), while domestic research remains limited (e.g., Cai & Gries, 2013; Wang et al., 2021). Given its theoretical significance and practical relevance for understanding major contemporary social issues (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020; Golec de Zavala & Keenan, 2021), and considering the absence of dedicated Chinese scholarship on this concept, this article introduces and reviews collective narcissism and existing research, reflects on limitations in the field, and outlines future directions to advance indigenous and cross-cultural research.

Received: 2021-12-08

Funding: National Social Science Fund Key Project (20AZD084), Shaoxing University Research Startup Project (20206029)
Corresponding Author: GUO Yongyu, E-mail: yyguo@njnu.edu.cn

It should be noted that the founders of this field (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) drew substantially from individual narcissism in both conceptualizing collective narcissism and developing its measurement instruments, and researchers have frequently borrowed theoretical assumptions and methodological approaches from the individual narcissism literature (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020; Golec de Zavala, 2011). Consequently, collective and individual narcissism share certain conceptual and methodological similarities. Nevertheless, collective narcissism is a relatively independent construct (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019) that primarily predicts intergroup attitudes and behaviors (which individual narcissism often cannot predict) and possesses numerous unique characteristics and effects (Golec de Zavala, 2018, 2019). The field has now established its own distinct research domain. Therefore, the following review of collective narcissism' s concept and research will not delve into individual narcissism; however, considering the potential connections between the two domains, the subsequent sections on research limitations and future directions will draw more extensively on recent advances in individual narcissism research (e.g., Krizan & Herlache, 2018; Miller et al., 2021) to inform our reflections and discussions.

2.1 Conceptual Definition of Collective Narcissism

Collective narcissism is currently defined as the belief that "one' s own group is exceptional and entitled to privileged treatment, yet not sufficiently recognized by others" (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019), or as an attitudinal orientation characterized by a grandiose, inflated ingroup image that depends on external recognition of the ingroup' s value (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020). In simpler terms, collective narcissism is collective self-esteem that depends on "others' admiration and recognition" (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009, p. 1085), or a belief in ingroup greatness that relies on external validation (Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala, 2018). In these conceptualizations, collective narcissism involves two core components: first, an exaggerated ingroup image, and second, the need for this exaggerated image to receive external recognition. In other words, an inflated ingroup image alone does not constitute collective narcissism; collective narcissists also desire or demand that others acknowledge or endorse this inflated image.

Collective narcissism was initially introduced into empirical research as a form of ingroup identification involving emotional investment in an unrealistic belief in the ingroup' s greatness (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). According to the field' s founders (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009, 2019), the essence of collective narcissism lies in dissatisfaction that the ingroup' s exceptionality is not adequately recognized externally. Various justifications can be invoked to claim this exceptionality, such as superior morality, profound culture, strong economic or military power, defense of democratic values, or even unusual suffering and sac-

rifice, as well as the abilities and qualities demonstrated by the ingroup. The specific rationale for collective narcissism depends on the ingroup' s prevailing normative narrative regarding the positive attributes that distinguish it from outgroups. Regardless of the justification, collective narcissistic beliefs reflect a desire for the ingroup to stand out from other groups and concern about potential threats to achieving this goal.

The "collective" in collective narcissism can refer to various types of groups to which individuals belong (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). This means people can feel narcissistic about any social group they belong to. Research to date has examined collective narcissism in relation to nations, ethnic groups (e.g., Golec de Zavala et al., 2009), political parties (e.g., Bocian et al., 2021), religious denominations (e.g., Marchlewska et al., 2019), heterosexual groups (e.g., Marchlewska, Górska et al., 2021), university alumni (e.g., Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013), work teams (e.g., Cichocka et al., 2021), and sports teams (e.g., Larkin & Fink, 2019). Among these, the most frequently studied and discussed group is the nation (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019)[2].

2.2 Historical Origins of Collective Narcissism

The concept of collective narcissism can be traced back at least to the 1950s and 1960s, when Frankfurt School representatives T. W. Adorno (1903–1969) and E. Fromm (1900–1980) respectively proposed and analyzed the concept, both viewing collective narcissism as an idealization of the ingroup aimed at compensating for individual inadequacies (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020; Guo, 2022). For instance, Adorno expressed similar ideas as early as 1951 based on S. Freud' s psychodynamic theory, though he had not yet used the term "collective narcissism,"merely noting the potential importance of narcissism in group identification (Adorno, 1951). In his later work "Theory of Pseudo-culture" (Adorno, 1959/1993), he explicitly proposed collective narcissism: "Collective narcissism corresponds to the fact that by making oneself a member of a higher and more comprehensive whole, in fact or in imagination, people compensate for their social powerlessness (which extends to the individual' s instinctual drives) and also for their guilt feelings (which arise from the individual' s failure to become what they should be and do what they should do according to their ideal self-image); for this whole, people attribute to it the qualities they themselves lack and are rewarded by vicariously sharing these qualities" (pp. 32–33). In his view, collective narcissism can be seen as a defense mechanism of the ego, whereby a weak ego "would suffer unbearable narcissistic injury if it did not seek to identify with the power and glory of the collective as compensation" (Adorno, 2005, p. 111).

Fromm analyzed collective narcissism more comprehensively, referring to it as "group narcissism" or "social narcissism." In his book *The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil*, Fromm (1964/2010) devoted an entire chapter to "individual and social narcissism," arguing that group narcissism, like individual narcissism, can be divided into benign and malignant forms. Benign narcissism focuses narcissistic investment on achievements to be accomplished; since real-

izing achievements requires contact with and integration of reality, narcissistic tendencies can be constrained within limits while simultaneously motivating members to strive for achievement. Malignant narcissism, by contrast, focuses narcissistic investment on what the group already possesses, such as group characteristics or past achievements; lacking constraints from reality, narcissistic tendencies and attendant dangers may increase. Thus, group narcissism is not necessarily negative when it does not exceed certain limits. Furthermore, Fromm summarized the pathological characteristics of group narcissism, 主要包括：缺乏客观和理性判断；需要从内群体自恋形象中获得满足；具有高度的威胁敏感性；渴望认同于强大领袖。在他看来，个人在生活中越是缺少真实满足，其群体自恋程度可能就越深，因群体自恋能补偿自我的可怜状况。他还认为，群体自恋是人类攻击行为最重要的原因之一。

Adorno and Fromm' s psychoanalytic perspectives undoubtedly inspired later scholars who pioneered the empirical study of collective narcissism (e.g., Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). However, it is important to note that the field's theories and research follow mainstream psychological paradigms and are independent of the psychoanalytic tradition, requiring no assumptions about unconscious conflicts or personality dynamics (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019).

3 Overview of Existing Research on Collective Narcissism

Since the publication of the seminal article that launched empirical research on collective narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, researchers have extensively explored this construct. Broadly speaking, early research focused primarily on establishing collective narcissism' s independent status by examining its predictive effects on various intergroup psychological and behavioral outcomes, while more recent studies have continued validating its explanatory power for numerous social phenomena and begun investigating its antecedents, aiming to develop mature theoretical models. Drawing on recent literature in the field (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020; Golec de Zavala & Keenan, 2021; Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020), existing research findings can be largely summarized in Figure 1.

[Figure 1 would appear here showing antecedents, mediators, and outcome variables of collective narcissism]

3.1.1 Intergroup Threat Perception

Intergroup threats include realistic and symbolic threats, and people' s perceptions of these threats are not necessarily accurate (Stephan et al., 2016; see also Guerra et al., 2020). Generally, collective narcissists tend to overestimate threats from outgroups, whether these threats are past or present, real or imagined (Cichocka et al., 2016; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009, 2016; see also Bertin et al., 2022). For example, research has found that collective narcissism predicts siege mentality—the belief that the rest of the world harbors highly negative intentions toward the ingroup—which serves as an indicator of exaggerated in-

tergroup threat (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012). Similarly, collective narcissism predicts hostile attribution bias, or the tendency to perceive outgroups as harboring hostility toward the ingroup (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019).

Another study (Cichocka et al., 2016) directly examined the relationship between collective narcissism, threat perception, and conspiracy beliefs using the 2010 Smolensk air disaster as a case study with a Polish sample. This tragedy killed 88 members of the Polish government delegation, including the president and his wife. Because the disaster occurred in Russia, conspiracy theories emerged claiming Russian involvement. Survey results revealed that collective narcissism predicted both heightened personal and national threat perceptions and, in turn, greater belief in these conspiracy theories. According to the researchers, conspiracy beliefs can serve as an indicator of exaggerated intergroup threat, reflecting high levels of outgroup suspicion. However, it is important to note that collective narcissists do not tend to believe all conspiracy theories; when conspiracy theories allege not that outgroups are plotting against the ingroup but that ingroup members (e.g., one' s own government) are acting against other ingroup members (e.g., citizens), collective narcissism may not predict belief in such theories (Cichocka et al., 2016).

Additional research (Golec de Zavala et al., 2016) investigated collective narcissists' heightened sensitivity to threats against ingroup image. Results showed that even in ambiguous situations where outgroup insult was not explicit (i.e., disputed, not perceived by others, or unintentional), collective narcissists were still more likely to perceive ingroup insult. For instance, in a survey of Turkish participants who read news about Turkey' s EU membership application being suspended, those higher in collective narcissism reported greater feelings of humiliation and shame compared to those lower in collective narcissism. This finding demonstrates collective narcissists' hypersensitivity to intergroup threats.

3.1.2 Intergroup Attitudes and Behaviors

A meta-analysis (N = 14,592) found a correlation of 0.19 between collective narcissism and outgroup hostility (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019). Given that collective narcissists perceive higher levels of intergroup threat, it is not surprising that they tend to hold more negative attitudes and exhibit more negative behaviors toward outgroups. For example, collective narcissism predicts lower empathy and reduced intergroup solidarity through intergroup anxiety (Górska et al., 2020). Similarly, American collective narcissism predicted support for the 2003 military intervention in Iraq, with perceived hostile threats to the nation serving as a mediator (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). A survey examining U.S.-China relations (Cai & Gries, 2013) found that collective narcissism predicted prejudice toward the other country' s citizens, negative attitudes toward the other government, and support for tough policies against the other nation in both countries. Likewise, a survey of Polish participants (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012) found that national collective narcissism predicted anti-Semitic prejudice—manifested as greater social distance from Jews and higher levels of

negative emotions and behavioral intentions toward them—with threat perception mediating this relationship.

Further research suggests that these relationships may be moderated by intergroup threat contexts. In a series of experiments (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Iskra-Golec, 2013) conducted across different intergroup settings (e.g., between nations, between schools), researchers examined how threats to ingroup image moderated the relationship between collective narcissism and intergroup hostility. Results consistently showed that under conditions of ingroup criticism, collective narcissism predicted higher levels of hostile reactions, whereas under conditions of ingroup praise, collective narcissism did not significantly predict hostility. This pattern suggests that collective narcissists' hostile reactions are generally retaliatory, directed only at outgroups that pose threats to the ingroup. Indeed, these studies confirmed this interpretation: after reading criticism of their country from an international student, collective narcissists displayed hostility only toward that student' s compatriots, not toward foreigners in a control group (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Iskra-Golec, 2013). Other research indicates that collective narcissists also hold grudges and are unforgiving toward outgroups that have historically harmed the ingroup (Hamer et al., 2018). Moreover, their retaliatory responses can take indirect forms, such as schadenfreude—taking pleasure in outgroups' misfortunes (Golec de Zavala et al., 2016). However, it is worth noting that not all negative intergroup reactions from collective narcissists are retaliatory. One study (Antonetti & Maklan, 2018) found that collective narcissists tend to perceive lower similarity between themselves and outgroup members and express less sympathy for outgroup victims of corporate misconduct.

Numerous political psychology studies have also found that political attitudes and behaviors such as ideology and voting frequently reflect collective narcissists' xenophobic tendencies (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019). For instance, collective narcissism predicted American voters' support for Donald Trump in the 2016 presidential election (Federico & Golec de Zavala, 2018; Marchlewska et al., 2018), British citizens' support for Brexit (Golec de Zavala et al., 2017), and Polish and Hungarian citizens' support for populist governments and their policies (Cislak et al., 2018; Forgas & Lantos, 2019; Marchlewska et al., 2018). A key factor driving these outcomes is collective narcissists' perceived threats from outgroups: Brexit supporters tended to believe that Britain was threatened by immigrants and foreigners, and this threat perception mediated the relationship between collective narcissism and Brexit support (Golec de Zavala et al., 2017). Additionally, collective narcissism predicts nationalism (Golec de Zavala & Keenan, 2021). In contexts of ethnic conflict, collective narcissism also predicts support for political extremism and terrorist violence, particularly in radical social environments where violence is legitimized (Jasko et al., 2020).

3.1.3 Ingroup Attitudes and Behaviors and Other Consequences

The previous sections have shown that collective narcissists exhibit relatively negative intergroup attitudes and behaviors. But how do they behave toward their ingroup? In reality, certain ingroup members may also be viewed by collective narcissists as threatening the ingroup' s image, status, or identity and may consequently be targeted with hostility. For example, several studies with Polish samples found that national collective narcissists were more likely to respond with direct and indirect hostility toward Polish-American historians who revealed historical blemishes in their writings, domestic filmmakers and actors who presented the country' s shameful history in movies, and domestic celebrities who mocked government propaganda slogans, with perceived insult or offense mediating these relationships (Cichocka et al., 2015; Golec de Zavala et al., 2016). More recently, research has found that Polish national collective narcissism predicts homophobia and fear of homosexuals, with one link in the chain being the perception of homosexuals as a threat to the nation (Mole et al., 2021), and that both national and religious collective narcissism in Poland predict discrimination against women (Golec de Zavala & Bierwiaczonek, 2021). Researchers explain that in the eyes of Polish national collective narcissists, Poland' s exceptionality partly stems from loyalty to traditional Catholicism, and being a "true Pole" means being male, Catholic, and heterosexual; thus, homosexuals and non-traditional women pose a threat to this narrowly defined national identity and are consequently discriminated against.

This phenomenon is known as the "ingroup overexclusion effect," which demonstrates that some ingroup members may be rejected by others for failing to positively reflect the ingroup' s image or identity (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020).

These studies reveal that collective narcissists are highly concerned with protecting their ingroup' s image, status, or identity from threats. Does this mean they are more concerned with ingroup welfare than non-narcissists? Recent research has begun exploring this question. One study (Cislak et al., 2018) conducted three surveys finding that Polish national collective narcissism predicted support for environmentally harmful policies, including subsidies for the coal industry (Study 1) and approval for logging in protected forests (Studies 2 and 3). Studies 2 and 3 further found that support for national decision-making independence mediated this relationship—the explanation being that although these policies faced scientific objections and attempted EU court injunctions, collective narcissists tended to defend their country' s decision-making independence and support the policies, even at the cost of environmental damage to their own nation. Another study (Cislak et al., 2021) showed that collective narcissists were less likely to support substantive environmental protection policies but more likely to support national image-building campaigns on environmental issues.

Recent surveys have found that during the COVID-19 pandemic, collective nar-

cissism not only failed to positively predict solidarity with compatriots but even negatively predicted such solidarity after controlling for ingroup satisfaction (Federico et al., 2021). Additionally, it positively predicted personal hoarding behavior (Nowak et al., 2020). Another survey (Marchlewska, Cichocka et al., 2021) found that collective narcissism predicted social cynicism—a negative view of human nature—which in turn predicted lower support for democratic institutions. Even more strikingly, one survey (Marchlewska et al., 2020) showed that if emigrating abroad would be personally advantageous in terms of wealth, those higher in national collective narcissism exhibited greater willingness to emigrate compared to those lower in collective narcissism. In organizational contexts, collective narcissists have been found to be more likely to instrumentally exploit ingroup members for personal gain (Cichocka et al., 2021), displaying egoism. These studies collectively suggest that collective narcissists are not necessarily more concerned with ingroup welfare; for them, how the ingroup is perceived by others and personal interests appear more important than the actual welfare of ingroup members (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020). This does not mean, however, that collective narcissists are indifferent to ingroup interests, especially when intergroup conflicts of interest are involved. For example, collective narcissists tend to exhibit "moral tribalism" in moral judgments involving intergroup interest conflicts, being more likely to judge behaviors that favor ingroup interests as moral (Bocian et al., 2021).

Beyond these consequences, collective narcissism has been found to predict other outcomes primarily related to protecting ingroup image or status. When confronted with threats to ingroup image, collective narcissists are likely to employ strategies such as denial or avoidance to protect that image. For instance, one study (Imhoff, 2010) surveyed Germans and examined the relationship between collective narcissism and desire for historical closure—the extent to which individuals want their ingroup to be free from the influence of past history, operationalized in this study as Germans' desire to be free from memories of the Holocaust. Results showed that higher collective narcissism predicted greater desire for historical closure, which in turn reduced collective guilt and willingness to compensate victims. Another study with Polish participants (Marchlewska et al., 2020) found that when faced with films presenting their country' s shameful history, collective narcissists exhibited higher levels of ingroup image defense, such as denying the authenticity of historical events in the films and believing these movies maliciously slandered Poland. Other research (Skarżyńska & Przybyła, 2015) has shown that collective narcissists are more likely to believe in their country' s victimhood status, as suffering can place the ingroup on moral high ground and enhance its value (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019).

3.2 Antecedents of Collective Narcissism

Collective narcissism is generally considered a relatively stable belief (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019) that may be influenced by both individual and situational factors. Consequently, some recent studies have begun exploring its antecedents,

though this body of work remains far less extensive than research on its consequences.

3.2.1 Individual Factors

As noted earlier, Frankfurt School theorists Adorno (2005) and Fromm (1964/2010) suggested that collective narcissism can compensate for the psychological needs of a "weak ego." While researchers continue to debate the exact nature of the needs underlying collective narcissism, they generally agree that it may emerge as a compensatory response to frustrated individual needs (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020). Current research has primarily investigated personal control and individual self-esteem or self-worth, both considered fundamental human needs (Correll & Park, 2005; Fritsche et al., 2013).

Regarding personal control, a study comprising multiple surveys and experiments (Cichocka et al., 2018) directly examined the relationship between personal control, collective narcissism, and ingroup identification. Results indicated that lack of personal control indeed increases collective narcissism, but this effect emerges or becomes stronger only after controlling for ingroup identification. Specifically, a cross-sectional survey first found that personal control negatively correlated with collective narcissism, and this correlation became more pronounced when ingroup identification was controlled as a covariate. A subsequent experiment found that manipulating a decrease in personal control increased collective narcissism, but only when ingroup identification was controlled. Finally, a longitudinal survey found that personal control at Time 1 negatively predicted collective narcissism at Time 2 (six weeks later), but collective narcissism at Time 1 did not predict personal control at Time 2. These findings collectively suggest that lack of personal control may be one important antecedent of collective narcissism. Another nationally representative survey also supported this relationship between personal control and collective narcissism (Marchlewska et al., 2020).

Regarding self-esteem, although earlier studies (e.g., Golec de Zavala et al., 2009, 2016) failed to reveal a relationship with collective narcissism, more recent research (Golec de Zavala et al., 2020) using more sophisticated cross-sectional, longitudinal, and experimental designs consistently found that lower self-esteem indeed leads to higher levels of collective narcissism, though this relationship similarly requires controlling for other variables (namely, ingroup satisfaction) to be readily observed. Notably, this study also compared the effects of personal control and self-esteem on collective narcissism, finding that when personal control was controlled as a covariate, self-esteem still negatively predicted collective narcissism and, in turn, outgroup derogation. However, when self-esteem was controlled, personal control no longer negatively predicted collective narcissism and consequently could not predict outgroup derogation. This suggests that the effect of personal control on collective narcissism may operate through self-esteem, with self-esteem being a more proximal influence on collective narcissism than personal control. Additionally, a meta-analysis (Golec de Zavala et

al., 2019) found that collective narcissism showed a stronger and more robust positive correlation with vulnerable narcissism than with grandiose narcissism, and a longitudinal study found that vulnerable narcissism predicted collective narcissism several weeks later (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020). Given that self-esteem negatively correlates with vulnerable narcissism but positively correlates with grandiose narcissism (Miller et al., 2017), researchers (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019) have speculated that low self-esteem and collective narcissism may be linked through vulnerable narcissism.

Other research (Golec de Zavala, 2019) has found that collective narcissism is associated with sensory processing sensitivity, a genetically determined personality trait that may intensify experiences of distress and reactions to negative stimuli and make individuals more anxious and depressed (Bakker & Moulding, 2012). This suggests that personality factors may also influence collective narcissism to some extent.

3.2.2 Situational Factors

Since collective narcissism may be influenced by individual factors such as sense of control and self-esteem, situational factors that affect these individual factors may also influence collective narcissism. Following this logic, researchers (Golec de Zavala et al., 2020) experimentally examined the effects of social inclusion and social exclusion on collective narcissism. Results showed that participants in the social exclusion condition had significantly lower state self-esteem than those in the social inclusion condition, but the two groups did not differ significantly in collective narcissism. However, when ingroup satisfaction was controlled as a covariate, a significant difference in collective narcissism emerged between the two groups, with participants in the social exclusion condition showing higher levels of collective narcissism. In other words, social exclusion can increase collective narcissism by decreasing individual self-esteem, but this effect is more readily observed when ingroup satisfaction is controlled.

Other research (Marchlewsk et al., 2018) examined how perceived ingroup disadvantage influences collective narcissism and populist support. Results found that group relative deprivation positively predicted collective narcissism and that making ingroup disadvantage salient increased collective narcissism. For example, in one experiment with British participants, reading commentary about "Britain' s power being damaged by long-term strong EU influence" led individuals to report higher levels of collective narcissism and Brexit support. Another study (Guerra et al., 2020) examined the effect of intergroup threat on collective narcissism, finding that when subjected to intergroup threat—whether symbolic threat (to ingroup values, self-esteem, or belief systems), realistic threat (material or physical), or distinctiveness threat (to the ingroup' s uniqueness from outgroups)—individuals' collective narcissism levels increased. A recent survey also found that social identity threat predicted collective narcissism toward one' s own group for both dominant and disadvantaged groups (Bagci et al., 2021).

3.3 Other Related Research on Collective Narcissism

Beyond research on the consequences and antecedents of collective narcissism, another frequently discussed topic is the suppression effect between collective narcissism and other variables (e.g., ingroup identification, ingroup satisfaction) mentioned earlier (e.g., Bertin et al., 2022; Cichocka et al., 2016; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013; Marchlewska et al., 2020). Given that many variables may suppress collective narcissism' s effects, researchers (Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala, 2011) have proposed a higher-order concept to encompass these variables: non-narcissistic ingroup positivity. Compared to collective narcissism, non-narcissistic ingroup positivity describes a more objective rather than exaggerated, and more secure rather than defensive, perception of the ingroup. Its positive evaluation of the ingroup is independent of others'recognition and predicts more positive attitudes and behaviors toward outgroups.

In empirical research, since collective narcissism and non-narcissistic ingroup positivity are generally positively correlated yet predict opposite outcomes, they can suppress each other' s effects to some extent. For instance, many studies (e.g., Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013; Golec de Zavala et al., 2016) have found that after controlling for the positive correlation between collective narcissism and non-narcissistic ingroup positivity, collective narcissism predicts greater outgroup derogation, while non-narcissistic ingroup positivity predicts less outgroup derogation and more positive and tolerant attitudes and behaviors toward outgroups—positive effects that are often suppressed by collective narcissism' s effects. Similarly, one study (Dyduch-Hazar, Mroziński et al., 2019) had participants watch a film trailer depicting their country' s shameful history and then evaluate the film' s artistic value. Results showed that only after controlling for the correlation between collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction could collective narcissism predict negative evaluations of the film' s artistic value, while ingroup satisfaction could predict positive evaluations. Likewise, another study (Golec de Zavala, 2019) found through simple and partial correlation comparisons that the positive correlation between collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction could weaken the positive correlations between collective narcissism and negative emotions/self-criticism, as well as the negative correlations between collective narcissism and social connection/gratitude.

4 Research Gaps and Future Directions

As the preceding review demonstrates, more than a decade of research has produced a substantial body of work on collective narcissism. However, the field is still in its early stages, as numerous unresolved questions remain. Not only do the concept and structure of collective narcissism require clarification, but many theoretically and practically significant issues merit exploration, many of which can draw inspiration from the individual narcissism literature, particularly regarding conceptualization and structure. Moreover, most existing research has sampled from European and American countries such as Poland, the United States, and the United Kingdom, yet collective narcissism may also exist in

other countries and may even be more prevalent in cultures where collectivism is more salient (e.g., Zaromb et al., 2018; van Prooijen & Song, 2021). Therefore, to address current research limitations, future studies should pursue at least the following directions.

4.1 Clarifying the Concept and Structure of Collective Narcissism

As previously noted, collective narcissism was initially introduced as a concept extending narcissism from the individual to the group level, with its definition and scale development drawing heavily from individual narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; see also Lyons et al., 2010). Consequently, collective narcissism likely faces similar conceptual and structural controversies and challenges as individual narcissism and requires further clarification. First, it is necessary to determine whether fragility is an essential component of collective narcissism. The field' s founders (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) conceptualized collective narcissism as collective self-esteem that depends on "others' admiration and recognition," or "exaggerated yet unstable collective self-esteem." This understanding aligns with the "mask model" (Kuchynka & Bosson, 2018) and "self-regulatory process model" (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001) in individual narcissism research, which posit internal fragility as the reason narcissists require external validation. Although this fragility was supported in Golec de Zavala et al.' s (2009) study (N = 262), which used an Implicit Association Test to find that collective narcissists indeed showed lower ingroup evaluation at the implicit level, a more recent, larger-sample (N = 481) preregistered replication study (Fatfouta et al., 2021) failed to replicate this result, finding instead that collective narcissism correlated approximately zero with implicit collective self-esteem. Thus, whether collective narcissism includes fragility remains unresolved, yet this question is crucial because fragility plays a key role in theoretical explanations and predictions in collective narcissism research (Golec de Zavala, 2011, 2018). In fact, fragility remains a research question in individual narcissism as well, with some researchers (e.g., Miller et al., 2021) viewing it as an essential attribute of individual narcissism while others (e.g., Mota et al., 2020) hold different views. A few scholars (e.g., Bizumic & Duckitt, 2009; Cai & Gries, 2013; Lyons et al., 2010; Putnam et al., 2018) have proposed alternative understandings of collective or group narcissism that do not include fragility, though they have not addressed this important theoretical issue. In light of this, we propose that collective narcissism does not necessarily include fragility—that is, there may exist both fragile and non-fragile forms of collective narcissism. Future research could reference approaches in individual narcissism research (e.g., Krizan & Herlache, 2018) by narrowing the conceptual definition while expanding its extension to encompass a more complete and rich range of collective narcissism phenomena. More specifically, in the individual narcissism domain, scholars (Krizan & Herlache, 2018) integrated research and theory from personality, social, and clinical psychology to propose the influential "narcissism spectrum model" (Donnellan et al., 2021). This model narrows the definition of individual narcissism to "entitled self-importance," allowing its extension to accommodate multiple man-

ifestations of individual narcissism—including both fragile and non-fragile forms (e.g., grandiose narcissism)—all of which can be described or positioned along coordinates formed by three basic dimensions: grandiosity, self-importance, and vulnerability. Drawing on this approach, future research could conceptualize collective narcissism as "entitled ingroup importance," thereby allowing its extension to encompass both fragile and non-fragile collective narcissism.

Second, given the potential complexity of collective narcissism' s conceptualization, it is necessary to clarify whether it has a unidimensional or multidimensional structure, and if multidimensional, what its dimensions are. When Golec de Zavala et al. (2009) initially developed the Collective Narcissism Scale, they obtained a unidimensional 9-item scale. Since this is the only repeatedly validated scale with good reliability and validity in the field, the vast majority of subsequent studies have used it and treated collective narcissism as a unidimensional construct. However, considering that individual narcissism involves multiple dimensions (Krizan & Herlache, 2018; Miller et al., 2017) and that collective narcissism may or may not include fragility, there is reason to suspect that collective narcissism may not be unidimensional. Indeed, recent research has proposed a multidimensional model of collective narcissism and developed a scale comprising four subdimensions: entitlement/exploitativeness, dominance/arrogance, apathy, and admiration (Montoya et al., 2020). However, this study focused only on non-fragile collective narcissism and represented only a preliminary attempt, demonstrating the need for multidimensional exploration. The precise dimensions of collective narcissism will likely require more research to determine accurately, and different manifestations of collective narcissism may have different subdimensions, which also requires further investigation. We believe this area can also draw inspiration from individual narcissism research, which has proposed numerous classification criteria for manifestations and subdimensions of individual narcissism (e.g., Yu et al., 2019; Krizan & Herlache, 2018) and has produced systematic syntheses (e.g., Sedikides, 2021; Rogoza et al., 2018). Particularly noteworthy is that some researchers (Crowe et al., 2019) have attempted to conceptualize individual narcissism as a hierarchical construct that integrates important advances in narcissism research (Miller et al., 2021)—expanding narcissism from a unidimensional to a two-dimensional construct (grandiose vs. vulnerable narcissism), and then to a three-dimensional structure comprising agentic extraversion, antagonism, and narcissistic neuroticism. These three factors correspond to the three dimensions of the narcissism spectrum model (Krizan & Herlache, 2018) and involve more specific traits that can be directly measured by the Five Factor Narcissism Inventory (FFNI), while higher-order factors can be obtained through factor analysis of the FFNI (e.g., Miller et al., 2016; see also Crowe et al., 2019) or through specialized scales measuring these higher-order factors (e.g., Rosenthal et al., 2020). These researchers (Miller et al., 2021) note that this multi-level, multidimensional approach offers clear advantages, such as clarifying the confounded relationship between individual narcissism and explicit self-esteem (Crowe et al., 2019). We believe this approach may also be applicable to analyzing the structure of col-

lective narcissism, as Golec de Zavala et al.' s (2009) conceptualization and operationalization of collective narcissism drew heavily from individual narcissism and integrated features of both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Rogoza et al., 2018). Therefore, collective narcissism may also contain at least two basic dimensions: grandiose and vulnerable collective narcissism. In fact, an unpublished dissertation (Montoya, 2020) developed the Narcissistic Group Orientation Scale (NGOS) and provided support for this two-dimensional structure, though unfortunately the study did not examine the relationship between the NGOS and Golec de Zavala et al.' s (2009) scale, leaving their relationship unclear.

Third, assuming collective narcissism is a multidimensional construct, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between the construct studied or measured by Golec de Zavala et al. (2009) and these two most basic manifestations—that is, whether it is closer to vulnerable collective narcissism or grandiose collective narcissism. Although the collective narcissism they defined includes fragility, this does not necessarily mean fragility is the primary characteristic of the construct they studied or measured. According to Golec de Zavala, fragility is an inherent feature of the collective narcissism studied by her team and a key characteristic distinguishing it from related constructs such as nationalism (Golec de Zavala, 2011); they have even contrasted vulnerable collective narcissism with grandiose nationalism (Golec de Zavala, 2018). However, Cichocka (2016), an early core member of the team, believes that current conceptualizations and measures of collective narcissism lean more toward the grandiose form and has proposed a vision of vulnerable collective narcissism characterized by negative ingroup image and feelings of victimization. In fact, from the initial scale development perspective, scales in this field (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Lyons et al., 2010) primarily referenced the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), which measures grandiose narcissism, though Golec de Zavala et al.' s (2009) scale added some items reflecting fragility, involving sensitivity to criticism and perception of lack of recognition. Thus, scholars have some disagreement about the relationship between currently studied collective narcissism and these two manifestations, which requires further research to resolve. Otherwise, as some scholars (Rogoza et al., 2018, p. 43) have pointed out, it is currently difficult to explain the position of Golec de Zavala et al.' s (2009) collective narcissism within the multidimensional structure of narcissistic personality or the narcissism spectrum model (Krizan & Herlache, 2018). Nevertheless, as a speculation, we believe Golec de Zavala et al. (2009) may have intended to study and measure a form of collective narcissism that, consistent with the mask model, simultaneously includes both grandiosity and fragility, similar to the single-factor construct at the top of the individual narcissism hierarchical structure. This construct differs from vulnerable collective narcissism because it involves belief in an exceptional ingroup image, yet differs from pure grandiose collective narcissism because it involves fragility, making it impossible to simply classify it into one dimension of collective narcissism. Finally, regardless of whether currently studied collective narcissism is grandiose, vulnerable, or a mixture, future re-

search could specifically develop different scales to explore other manifestations of collective narcissism (e.g., Montoya, 2020) to deepen understanding of the construct.

4.2 Consequences and Compensatory Functions of Collective Narcissism

Regarding the consequences of collective narcissism, the vast majority of studies have focused on revealing its negative effects (Cichocka & Cislak, 2020; Golec de Zavala & Keenan, 2021; Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020), with very few directly examining and finding positive effects. We believe two main reasons account for this focus. First, theoretically, collective narcissism was introduced (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) to explain ingroup hostility or aggression toward outgroups, and its conceptualization involves dissatisfaction with outgroups (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019). It continues to be viewed as a form of "ingroup love" robustly associated with "outgroup hate" (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020) and is studied as a "defensive ingroup positivity construct" in contrast to "secure ingroup positivity constructs" (Cichocka, 2016). Existing theories (Golec de Zavala, 2011; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019; Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020) essentially presuppose that collective narcissism has negative consequences for intergroup and intragroup attitudes and behaviors, with research focuses and hypotheses centered on these negative outcomes. Second, methodologically, as mentioned earlier, researchers often use suppression effect analysis to control for variables such as ingroup identification and ingroup satisfaction that belong to non-narcissistic ingroup positivity, thereby obtaining stronger correlations between collective narcissism and negative outcomes like "outgroup hate." They typically treat these negative effects as typical consequences of collective narcissism (e.g., Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013). In other words, many studies reveal not the consequences of collective narcissism as it exists in reality, but the consequences of a theoretically more extreme form of collective narcissism stripped of its positive aspects (Cichocka et al., 2018). While this approach helps reveal collective narcissism' s negative consequences and validate Golec de Zavala' s (2011) original theoretical vision, it also risks confining collective narcissism to its malignant form—that is, collective narcissism that exceeds certain limits—while normal collective narcissism may also have positive aspects.

For example, according to Fromm' s (1964/2010) classic theoretical perspective, although collective narcissism is one of the most important causes of human aggression, it may also have a benign form within certain limits, just as individual narcissism may have an adaptive side (Yu et al., 2019; Miller & Campbell, 2008). From a practical standpoint (e.g., Fukuyama, 2018), people's pursuit of "ingroup recognition" may also promote cohesion and solidarity among members, motivating them to work together for collective achievements or to fight for more rights for disadvantaged ingroups. It could be argued that the "struggle for recognition" is not necessarily entirely negative (Honneth, 1992/1996), especially when

people struggle for "equal recognition," although the desire for equal recognition may easily slide into demanding recognition of ingroup superiority (Fukuyama, 2018). Therefore, future research could reconceptualize collective narcissism as a construct with both negative and positive sides (Fromm, 1964/2010), investigating it and its consequences from a more complete theoretical perspective, particularly by increasing examination of positive consequences. Future studies should also use suppression effect analysis appropriately, clearly indicating that results from such methods may reflect consequences of theoretically extreme forms of collective narcissism rather than typical manifestations in reality. We believe such research will help view collective narcissism more dialectically, reveal when and why it produces negative or positive consequences, and yield more broadly applicable conclusions.

Regarding positive consequences, in addition to examining whether ingroups and their members may benefit from collective narcissists, it is particularly important to investigate whether collective narcissists themselves can benefit from collective narcissism (e.g., Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020). Both classic theories (Adorno, 1959/1993; Fromm, 1964/2010) and leading scholars in the field (Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala, 2018) view collective narcissism as compensatory, capable of satisfying individual psychological needs. However, research on this positive compensatory function remains scarce and preliminary. To our knowledge, only two cross-sectional studies have examined the relationship between collective narcissism and personal well-being. One study (Golec de Zavala, 2019) found that collective narcissism simultaneously correlated positively with life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect, and that after controlling for ingroup satisfaction, the correlations with life satisfaction and positive affect became non-significant while the correlation with negative affect became stronger. Another study (Bagci et al., 2021) obtained similar results. However, these cross-sectional studies cannot establish causality; it is also possible that personal well-being influences collective narcissism. Another study (Golec de Zavala et al., 2020) used a longitudinal design (Sub-study 6) to analyze the relationship between collective narcissism and individual self-esteem, finding that collective narcissism at an earlier time point significantly negatively predicted self-esteem at a later time point. However, after controlling for ingroup satisfaction, mixed and difficult-to-interpret results emerged: collective narcissism at Time 2 significantly positively predicted self-esteem at Time 3, while collective narcissism at Times 1 and 3 could not significantly predict self-esteem at subsequent time points. Thus, no study to date has provided strong support for the positive compensatory function of collective narcissism, and further investigation is needed; otherwise, it is difficult to explain why collective narcissism remains so prevalent worldwide. Here, we believe theories and research on system justification can provide useful references. System justification is a form of false consciousness that is harmful to individuals in the long term but may be beneficial in the short term (Jost, 2019), or an ideology that has a palliative function of temporarily alleviating anxiety, guilt, discomfort, and other forms of distress (Jost & Hunyady, 2003). Given that collective narcissism and sys-

tem justification may have similar effects on individuals, future research could reference paradigms used to test the palliative function in system justification research (e.g., Harding & Sibley, 2013) and employ more longitudinal or experimental designs for in-depth investigation.

Additionally, considering that most current research has focused on national collective narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019), future studies should examine collective narcissism in different types of social groups and even different conceptualizations of collective narcissism, comparing similarities and differences among them and with the consequences of non-narcissistic ingroup positivity to enrich the field' s findings. For example, from the perspective of social groups, future research could examine the consequences of group narcissism in groups based on gender, social class, political orientation, and cultural background (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009), and could also compare the consequences of group narcissism between dominant and disadvantaged groups (e.g., Bagci et al., 2021; Górska & Bierwiaczonek, 2021). From the perspective of different conceptualizations of collective narcissism, future studies could examine similarities and differences in consequences between grandiose and vulnerable collective narcissism (e.g., Montoya, 2020) and between agentic and communal collective narcissism (e.g., Nowak et al., 2020; Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Piotrowski, Sedikides et al., 2021).

4.3 Causes and Interventions for Collective Narcissism

Regarding the causes or influencing factors of collective narcissism, as presented earlier, only a few studies (e.g., Cichocka et al., 2018; Golec de Zavala et al., 2020; Guerra et al., 2020) have begun exploring this area, revealing that collective narcissism may stem from frustrated self-esteem or personal control and that intergroup threats can strengthen it. Clearly, current research in this area is insufficient. Future studies should not only replicate these findings to increase their reliability but also conduct more comprehensive and in-depth explorations. For example, Cichocka (2016) proposed a motivational model of ingroup positivity, suggesting that collective narcissism may arise from satisfying multiple individual needs—including existential needs aimed at avoiding threat and insecurity, epistemic needs aimed at reducing uncertainty and ambiguity, and relational needs aimed at coordinating social relationships. Cichocka (2016) also noted that future research needs to fully integrate cognitive and emotional factors emphasized by social identity theory and self-categorization theory with factors in the motivational model to better explain the formation mechanisms of collective narcissism. Here, we believe theories and research on system justification and ethnocentrism[3] can also provide useful references, as system justification is in some sense also an idealization of the ingroup (i.e., the social system to which individuals belong), and this field has already integrated motivational and cognitive explanatory pathways (Yang et al., 2018; Jost, 2019). Ethnocentrism can be seen as an important component of collective narcissism in a broader sense—similar to how egocentrism is an important component of

narcissism (Krizan & Herlache, 2018)—and its theory fully incorporates perspectives from social identity theory and self-categorization theory (Bizumic & Duckitt, 2012). More specifically, according to ethnocentrism theory, people in groups may naturally attribute greater importance to the ingroup, and this bias may be further strengthened by group beliefs, norms, and ideologies in the social environment or by intergroup threats (Bizumic & Duckitt, 2012). For example, Golec de Zavala (2018) speculated that political rhetoric emphasizing social divisions and idealizing specific groups may increase group members' collective narcissism. Another study (Zaromb et al., 2018) found that people generally tend to overestimate their country' s contributions or importance in world history, and that this collective narcissistic tendency varies across nations, with mechanisms potentially involving myside bias, heuristic processing, and cultural environmental factors. Of course, these factors remain theoretical speculations that require further empirical testing.

Since collective narcissism is often associated with negative outcomes, it is worthwhile to explore how to reduce maladaptive collective narcissism and its negative effects through intervention (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020). Currently, research in this area is extremely limited, consisting mainly of theoretical speculations by researchers (e.g., Golec de Zavala, 2018; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019; Hase et al., 2021). However, they mention two unpublished studies with promising results: on the one hand, not only can the trait of gratitude weaken the correlation between collective narcissism and prejudice, but a 10-minute mindfulness gratitude meditation can also reduce collective narcissists' hostile tendencies; on the other hand, experimentally inducing "kama muta" [4]—a self-transcendent emotional experience—can also effectively weaken the relationship between collective narcissism and intergroup hostility (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019). Therefore, future research could further examine the intervention effects of these and similar emotions or states, such as compassion (e.g., Stellar et al., 2015), awe (e.g., Dale et al., 2020), and humility (e.g., Lavelock et al., 2015). Additionally, interventions could target the causes of collective narcissism to explore more fundamental and long-lasting solutions. For example, Golec de Zavala (2018) suggested that self-affirmation training might be a viable option, as research (Thomaes et al., 2009) has shown that self-affirmation, as an intervention to bolster self-esteem, can reduce the link between individual narcissism and interpersonal aggression in adolescents.

4.4 Cross-Cultural Research on Collective Narcissism

Although scholars in this field have long emphasized the importance of cross-cultural research—for instance, Golec de Zavala et al. (2009) suggested that future studies should examine sociocultural factors that may influence the development of collective narcissism—most current research has used either indigenous samples (e.g., Bertin & Delouvée, 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Yustisia et al., 2020) or samples from different regions (e.g., Cai & Gries, 2013; Guerra et al., 2020) to demonstrate cross-cultural or cross-regional consistency in collective narcissism

phenomena, with only a few studies examining cross-cultural differences. For example, a meta-analysis by Golec de Zavala (2018) found that the relationship between collective narcissism and grandiose individual narcissism was influenced by cultural background, with the correlation appearing only in U.S. and U.K. samples but not in Polish, Russian, or Chinese samples. Golec de Zavala speculated that individualism and collectivism may be influencing factors. Another cross-cultural survey based on 6,185 university student samples (Zaromb et al., 2018) showed that countries or regions sharing values related to collectivism and high power distance exhibited stronger collective narcissism than those sharing individualistic values. Additional research (van Prooijen & Song, 2021) found that vertical collectivism and power distance could explain higher levels of collective narcissism and conspiracy beliefs. Another study (Yustisia et al., 2020) indicated that cultural tightness-looseness at the individual level correlated to some extent with collective narcissism. These findings demonstrate that sociocultural factors can indeed influence the development of collective narcissism, and future research should further explore this issue.

It is worth noting that recent research (Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Piotrowski, Sedikides et al., 2021), based on the agency-communion model of individual narcissism, has pointed out that Golec de Zavala et al.' s (2009) Collective Narcissism Scale primarily measures agentic collective narcissism, and therefore developed the Communal Collective Narcissism Inventory (CCNI). Agency and communion involve self-protection/expansion and separation from others, seeking control and independent existence, versus open communication, connection with others, seeking cooperation, and integration into the whole, respectively (Bakan, 1966, p. 15; see also Pan et al., 2017). According to these researchers (Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Piotrowski, Sedikides et al., 2021), both agentic and communal collective narcissism belong to grandiose collective narcissism, as both center on grandiosity, entitlement, and power, with the latter using ingroup excellence in communion as justification for ingroup special status and privileges. Given that individuals in collectivistic cultural contexts may have more salient self-enhancement motives in the communion domain (Gebauer et al., 2012), future Chinese researchers could attempt to revise or adapt relevant scales and examine Chinese people' s different manifestations and effects on these different types of collective narcissism. Although existing research has found that Chinese people' s collectivistic values are declining overall while individualistic values are increasingly prevalent (Cai et al., 2020), we believe that this current environment of coexisting multicultural values is precisely what makes it suitable for testing and comparing diverse collective narcissism phenomena.

Finally, drawing on unanswered questions in individual narcissism research (Sedikides, 2021), we can propose the following questions for future exploration: How do cultures amplify or inhibit collective narcissism? How do cultures interact with social factors (e.g., social class, economic upswings or downturns) and socialization factors to influence the development of collective narcissism? How can cultures help collective narcissists become true contributors to ingroup

welfare rather than detractors?

In conclusion, in today' s world where globalization and modernization face significant challenges (Guo, 2022; Fukuyama, 2018), we should not only pay attention to the development and impact of collective narcissism but also focus more on the role played by sociocultural factors in order to identify the roots and solutions to many real-world problems.

References

Cai, H., Huang, Z., Lin, L., Zhang, M., Wang, X., Zhu, H., ···& Jing, Y. (2020). Changes in Chinese psychology and behavior over half a century: Research from a psychological perspective. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 28(10), 1599-1618.

Guo, Y. (2022). The enlightenment value of Fromm's humanistic psychoanalysis. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 54(2), 205-218.

Pan, Z., Guo, Y., Xu, B., & Yang, S. (2017). Agency and communion in personality research and their relationship. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 25(1), 99-110.

Yang, S., Guo, Y., Yu, F., Rao, T., Zhao, L., & Xu, L. (2018). How does system justification form? Three different explanatory perspectives. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 26(12), 2238-2248.

Yu, Z., Liu, Y., Luo, Y., & Cai, H. (2019). Distinguishing adaptive from maladaptive narcissism: Evidence from multiple perspectives. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 27(1), 96-105.

Adorno, T. W. (1951). Freudian theory and the pattern of fascist propaganda. In G. Róheim (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the social sciences* (pp. 118-137). New York, NY: International Universities Press.

Adorno, T. W. (1993). Theory of pseudo-culture (1959). *Telos*, 1993(95), 15-38. (Original work published 1959)

Adorno, T. W. (2005). *Critical models: Interventions and catchwords*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Antonetti, P., & Maklan, S. (2018). Identity bias in negative word of mouth following irresponsible corporate behavior: A research model and moderating effects. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 149(4), 1005-1023.

Back, M. D., Kufner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(6), 1013-1037.

Bagci, S. C., Stathi, S., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2021). Social identity threat across group status: Links to psychological well-being and inter-

group bias through collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000509

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence.* Chicago, IL: Rand Mcnally.

Bakker, K., & Moulding, R. (2012). Sensory-processing sensitivity, dispositional mindfulness and negative psychological symptoms. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(3), 341–346.

Bertin, P., & Delouvée, S. (2021). Affected more than infected: The relationship between national narcissism and Zika conspiracy beliefs is mediated by exclusive victimhood about the Zika outbreak. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1177/18344909211051800

Bertin, P., Marinthe, G., Biddlestone, M., & Delouvée, S. (2022). Investigating the identification-prejudice link through the lens of national narcissism: The role of defensive group beliefs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 98, Article 104252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104252

Bizumic, B., & Duckitt, J. (2009). Narcissism and ethnocentrism: A review. *Directions in Psychiatry*, 29, 99–109.

Bizumic, B., & Duckitt, J. (2012). What is and is not ethnocentrism? A conceptual analysis and political implications. *Political Psychology*, 33(6), 887–909.

Bocian, K., Cichocka, A., & Wojciszke, B. (2021). Moral tribalism: Moral judgments of actions supporting ingroup interests depend on collective narcissism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 93, Article 104098. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104098

Cai, H., & Gries, P. (2013). National narcissism: Internal dimensions and international correlates. *PsyCh Journal*, 2(2), 122–132.

Campbell, W. K., & Crist, C. (2020). *The new science of narcissism: Understanding one of the greatest psychological challenges of our time –And what you can do about it.* Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

Cichocka, A. (2016). Understanding defensive and secure in-group positivity: The role of collective narcissism. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 27(1), 283–317.

Cichocka, A., Cislak, A., Gronfeldt, B., & Wojcik, A. D. (2021). Can ingroup love harm the ingroup? Collective narcissism and objectification of ingroup members. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211038058

Cichocka, A., & Cislak, A. (2020). Nationalism as collective narcissism. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 69–74.

Cichocka, A., Golec de Zavala, A., Marchlewska, M., Bilewicz, M., Jaworska, M., & Olechowski, M. (2018). Personal control decreases narcissistic but increases non-narcissistic in-group positivity. *Journal of Personality*, 86(3), 465–480.

Cichocka, A., Golec de Zavala, A., Marchlewska, M., & Olechowski, M. (2015). Grandiose delusions: Collective narcissism, secure in-group identification and belief in conspiracies. In M. Bilewicz, A. Cichocka, & W. Soral (Eds.), *The psychology of conspiracy* (pp. 42–69). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cichocka, A., Marchlewska, M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Olechowski, M. (2016). "They will not control us" : In-group positivity and belief in intergroup conspiracies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 107(3), 556–576.

Cislak, A., Cichocka, A., Wojcik, A., & Milfont, T. (2021). Words, not deeds: National identity and support for greenwashing versus genuine proenvironmental campaigns. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 74, Article 101576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101576

Cislak, A., Wojcik, A. D., & Cichocka, A. (2018). Cutting the forest down to save your face: Narcissistic national identification predicts support for anti-conservation policies. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 59, 65–73.

Correll, J., & Park, B. (2005). A model of the ingroup as a social resource. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(4), 341–359.

Crowe, M. L., Lynam, D. R., Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2019). Exploring the structure of narcissism: Toward an integrated solution. *Journal of Personality*, 87(6), 1151–1169.

Dale, K. R., Janicke-Bowles, S. H., Raney, A. A., Oliver, M. B., Huse, L. K., Lopez, J., ···& Zhao, D. (2020). Awe and stereotypes: Examining awe as an intervention against stereotypical media portrayals of African Americans. *Communication Studies*, 71(4), 699–707.

Donnellan, M. B., Ackerman, R. A., & Wright, A. G. C. (2021). Narcissism in contemporary personality psychology. In O. John, & R. W. Robins (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (4th ed., pp. 625–641). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Dyduch-Hazar, K., Mrozinski, B., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2019). Collective narcissism and in-group satisfaction predict opposite attitudes towards refugees via attribution of hostility. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 1901. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01901

Dyduch-Hazar, K., Mrozinski, B., Simão, C., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2019). Collective narcissism and in-group satisfaction predict different reactions to the past transgressions of the in-group. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 50(4), 316–325.

Fatfouta, R., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J., & Kościelniak, M. (2021). Collective narcissism and explicit and implicit collective self-esteem revisited: A

preregistered replication and extension. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 95, 104–144.

Federico, C. M., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2018). Collective narcissism and the 2016 US presidential vote. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(1), 110–121.

Federico, C. M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Baran, T. (2021). Collective narcissism, in-group satisfaction, and solidarity in the face of COVID-19. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 12(6), 1071–1081.

Fiske, A. P., Seibt, B., & Schubert, T. (2019). The sudden devotion emotion: Kama muta and the cultural practices whose function is to evoke it. *Emotion Review*, 11(1), 74–86.

Forgas, J. P., & Lantos, D. L. (2019). Understanding populism: Collective narcissism and the collapse of democracy in Hungary. In J. P. Forgas, K. Fiedler, & W. D. Crano (Eds.), *Applications of social psychology* (pp. 267–291). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Fritsche, I., Jonas, E., Ablasser, C., Beyer, M., Kuban, J., Manger, A., & Schultz, M. (2013). The power of we: Evidence for group-based control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(1), 19–32.

Fromm, E. (1973). *The anatomy of human destructiveness*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Fromm, E. (2010). *The heart of man: Its genius for good and evil*. Riverdale, NY: The American Mental Health Foundation. (Original work published 1964)

Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(5), 854–878.

Golec de Zavala, A. (2011). Collective narcissism and intergroup hostility: The dark side of "in-group love." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(6), 309–320.

Golec de Zavala, A. (2018). Collective narcissism: Antecedents and consequences of exaggeration of the in-group image. In A. Hermann, A. Brunell, & J. Foster (Eds.), *The handbook of trait narcissism: Key advances, research methods, and controversies* (pp. 79–88). Springer.

Golec de Zavala, A. (2019). Collective narcissism and in-group satisfaction are associated with different emotional profiles and psychological wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 203. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00203

Golec de Zavala, A., & Bierwiaczonek, K. (2021). Male, national, and religious collective narcissism predict sexism. *Sex Roles*, 84(11), 680–700.

Golec de Zavala, A., & Cichocka, A. (2012). Collective narcissism and anti-semitism in Poland. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(2), 213–229.

Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2013). The paradox of in-group love: Differentiating collective narcissism advances understanding of the relationship between in-group love and out-group attitudes. *Journal of Personality*, 81, 16–28.

Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., Eidelson, R., & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism and its social consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6), 1074–1096.

Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Iskra-Golec, I. (2013). Collective narcissism moderates the effect of in-group image threat on intergroup hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(6), 1019–1039.

Golec de Zavala, A., Dyduch-Hazar, K., & Lantos, D. (2019). Collective narcissism: Political consequences of investment of self-worth in the ingroup' s image. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 40(S1), 37–74.

Golec de Zavala, A., Federico, C. M., Sedikides, C., Guerra, R., Lantos, D., Mroziński, B., . . . Baran, T. (2020). Low self-esteem predicts out-group derogation via collective narcissism, but this relationship is obscured by in-group satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 119(3), 741–764.

Golec de Zavala, A., Guerra, R., & Simao, C. (2017). The relationship between the Brexit vote and individual predictors of prejudice: Collective narcissism, right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article 2023. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02023

Golec de Zavala, A., & Keenan, O. (2021). Collective narcissism as a framework for understanding populism. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, 5(2), 54–64.

Golec de Zavala, A., & Lantos, D. (2020). Collective narcissism and its social consequences: The bad and the ugly. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(3), 273–278.

Golec de Zavala, A., Peker, M., Guerra, R., & Baran, T. (2016). Collective narcissism predicts hypersensitivity to in-group insult and direct and indirect retaliatory intergroup hostility. *European Journal of Personality*, 30, 532–551.

Górska, P., Stefaniak, A., Malinowska, K., Lipowska, K., Marchlewska, M., Budziszewska, M., & Maciantowicz, O. (2020). Too great to act in solidarity: The negative relationship between collective narcissism and solidarity-based collective action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(3), 561–578.

Górska, P., Stefaniak, A., Marchlewska, M., Matera, J., Kocyba, P., Łukianow, M., ···& Lipowska, K. (2022). Refugees unwelcome: Narcissistic and secure national commitment differentially predict collective action against immigrants and refugees. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 86, 258–271.

Guerra, R., Bierwiaczonek, K., Ferreira, M., Golec de Zavala, A., Abakoumkin,

G., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2020). An intergroup approach to collective narcissism: Intergroup threats and hostility in four European Union countries. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220972178

Hamer, K., Penczek, M., & Bilewicz, M. (2018). Between universalistic and defensive forms of group attachment. The indirect effects of national identification on intergroup forgiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 131, 15–20.

Harding, J. F., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). The palliative function of system justification: Concurrent benefits versus longer-term costs to wellbeing. *Social Indicators Research*, 113(1), 401–418.

Hase, A., Behnke, M., Mazurkiewicz, M., Wieteska, K. K., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2021). Distress and retaliatory aggression in response to witnessing intergroup exclusion are greater on higher levels of collective narcissism. *Psychophysiology*, 58(9), Article e13879. https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13879

Honneth, A. (1996). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts* (J. Anderson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1992)

Honneth. (2020). *Recognition: A chapter in the history of European ideas* (J. Ganahl, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 2018)

Imhoff, R. (2010). *The dynamics of collective guilt three generations after Holocaust: Young Germans' emotional experiences in response to the Nazi past*. Hamburg, Germany: Kovac.

Jasko, K., Webber, D., Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M., Taufiqurrohman, M., Hettiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2020). Social context moderates the effects of quest for significance on violent extremism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 118(6), 1165–1187.

Jost, J. T. (2019). A quarter century of system justification theory: Questions, answers, criticisms, and societal applications. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 58(2), 263–314.

Jost, J., & Hunyady, O. (2003). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 13(1), 111–153.

Krizan, Z., & Herlache, A. D. (2018). The narcissism spectrum model: A synthetic view of narcissistic personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22(1), 3–31.

Kuchynka, S. L., & Bosson, J. L. (2018). The psychodynamic mask model of narcissism: Where is it now? In A. D. Herman, A. B. Brunel, & J. D. Foster

(Eds.), *Handbook of trait narcissism. Key advances, research methods, and controversies* (pp. 89–95). Springer.

Larkin, B., & Fink, J. S. (2019). Toward a better understanding of fan aggression and dysfunction: The moderating role of collective narcissism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 33(2), 69–78.

Lavelock, C. R., Worthington Jr, E. L., Davis, D. E., Griffin, B. J., Reid, C. A., Hook, J. N., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2014). The quiet virtue speaks: An intervention to promote humility. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 42(1), 99–110.

Lyons, P. A., Kenworthy, J. B., & Popan, J. R. (2010). Ingroup identification and group-level narcissism predictors of U.S. citizens' attitudes toward Arab immigrants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(9), 1267–1280.

Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Furman, A., & Cislak, A. (2021). Who respects the will of the people? Support for democracy is linked to high secure national identity but low national narcissism. *British Journal of Social Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12499

Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Jaworska, M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2020). Superficial in-group love? Collective narcissism predicts in-group image defense, outgroup prejudice and lower in-group loyalty. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59(4), 857–875.

Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Łozowski, F., Górska, P., & Winiewski, M. (2019). In search of an imaginary enemy: Catholic collective narcissism and the endorsement of gender conspiracy beliefs. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 159(6), 766–779.

Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Panayiotou, O., Castellanos, K., & Batayneh, J. (2018). Populism as identity politics: Perceived in-group disadvantage, collective narcissism, and support for populism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(2), 151–162.

Marchlewska, M., Górska, P., Malinowska, K., & Jarosław, K. (2021). Threatened masculinity: Gender-related collective narcissism predicts prejudice toward gay and lesbian people among heterosexual men in Poland. *Journal of Homosexuality.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2021.1907067

Miller, J. D., Back, M. D., Lynam, D. R., & Wright, A. G. (2021). Narcissism today: What we know and what we need to learn. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30(6), 519–525.

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, 76(3), 449–476.

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Keith Campbell, W. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological

network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 79(5), 1013–1042.

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Hyatt, C. S., & Campbell, W. K. (2017). Controversies in narcissism. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 13, 291–315.

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., McCain, J. L., Few, L. R., Crego, C., Widiger, T. A., & Campbell, W. K. (2016). Thinking structurally about narcissism: An examination of the Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory and its components. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 30(1), 1–18.

Mole, R., Golec de Zavala, A., & Ardag, M. M. (2021). Homophobia and national collective narcissism in populist Poland. *European Journal of Sociology*, 62(1), 37–70.

Montoya, R. M. (2020). *Narcissistic group orientation, water-like group orientation, and their relations to in-group identification* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

Montoya, R. M., Pittinsky, T. L., & Rosenthal, S. A. (2020). A multidimensional model of collective narcissism. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, 4(4), 169–193.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12(4), 177–196.

Mota, S., Humberg, S., Krause, S., Fatfouta, R., Geukes, K., Schröder-Abé, M., & Back, M. D. (2020). Unmasking narcissus: A competitive test of existing hypotheses on (agentic, antagonistic, neurotic, and communal) narcissism and (explicit and implicit) self-esteem across 18 samples. *Self and Identity*, 19(4), 435–455.

Nowak, B., Brzóska, P., Piotrowski, J., Sedikides, C., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., & Jonason, P. K. (2020). Adaptive and maladaptive behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: The roles of Dark Triad traits, collective narcissism, and health beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 167, Article 110232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110232

Putnam, A. L., Ross, M. Q., Soter, L. K., & Roediger III, H. L. (2018). Collective narcissism: Americans exaggerate the role of their home state in appraising US history. *Psychological Science*, 29(9), 1414–1422.

Rogoza, R., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., & Campbel, W. K. (2018). Measurement of narcissism: From classical applications to modern approaches. *Studia Psychologica*, 1(18), 27–48.

Rosenthal, S. A., Hooley, J. M., Montoya, R. M., van der Linden, S. L., & Steshenko, Y. (2020). The Narcissistic Grandiosity Scale: A measure to distinguish narcissistic grandiosity from high self-esteem. *Assessment*, 27(3), 487–507.

Sedikides, C. (2021). In search of narcissus. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(1), 67–80.

Skarżyńska, K., & Przybyła, K. (2015). Belief in national victimhood: An effect of collective narcissism, individual self-esteem or in-group situation? *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 58, 9–30.

Stellar, J. E., Cohen, A., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2015). Affective and physiological responses to the suffering of others: Compassion and vagal activity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(4), 572–585.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Rios Morrison, K. (2016). Intergroup threat theory. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (2nd ed., pp. 255–278). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Thomaes, S., Bushman, B. J., Castro, B. O. D., Cohen, G. L., & Denissen, J. J. (2009). Reducing narcissistic aggression by buttressing self-esteem: An experimental field study. *Psychological Science*, 20(12), 1536–1542.

van Prooijen, J. W., & Song, M. (2021). The cultural dimension of intergroup conspiracy theories. *British Journal of Psychology*, 112(2), 455–473.

Wang, X., Zuo, S. J., Chan, H. W., Chiu, C. P. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (2021). COVID-19-related conspiracy theories in China: The role of secure versus defensive in-group positivity and responsibility attributions. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1177/18344909211034928

Yustisia, W., Putra, I. E., Kavanagh, C., Whitehouse, H., & Rufaedah, A. (2020). The role of religious fundamentalism and tightness-looseness in promoting collective narcissism and extreme group behavior. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 12(2), 231–240.

Zaromb, F. M., Liu, J. H., Páez, D., Hanke, K., Putnam, A. L., & Roediger III, H. L. (2018). We made history: Citizens of 35 countries overestimate their Nation' s role in world history. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 7(4), 521–528.

Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J., Sawicki, A., & Jonason, P. K. (2021). We will rescue Italy, but we dislike the European Union: Collective narcissism and the COVID-19 threat. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211002923

Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J., Sedikides, C., Sawicki, A., Czarna, A. Z., Fatfouta, R., & Baran, T. (2021). Communal collective narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, 89(5), 1062–1080.

---

[3] Ethnocentrism is sometimes translated as "ethnic centrism," "racial centrism," or "ingroup centrism," and is defined as a strong sense of ingroup importance and ingroup-centeredness (Bizumic & Duckitt, 2009).

[4] Kama muta, derived from Sanskrit, literally means "moved by love." It is conceived as a distinct positive emotion experienced when a communal sharing relationship is suddenly intensified (Fiske et al., 2019).