

Collective Narcissism and Anti-Semitism in Poland: the Mediating Role of Siege Beliefs and the
Conspiracy Stereotype of Jews

Agnieszka Golec de Zavala

Middlesex University

&

Aleksandra Cichocka

University of Warsaw

Agnieszka Golec de Zavala is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Psychology, School of Health and Social Sciences, Middlesex University, London, United Kingdom. Aleksandra Cichocka is a doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland.

Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Agnieszka Golec de Zavala, Department of Psychology, Middlesex University, The Town Hall, The Burroughs, Hendon, London NW4 4BT, UK. Email: a.golec@MDX.ac.uk Phone +44 2084114902.

Abstract

Two studies examined the relationship between collective narcissism - an identification with an in-group linked to an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief about its unparalleled greatness (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) - and anti-Semitism in Poland. Results indicate that this relationship is simultaneously mediated by (a) a belief that the in-group is constantly threatened by hostile intentions of other groups (Polish siege beliefs; Bar-Tal & Antebi, 1992a, b) and (b) a belief that the Jewish out-group is particularly threatening because its members secretly aim to dominate the world (conspiracy stereotype of Jews; Bergmann, 2008; Kofta & Sędek, 2005). Results confirm that collective narcissism is linked to increased sensitivity to intergroup threat which drives its association with intergroup hostility.

Keywords: collective narcissism, anti-Semitism, siege beliefs, conspiracy stereotype of Jews

In a comprehensive meta-analytic review of research on the relationship between intergroup threat and prejudice, Riek, Mania and Gaertner (2006) suggest that in order to better understand the aetiology of prejudice it is important to identify individual difference variables that increase the likelihood of interpreting intergroup situations as threatening. We propose that collective narcissism - an in-group identification tied to an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief about the in-group's greatness - is related to high susceptibility to signs of intergroup threat accompanied by prejudice against out-groups, especially those stereotypically perceived as threatening, powerful and competitive (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson & Jayawickreme, 2009).

Collective narcissism predicts intergroup aggressiveness over and above such robust predictors as social dominance orientation, authoritarianism, blind patriotism, nationalism, in-group glorification or a belief in the in-group's superiority (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009; Golec de Zavala, 2007). Collective narcissists retaliate against threats to the in-group's positive image (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2009a) and interpret ambiguous out-group actions as insulting and offensive to the in-group (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009). Collective narcissism is also associated with enduring negative attitudes towards *certain* social groups: those with whom the in-group shares a history of interdependence and mutual grievances. For example, ethnic collective narcissism in Great Britain predicts negativity towards Whites among Blacks and animosity towards Blacks among Whites (Golec de Zavala, et al, 2009). Polish national narcissism predicts anti-Semitism (Golec de Zavala, et al, 2009) but it is not related to negative attitudes towards the French or British (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 20010).

In this paper, we argue that the relationship between collective narcissism and prejudice is driven by a belief that the in-group is particularly exposed and vulnerable in intergroup relations and a belief that the out-group is a source of threat. We present results of two studies that focus on the relationship between Polish national narcissism and anti-Semitism and test the hypotheses that the relationship between Polish collective narcissism and anti-Semitism is mediated by (i) the exaggerated sensitivity to intergroup threat expressed in national *siege beliefs* and (ii) the tendency to believe that Jews are a particularly threatening out-group expressed in the conspiracy stereotype of Jews. We focus on predictors of anti-Semitism because it is one of the most prevalent forms of prejudice in Poland and across Europe (Bergmann, 2008; see also Kofta & Sędek, 2005; Krzemiński, 2004). It is particularly curious because in most countries it is a case of “anti-Semitism without Jews”, i.e. prejudice against an almost non-existent minority, which is stereotypically perceived as threatening to the national self-image (Bergmann, 2008).

Collective Narcissism, Intergroup Hostility and Prejudice

According to social identity theory (e.g. Tajfel & Turner, 1986), a tendency to derogate out-groups intensifies under perceived threat to the social identity and increased salience of group membership. It has been suggested that the strength of in-group identification is one of the important antecedents of perceived intergroup threat. The more people identify with their group, the more they are chronically aware of their group membership (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Tausch, Hewstone, Kenworthy, Cairns & Christ, 2007) and the more sensitive they are to anything that can harm the in-group (e.g. Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). In addition, high identifiers are more likely to see the threats to the in-group as personally threatening (Bizman & Yinon, 2001). However, the meta-analytic review indicates that the relationship between the strength of positive in-group identification and

perceived intergroup threat, although statistically significant, is rather weak (Riek et al., 2006).

We propose that it may not be the strength but the specific form of in-group identification that reliably predicts the perception of intergroup threat and prejudice. It has been demonstrated that certain forms of positive in-group identification are more reliably accompanied with out-group negativity than others (e.g. Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brewer, 1999; Brown, 2000).

Studies indicate that *collective* and *threatened* self-esteem seems to be systematically linked to out-group hostility. Out-group derogation serves as a means of protecting threatened personal (Fein & Spencer, 1997) or collective self-esteem (Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003). Studies show also that high private collective self-esteem, which reflects positive evaluation of an in-group *or* low, public, collective self-esteem, which reflects the belief that others do not evaluate an in-group positively, account for intergroup bias (e.g. Hunter et al., 2005; Long & Spears, 1998; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). In addition, individuals with discrepant (or defensive) personal self-esteem (assessed as the inconsistency between high, explicit and low, implicit self-esteem) tend to discriminate against out-groups when their self-image is threatened (Jordan, Spencer, Zanna, Hoshino-Browne & Correll, 2003; Jordan, Spencer & Zanna, 2005; Spencer, Jordan, Logel & Zanna, 2005; Kernis, Grannemann & Barclay, 1989). In the context of national groups, studies show that blind patriotism (i.e. the uncritical idealization of a nation) and nationalism (i.e. the sense of superiority of a national group) are more likely to be related to prejudice and intergroup hostility than constructive patriotism (i.e. the love and commitment to a national group, e.g. de Figueiro & Elkins, 2003; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Schatz & Staub, 1997; Viroli, 1995).

We argue that the concept of collective narcissism provides a common interpretative framework for those diverse findings and helps explain why certain forms of in-group love (e.g. nationalism or blind patriotism) are related to prejudice towards out-groups. Collective

narcissism is an individual difference variable that describes what people believe about the social group to which they belong and with which they identify. The concept of collective narcissism extends into the intergroup domain via the concept of individual narcissism, a grandiose view of oneself that requires continual external validation¹ (e.g. Crocker & Park, 2004; Emmons, 1987; Horney, 1937; Morf, & Rhodewalt, 2001; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Rhodewalt & Sorrow, 2003), and that is related to a defensive and discrepant personal self-esteem (e.g. Bosson, Lakey, Campbell, Zeigler-Hill, Jordan & Kernis, 2008; Bosson, Brown, Zeigler-Hill & Swann, 2003; Jordan et al., 2003; Jordan, Spencer, & Zanna, 2003; Kernis, Abend, Shrira, Goldman, Paradise & Hampton, 2005; Zeigler-Hill, 2006). Narcissists are emotionally attached to their belief in their own greatness and they are preoccupied with protecting it. For collective narcissists the grandiose belief concerns the group with which they identify. Collective narcissism is predicted by high private *and* low public collective self-esteem. Thus, it can be seen as a combination of a belief in the positive characteristics of the in-group and a belief that the in-group is not as appreciated by others. Collective narcissism represents *threatened and defensive, collective* self-esteem. It is predicted by a combination of the explicit high regard for the in-group accompanied by the implicit low collective self-esteem (as indicated by the national self-esteem IAT test; Golec de Zavala et al, 2009). Thus, collective narcissism seems to combine the grandiose group image, the conviction that the group is not adequately appreciated by others and the more or less acknowledged self doubts about the group's greatness

Collective Narcissism and Other Forms of In-Group Favouritism

Collective narcissism is distinct from such forms of extensive in-group favouritism as the belief in the in-group's superiority (Eidelson & Eidelson, 1999; or nationalism, in the context of a national group; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989) or in-group's glorification

(Rocass, Klar & Liviatan, 2006; or blind patriotism, in the context of a national group; Schatz et al, 1999).² Studies also confirm that collective narcissism is a more reliable predictor of out-group hostility than in-group glorification or belief in the in-group's superiority (Cichocka & Golec de Zavala, 2010; Golec de Zavala, 2006; Golec de Zavala et al, 2009; Imhoff, 2009) and it partially mediates the effects of blind patriotism and nationalism on intergroup aggressiveness (Golec de Zavala, 2006; Golec de Zavala et al, 2009). Moreover, when the common variance between national narcissism and constructive national self-esteem is controlled, only national narcissism predicts out-group enmity and it emerges as a suppressor of the negative relationship between constructive national esteem and prejudice (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka & Bilewicz, 2010).

Collective narcissism is a broader concept than nationalism or blind patriotism as people can be narcissistic about other, not only national, groups. However, national narcissism and blind patriotism overlap in the uncritical approach towards the national in-group and national narcissism and nationalism share the belief in the nation's inherent superiority. However, unlike the other variables collective narcissism is primarily preoccupied with validating and protecting the in-group's image. The aggressiveness related to collective narcissism is defensive and retaliatory. It does not serve the purpose of achieving a dominant in-group position born out of competitiveness. These concerns, however, constitute nationalism and blind patriotism (Schatz et al., 1999; see also Bar-Tal, 1996; de Figueiredo & Elkins, 2003). We argue that national narcissism is an important aspect of nationalism and an attempt to explain why collective narcissism inspires prejudice is likely to deepen our understanding of nationalistic hostility.

We argue that it is the very nature of the beliefs about the in-group which make up collective narcissism that inspires the sensitivity to any sign of threat to the in-group's

exaggerated image and links it to out-group hostility. Collective narcissism comprises an unrealistically high group esteem that is contingent on constant external validation. People with contingent self-worth exaggerate failures and underestimate successes in the domains of contingency (Baumesiter & Vohs, 2001; Crocker & Park, 2004; Kernis, 2003; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Therefore, collective narcissists rarely see the acknowledgement of the in-group by others as satisfactory. They quickly develop “tolerance” to known sources of support for the exaggerated in-group’s image and are constantly on the lookout for new signs of anything that may undermine their group. They tend to overreact to what they perceive as a threat to the in-group’s positive image.

Collective Narcissism and Polish Siege Beliefs

We propose that collective narcissism, with its extraordinary sensitivity to anything that can undermine the in-group’s image, is likely to inspire the *siege beliefs system* resulting from the exaggeration of signs of out-group’s hostility. The *siege mentality* prompts generally distrustful and negative attitudes towards other groups as it is “[a] belief held by group members stating that the rest of the world has highly negative behavioural intentions toward them” (Bar-tal & Antebi, 1992a, pp.49) that is “accompanied with additional thoughts (...) that they are ‘alone’ in the world, that there is a threat to their existence, that the group must be united in the face of danger, that they cannot expect help from anyone in time of need, and that all means are justified for group defence” (Bar-Tal & Antebi, 1992b, pp. 34; see also Bar-Tal, 2000).

Siege beliefs explain and justify hardships suffered in the name of the in-group in intractable conflicts and legitimize the hostility and violence perpetrated by the in-group (Bar-Tal & Antebi, 1992a, b). Importantly, people may differ with respect to how much conflict they perceive (e.g. Bar-Tal, Kruglanski & Klar, 1993; Golec & Federico, 2004) and how

much they find the siege beliefs convincing. The siege beliefs offer an explanation and justification for the constant monitoring of the signs of the mistreatment of the in-group associated with collective narcissism. They are also likely to satisfy collective narcissists' need for the sense of in-group's uniqueness, special status and moral superiority because they maintain that the misunderstood and righteous in-group stands alone against the hostile and dissolute world. Most importantly, the siege beliefs may appeal to collective narcissists because they confirm what the narcissists seem continuously, although unwillingly, to suspect: that other groups do not properly acknowledge their greatness.

We propose that because of its association with the siege beliefs about the nation, Polish national narcissism will be related to anti-Semitism. Polish studies indicate that Jews (or, more specifically, Poles of Jewish origin) are perceived as an out-group (e.g. Bilewicz, 2007). More than any other minority, this out-group inspires ambivalent emotions: guilt, anger and fear. Importantly, the Jewish people are seen as a threat to the positive national image (because of the criticism regarding Polish anti-Semitism), to Poland's national interest (because of the claims of Polish Jews or their families regarding financial retributions for the properties confiscated by the communist government in Poland) or to national security (because of the conspiracy beliefs attributing hostile intentions against the Polish state to Jews) (e.g. Bilewicz, 2007; Kofta & Sędek, 2005; Krzemiński, 2004; Wójcik, 2008). Thus, collective narcissists are likely to be prejudiced against Jews because they are likely to see this out-group as a particular exemplification of the general, external hostility against the in-group.

Collective Narcissism and The Conspiracy Stereotype of Jews

The relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism is likely to be independently driven by beliefs about the Jewish out-group. Intergroup threat can be

embedded in a negative stereotype of an out-group conveying the prediction of its hostile intentions towards the in-group (Stephan & Stephan 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). Although anti-Semitic beliefs and attitudes in Europe are under-studied, several studies indicate that the Jewish minority is quite universally perceived as threat to national identity, especially the regions where the Jewish minority was large before WWII (Bergmann, 2008). No matter how well assimilated, Jews tend to be perceived as a group that stands “*outside the national order of the world*” remaining “*essentially alien to the surrounding societies*” (Bergmann, 2008; p. 346). In addition, the in-group’s ambivalent position during the Holocaust is experienced as threat to the national self-image (e.g. Bergmann, 2008). Poland is a good example of the ambivalent position towards the Holocaust. There are reported cases of pogroms of Polish Jews perpetrated by Poles during the WWII and shortly afterwards (e.g. Gross, 2008). At the same time many Polish soldiers (of the Home Army, *Armia Krajowa*) fought in the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and Poles represent the biggest number of people who rescued Jews during the Holocaust and were awarded the ‘Righteous among the Nations’ medal by Israel (YadVashem, 2009).

In Poland and other European countries Jews are stereotypically perceived as a dangerous out-group because they are seen as motivated by a common intention to dominate the world (Bergmann, 2008; Cohen, & Golub, 1991; Kofta & Sędek, 2005). The alleged dominant and controlling intentions are executed by means of indirect and deceptive methods, hidden and non-obvious ways whose negative consequences can only be observed. According to this conspiracy stereotype, past, present and even future harm and hardship experienced by the in-group can be explained by the veiled actions of the Jewish out-group. The conspiracy stereotype of Jews predicts anti-Semitism in Poland and support for this stereotype increases in times of elections and intense political campaign (Kofta & Sędek, 2005). We expect that

collective narcissists, sensitive to all signs of potential threat to the in-group, will be likely to find the conspiracy stereotype of Jews convincing and threatening. A tendency to support the conspiracy stereotype of Jews will mediate the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitic prejudice. This mediation through the beliefs about the out-group will be parallel to and independent of the mediation through the Polish siege beliefs that emphasize the vulnerable position of the in-group.

Overview of the Studies

In Study 1 we test the prediction that Polish national narcissism is associated with the Polish siege beliefs, the set of convictions indicating that the national in-group is constantly threatened by the hostile intentions of other groups (Bar-Tal & Antebi, 1992a, b). We expect that Polish siege beliefs will mediate the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism. We propose that the out-groups with whom the in-group shares a history of competitive relations and which were previously indicated as threat to the national in-group are more likely to be targeted by prejudice because they are seen as a particular exemplification of the hostile intentions of other groups.

In Study 2 we seek to replicate the results of Study 1. We also test the hypothesis that the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism is independently mediated by the conspiracy stereotype of Jews. The conspiracy stereotype conveys the image of Jews as a powerful and skilful out-group whose competitive intentions threaten the interests, image, if not the mere existence of, the in-group. The stereotype of the Jewish out-group poses the intergroup threat. We expect that the two mediations – via the siege beliefs and via the conspiracy stereotype of Jews - are parallel, i.e. simultaneous and independent. Even though the siege beliefs about the in-group and the conspiracy beliefs about the out-group may share

common components, we assume that each of these variables should have a unique ability to mediate between Polish national narcissism and anti-Semitism above and beyond the other variable. In other words, there are two separate reasons why collective narcissism is likely to be linked to prejudice. One reason pertains to beliefs about the vulnerable and exposed position of the in-group. The second reason pertains to characteristics attributed to the out-group that make it seem particularly threatening to the in-group. In addition, in Study 2 we seek to demonstrate that collective narcissism, rather than the mere strength of group identification (e.g. Bizman & Yinon, 2001; Branscombe & Wann, 1994), predicts the perception of intergroup threat and out-group negativity.

Study 1

Method

Participants and procedure.

Participants of Study 1 were 148 undergraduate students of a large Polish university. The study was conducted on-line. Participants obtained a research participation credit and the possibility to take part in a prize draw in return for participation. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 45 ($M = 23.12$, $SD = 4.89$). There were 135 women and 13 men among the participants.

Measures.

Collective narcissism ($\alpha = .77$, $M = 3.26$, $SD = .67$). The 9-item Collective Narcissism Scale (Golec de Zavala, et al, 2009) was used in order to measure this construct. The items for this scale were generated based on the definition of the construct and existing inventories of individual narcissism, mostly the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) (Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Only the items that corresponded to the core aspects of the concept of individual narcissism but at the same time could be meaningfully translated onto the group

level were used. For selected items, beliefs about the self were replaced with beliefs about one's in-group. The scale contains items reflecting the belief in the in-group's greatness and lack of its proper recognition (e.g. "*If my group had a major say in the world, the world would be a much better place*"; "*I wish other groups would more quickly recognize the authority of my group.*"; "*My group deserves special treatment*"; "(6) *I do not get upset when people do not notice the achievements of my group*" (reversely coded);). Participants were instructed to think about their national group while responding to the items of the scale. Participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with statements using a 6-point scale (1 = "*I strongly disagree*" and 6 = "*I strongly agree*").

Siege beliefs ($\alpha = .77$, $M = 2.81$, $SD = .76$). The 12-item General Siege Mentality Scale proposed by Bar-Tal & Antebi (1992a) was used to measure this construct. The scale was translated from English to Polish by a bilingual translator. It was then back translated by a bilingual expert in social psychology. The scale contains items reflecting the belief that the in-group is constantly threatened (e.g. "*Most nations will conspire against us, if only they have the possibility to do so.*" or "*There have always been countries which looked for closeness and friendship with us.*" (reversely coded) and has to protect itself in this time of need (e.g. "*Only unity will save us from external enemies.*"). Participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with each statement using a 7-point scale from 1 = "*definitely disagree*" to 7 = "*definitely agree*".

Anti-Semitism ($\alpha = .71$, $M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.02$). In Study 1 we defined anti-Semitic prejudice in terms of social distance, i.e. unwillingness to engage in contacts with the Jewish out-group (see e.g. Goff, Steele & Davies, 2008; Struch & Schwartz, 1989; Bogardus, 1925). We used a 4-item scale measuring preferred social distance from Jews: "*Would you like a Jew to be your neighbor?*" (reversely coded), "*Would you like a Jew to be your friend?*"

(reversely coded), “*Would you mind your child playing with a Jewish child?*”, “*Would you mind your child marrying a person of Jewish origin?*”. Participants were asked to respond to these items using a scale from 1 - “*definitely no*” to 7 - “*definitely yes*”.

Results

In the first step of data analysis we compute zero-order correlations among variables. Collective narcissism was significantly positively related to the Polish siege beliefs ($r(147) = .48, p = .001$) and anti-Semitism ($r(146) = .20, p = .02$). Siege beliefs were significantly correlated with anti-Semitism ($r(147) = .37, p = .001$).

In order to test the main hypothesis that siege beliefs mediate the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism, we used the bootstrapping method recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2004) to obtain bias corrected 95% bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effect of the mediator. Bootstrapping does not require assumptions about the shape of the sampling distribution of the indirect effect and is considered as a suitable method for assessing indirect effects in smaller samples (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; for information on required sample size for detecting effects with the use of different tests of mediation see also Fritz and MacKinnon, 2007).

The mediation model is presented in Figure 1. The total effect of collective narcissism on the tendency to keep one’s distance from Jews was positive and significant, $B = .29, SE = .12, t = 2.37, p = .02$. The relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism was reduced and became non-significant after the mediator was added to the model. The direct effect amounted to $B = .04, SE = .13, t = .31, p = .76$. Collective narcissism was positively associated with siege mentality, $B = .54, SE = .08, t = 6.52, p < .001$. Siege mentality was positively associated with anti-Semitism, $B = .47, SE = .12, t = 3.91, p < .001$. The difference between the total and direct effects of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism is the total

indirect effect via the siege beliefs. We computed its confidence interval with 10,000 bootstrap samples. The indirect effect had a 95% bootstrap bias corrected confidence interval of .12 to .40, which indicates that the indirect effect of the mediator was significant. The whole mediation model was also significant, $R^2 = .14$, $F(4,142) = 5.66$, $p < .001$.

Although considered the most appropriate method of assessment of indirect effects (Hayes, 2009; Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2008), bootstrapping is also a relatively new approach. Thus, we performed the mediation analysis also using a more familiar (although less accurate) Sobel (1982) test to provide an alternative test of the significance of the indirect effect of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism via siege beliefs. The Sobel test indicated that collective narcissism had a significant indirect effect on anti-Semitism via the siege beliefs ($z = 3.30$; $p < .001$).

Discussion Study 1

The results of Study 1 confirm the positive relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism. Most importantly, as hypothesized, they reveal that this relationship is mediated by the siege beliefs portraying the in-group as constantly threatened by hostile intentions of other groups. Thus, collective narcissism emerges as an individual difference variable that is associated with chronic perception of the exposed and vulnerable position of the in-group in the context of intergroup relationships. Such a perception is likely to increase susceptibility to intergroup threat. This perception drives the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitic prejudice. The results of study 1 suggest that the assumptions about the in-group motivate negative attitudes towards a particular out-group. Earlier studies indicate that collective narcissism is not related to generalized negativity towards out-groups. It predicts prejudice towards certain, but not all, social groups (e.g. Golec de Zavala, 2006).

Thus, there is also something about the out-group that spurs the hostility of collective narcissists.

In Study 2 we test the assumption that the stereotypical belief that the Jewish out-group is particularly threatening and hostile mediates the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism, over and above the mediation through the siege beliefs. In Study 2 we use more direct indicators of anti-Semitism in order to conceptually replicate the results of Study 1, namely negative emotions and aggressive behavioural intentions towards Jews. In Study 2 we also compare the role of collective narcissism and the strength of in-group identification as predictors of perceived intergroup threat and anti-Semitism.

Study 2

Method

Participants and Procedure.

Study 2 was conducted among 89 undergraduate students of a large Polish university. Participants were asked to take part in an on-line survey in return for research participation credit. The age of the participants ranged from 17 to 24 ($M = 21.17$, $SD = 1.51$). There were 63 women and 26 men among the participants.

Measures.

Collective narcissism ($\alpha = .84$, $M = 3.51$, $SD = .78$). The Collective Narcissism Scale (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) was used in order to measure this variable as in Study 1.

Group identification ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 1.70$). The overlap in-group identification measure proposed by Tropp & Wright (2001) was used. Participants were asked to indicate the degree of their identification with the national in-group as represented by two overlapping circles, one representing the self and the other representing national in-group. The circles

formed an 8-point scale from a set of two separate circles (1 – “*no identification at all*”) through degrees of overlap to full overlap (8 – “*total identification*”).

Siege beliefs ($\alpha = .77, M = 3.30, SD = .87$). The same Polish translation of the General Siege Mentality Scale (Bar-Tal, Antebi, 1992a) as in Study 1 was used.

Conspiracy Jewish stereotype ($\alpha = .90, M = 5.41, SD = 1.99$). This variable was measured with a 6-item Jewish Conspiracy Stereotype Scale proposed by Kofta and Sędek (2005). The scale measures the belief that secret and deceptive actions of the Jewish out-group are aimed at taking control over the world. The Jewish out-group is seen as an entity driven by one common motivation to dominate others. The conspiracy stereotype is considered a central characteristic of anti-Semitism in Poland (Kofta & Sędek, 2005). The items of the scale reflected the belief that Jews strive for power (e.g. “*Members of this group strive to rule the world*”, “*Members of this group attempt to take over the world’s economy*”, “*Members of this group would like to hold decisive votes in international financial institutions*”) and that their actions are secretive and well co-ordinated (e.g. “*Members of this group meet secretly to discuss important issues*”, “*Actions of members of this group are often clandestine*”, “*Members of this group reach their goals through secret agreements*”). Participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with each statement using a 9-point scale from 1 = “*definitely disagree*” to 9 = “*definitely agree*”.

Negative evaluation of Jews ($\alpha = .95, M = 3.57, SD = 1.41$). This variable was measured following the procedure proposed by Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp (1997; see also Butz, Plant, & Doerr, 2007). Participants were asked to indicate their feelings towards Jews using six semantic differentials: *cold – warm, unfriendly – friendly, trustful – distrustful, positive – negative, respect – contempt, admiration – disgust*. Scores could range from 1 to 8. Higher scores indicated greater out-group negativity.

Aggressiveness towards Jews ($\alpha = .92$, $M = 1.45$, $SD = .99$). Aggressive behavioral intentions against Jews were measured by four items adopted from Struch and Schwartz (1989). Hypothetical aggressive acts towards Jews were listed, e.g. refusing to hire Jews because of their origins, convincing friends not to rent flats to Jews, listening to noisy music in order to irritate a Jewish neighbor. Participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with each action and would perform it themselves, using a scale from 1 = “*definitely reject it*” to 7 = “*agree with the action and would perform it myself in certain conditions*”.

The negative evaluation of Jews and support for aggressive actions against them were positively correlated ($r = .38$, $p < .001$). We created a composite score of anti-Semitism that encompassed the two direct indicators of anti-Semitism. Because the two components of the composite score were measured on different scales, responses were first transformed into z scores before the composite indicator of anti-Semitism was computed.

Results

Correlational analyses presented in Table 1 indicate that collective narcissism is positively related to siege mentality, the conspiracy stereotype of Jews and anti-Semitism. National in-group identification is related to siege beliefs but not to the conspiracy stereotype or to prejudice against Jews. In order to control for the common variance between collective narcissism and in-group identification we regressed collective narcissism and group identification on siege mentality (controlling for age and gender). Collective narcissism was positively and significantly associated with siege mentality, $B = .73$, $SE = .11$, $t = 6.83$, $p < .001$, whereas the relationship between in-group identification and perceived threat from hostile intentions of others was reduced and became non-significant, $B = -.04$, $SE = .05$, $t = -.078$, $p = .44$; $R^2 = .40$, $F(4,83) = 14.04$, $p < .001$. Once the common variance of the strength

of in-group identification and collective narcissism is controlled, collective narcissism emerges as the unique predictor of the siege beliefs.

-----Insert Table 1 about here-----

In order to test the hypothesis that siege beliefs and the Jewish conspiracy stereotype independently mediate the relationship between collective narcissism and anti-Semitism we used the bootstrapping method suggested by Preacher and Hayes (2008). This approach allows us to assess the extent to which each of these variables mediates the effect of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism, conditional on the presence of the other variable in the model. Since siege beliefs and conspiracy stereotype were positively correlated, analyzing them simultaneously in a multiple mediator model teased apart their individual mediating abilities that could be attributed to their content overlap (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

To assess the independent indirect effects of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism via the siege beliefs and the conspiracy stereotype of Jews, we used bootstrapping to obtain the bias corrected 95 % confidence intervals for the total indirect effect and the specific indirect effects of each mediator analyzed together. The analyses controlled for age and gender.³ The coefficients of the model are presented in Figure 2 and the bootstrapping confidence intervals are presented in Table 2.

-----Insert Figure 2 and Table 2 about here-----

The total effect of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism amounts to $B = .23$, $SE = .11$, $t = 1.99$, $p = .05$, while its direct effect is $B = -.21$, $SE = .14$, $t = -1.53$, $p = .13$. The difference between the total and direct effects is the total indirect effect via the two mediators. It had a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of .25 to .69, i.e. the total indirect effect of both mediators is significant.

Running head: COLLECTIVE NARCISSISM, SIEGE BELIEFS, CONSPIRACY
STEREOTYPE OF JEWS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

The path from collective narcissism to siege mentality had a coefficient of $B = .69$, $SE = .10$, $t = 7.28$, $p < .001$ and the path from collective narcissism to conspiracy stereotype had a coefficient of $B = 1.18$, $SE = .23$, $t = 5.11$, $p < .001$. The direct effects of mediators on anti-Semitism were also significant: $B = .27$, $SE = .12$, $t = 2.34$, $p = .02$ for siege mentality and $B = .21$, $SE = .05$, $t = 4.33$, $p < .001$ for conspiracy stereotype. The predictors included in the full model accounted for a significant portion of variance in anti-Semitism, $R^2 = .30$, $F(5,81) = 7.04$, $p < .001$.

An examination of the specific indirect effects indicated that both siege beliefs and the conspiracy stereotype of Jews were statistically significant and independent mediators of the effect of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism. The specific indirect effect via the siege beliefs had a confidence interval of .05 to .40 and the specific indirect effect via the conspiracy stereotype had a confidence interval of .13 to .41. In order to establish whether the effects of mediators differ significantly in magnitude we conducted a pairwise contrast of the two indirect effects. Since the siege mentality minus conspiracy stereotype contrast had a confidence interval of -.18 to .26, we cannot infer that the two effects differed in magnitude.

Finally, we used the Sobel test (1982) to confirm the significance of the indirect effects of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism via siege beliefs and via the conspiracy stereotype. Collective narcissism had significant indirect effects on negativity towards Jews both via siege mentality ($z = 2.14$, $p = .03$) and via the conspiracy stereotype of Jews ($z = 3.25$, $p = .001$).

Since siege mentality and the conspiracy stereotype of Jews were positively correlated, it is also plausible that they influenced each other in driving anti-Semitic sentiments. For example, one could argue that collective narcissism is related to siege mentality, which in turn leads to conspiracy stereotyping and, thus, to hostility towards Jews. To verify this possibility

we tested the multiple-step multiple mediator model proposed by Hayes, Preacher & Myersa (in press). We used the MODTHREE macro that allows for a simultaneous test of specific indirect effects of each mediator alone and a specific indirect effect through both mediators. In the first analysis we tested the collective narcissism → the siege beliefs → conspiracy stereotyping → anti-Semitism multi-step mediation. While the independent specific indirect effects of siege mentality and the conspiracy stereotype remained significant, the indirect effect of both mediators became insignificant (95% bootstrap confidence intervals ranged from -.01 to .16). Similar results were obtained when we tested a model with collective narcissism → conspiracy stereotyping → siege beliefs → anti-Semitism multi-step mediation. Both indirect effects of single mediators were significant and the indirect effect of the two mediators was not significant (its 95% bootstrap confidence intervals ranged from -.01 to .05). These analyses provide further support for our hypothesis that the siege mentality and conspiracy stereotype are two independent links between narcissistic attachment to the Polish national group and anti-Semitism.

Discussion Study 2

The results of Study 2 confirm the hypothesis that siege beliefs and the belief that Jews secretly conspire to achieve economic and political power and dominate the world independently mediate the relationship between Polish national narcissism and anti-Semitism. Collective narcissism is associated with a tendency to perceive the in-group as threatened and the out-group as particularly threatening. Both tendencies independently predict out-group negativity. The strength of in-group identification is not related to prejudice against Jews. It is related to the Polish siege beliefs but this relationship is driven by the overlap between the strength of in-group identification and collective narcissism. Once the narcissistic aspect of

positive in-group identification is teased out, the relationship between the strength of in-group identification and siege beliefs disappears. These results support our claim that it is not the strength of in-group identification in general, but rather the individual level of specific, narcissistic identification that is related to the perception of intergroup threat. Consequently, it is not the strength of in-group identification but collective narcissism that is related to out-group negativity.

General Discussion

Numerous studies indicate that the perceived threat to an in-group predicts out-group derogation, prejudice and discrimination (see Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 2002; Riek et al, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). An intergroup threat may be realistic and concern group interests (e.g. Brown, Maras, Masser, Vivian & Hewstone, 2001) or symbolic and concern difference in worldviews, values and beliefs (e.g. Esses, Dovidio, Jackson & Armstrong, 2001; Greenberg, et al, 1990; McGregor et al., 1998; McLaren, 2003; Pyszczynski, et al, 2006; Sears, 1988). It can come from out-group aggression, embarrassing rejection, unjustified discrimination (Britt, Boniecki, Vescio, Biernat & Brown, 1996; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Corenblum & Stephan 2001) or uncertainty and awkwardness in the presence of out-group members (e.g. Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Importantly, intergroup threat can be also embedded in a negative stereotype of an out-group that attributes threatening features and intentions to the group and its members (Stephan & Stephan 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). It has been suggested that in order to expand our understanding of predictors of intergroup hostility it is important to study the antecedents of perception of intergroup threat.

The present results confirm that collective narcissism predicts increased sensitivity to intergroup threat. Collective narcissism is related to a tendency to perceive the in-group as

exposed and vulnerable to external threats and a tendency to believe that certain social groups are particularly threatening. Polish national narcissism is related to the Polish siege belief – the belief that the national group is threatened by the aggressive intentions of other groups and stands along against the hostile world. It is also related to increased sensitivity to the intergroup threat embedded in the negative stereotype of Jews as a particularly threatening out-group that conspires to dominate and rule the world. The perception of intergroup threat drives the relationship between collective narcissism and prejudice against the out-group that seems to embody the threat. The relationship between Polish national narcissism and anti-Semitism is independently mediated by the beliefs about threatened position of the national in-group and particularly threatening intentions and characteristics of the Jewish out-group.

The present results complement earlier findings indicating that collective narcissists react aggressively to the threat from out-group aggressiveness, out-group distancing and rejection of the in-group (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009), criticism of the in-group (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2009a) and the threat to the in-group's distinctiveness (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2009b). The present results corroborate earlier findings suggesting that the relationship between collective narcissism and intergroup hostility is mediated by perceived intergroup threat and that collective narcissism predicts the interpretation of ambiguous intergroup situations as threatening the in-group's image (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009).

Most importantly, the present results reveal an intriguing novel aspect of the relationship between collective narcissism and out-group negativity. They indicate that collective narcissism predicts not only retaliatory aggressiveness in response to momentary intergroup threat but is also associated with enduring prejudice against a known out-group in response to the stereotypical perception of this out-group as hostile and threatening and with a generalized feeling that the in-group is unjustifiably persecuted by other groups. Thus, the

present results go beyond earlier findings indicating that the relationship between collective narcissism and negative attitudes towards certain social groups can be chronic.

The present results confirm earlier suggestions that Polish anti-Semitism is related to threat and narcissistic national pride (e.g. Bergmann, 2008; Krzemiński, 2004). They indicate that Polish anti-Semitism is grounded in beliefs in national superiority that are insecure and narcissistic and fuel the sense of the in-group's vulnerability in an intergroup context and fear the hostile intentions of the Jewish out-group. We suggest that a similar mechanism is likely to drive the relationship between national narcissism and prejudice against other out-groups with whom the national in-group comes into frequent contact. Frequent intergroup relationships are hardly ever entirely smooth and harmonious. Collective narcissists neither forget nor forgive wrongs done to the in-group by out-groups (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009). Thus, they are likely to see the out-groups that in the past transgressed against the in-group as potential threats, even if the transgression was mostly in 'the eye of the beholder'. Collective narcissists exaggerate information about intergroup threat. They are likely to perceive out-groups as threatening. The more frequent and less unequivocally positive the intergroup relations with a given group, the greater the chance is that this group will be targeted by prejudice. The examination of the generalizability of the present mediation model beyond anti-Semitic prejudice would be an important direction for further research.

It is noteworthy that the earlier and present results do not suggest that collective narcissism is universally associated with intergroup aggressiveness or related to generalized out-group negativity. Instead, collective narcissism seems to describe a combination of group-based feelings that can fuel hostility in certain intergroup situations and in response to certain out-groups. Thus, although not always directly linked to out-group hostility, collective narcissism describes a predisposition to react aggressively in threatening situations and to be

prejudiced against threatening out-groups. Collective narcissism inspires the beliefs about the vulnerable and exposed position of the in-group. At the same time, collective narcissists are more susceptible to the intergroup threat embedded in the stereotypical image of the out-group. These two sets of beliefs independently mediate the relationship between collective narcissism and prejudice. The perception of the vulnerable position of the in-group does not increase the tendency to perceive the out-group as threatening and a tendency to derogate others.

Our results also confirm that Jews are stereotypically perceived as skilful but aloof and only look after themselves (e.g. Bergmann, 2008). The conspiracy stereotype conveys the image of Jews as a powerful group secretly plotting to dominate the world. The intergroup threat embedded in the negative stereotype of Jews elicits anti-Semitism. These results confirm the expectations, derived from the stereotype content model, that groups associated with high competency but low warmth are envied and disliked (e.g. Lin, Kwan, Cheung & Fiske, 2005; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu, 2002; Fiske, Xu, Cuddy & Glick, 1999) and are likely to be scapegoated by other groups (Bergmann, 2008; Glick, 2002).

We propose that the relationship between collective narcissism and the sensitivity to intergroup threat can be explained by the nature of narcissistic in-group evaluation. Collective narcissism is related to high regard for the in-group combined with a belief that the in-group is not sufficiently recognized by others and the lack of the positive evaluation of the in-group on the implicit level. Thus, collective narcissists are easily convinced that the image of their in-group is being undermined, at least partially, because willingly or not, knowingly or not, they question the positive image of the in-group themselves. At least to some extent, the threat to the positive image of the in-group comes from within rather than outside.

Aggressive responses to the perceived threat serve as means of protecting the in-group's image and maintaining the in-group's positive esteem (see Golec de Zavala et al, 2009).

Importantly, our results reveal that collective narcissism is a better predictor of the perception of intergroup threat and prejudice than just the strength of identification with the in-group. The positive relationship between the strength of in-group identification and perceived intergroup threat was reduced and became non-significant after collective narcissism was taken into account. Recently, it has been suggested that situationally manipulated in-group identification predicts intergroup negativity (Reynolds et al, 2007; see also Demoulin et al., 2009). Studies show also that negative feedback lowers public collective self-esteem and results in out-group negativity (Branscombe, Spears, Ellemers & Doosje, 2002). Our recent studies examine whether the level of collective narcissism can be situationally manipulated. Their results suggest that a tendency to identify with an in-group in a narcissistic way increases when in-group's perceived achievements or successes are not sufficiently recognized by others. Thus, we suggest that the sensitivity to intergroup threat can increase when collective narcissism is situationally manipulated, resulting in increased out-group negativity. Future studies should further examine this proposition.

Limitations

The present studies provide strong support for the hypotheses derived from the concept of collective narcissism. However, they have several shortcomings that should be considered. Firstly, in both samples, there is a disproportionate number of women among the participants. However, in all analyses we included gender as a control variable and found no significant effect of gender. In addition, we do not have any theoretical reasons to assume that men and women differ with respect to their individual levels of collective narcissism.

Secondly, the present findings are based on university student samples, which may not be representative of the population as a whole (Sears, 1986). Future studies should extend the investigation of collective narcissism and its correlates and effects to different populations. However, it is worth noting that we found remarkably consistent patterns of relationships across both presented studies.

Most importantly, although the present studies provide support for the mediational hypotheses derived from the concept of collective narcissism, they are based on correlational data and do not allow for unequivocal conclusions about causality and order of the variables. In the present paper, we provide sound theoretical reasons to justify our assumption that collective narcissism is related to siege beliefs and the conspiracy stereotype of Jews and through these beliefs to anti-Semitism. In addition, most research in the social sciences confirm the direction of causality assumed in the proposed model, suggesting that broader ideological orientations and basic in-group identification constrain specific attitudes and beliefs, such as the siege belief or the conspiracy stereotype of Jews, and out-group hostility (rather than vice versa; see e.g. Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005; Duckitt, 2006; Duckitt & Sibley, 2006; Feshbach, 1994; de Figueiredo & Elkins, 2003; Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin & Pratto, 1997). However, further experimental studies are needed in order to examine the role of collective narcissism in eliciting increased sensitivity to intergroup threat and prejudice. Such studies will deepen our understanding of individual difference variables and situational conditions, increasing the likelihood of out-group negativity and intergroup aggression.

References

- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47-92.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1996). Development of social categories and stereotypes in early childhood: The case of 'the Arab' concept formation, stereotype and attitudes by Jewish children in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(3- 4), 341-370.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2000). *Shared beliefs in a society: Social psychological analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Antebi, D. (1992a). Siege mentality in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 251-275.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Antebi, D. (1992b). Beliefs about negative intentions of the world: A study of the Israeli siege mentality. *Political Psychology*, 13, 633-645.
- Bilewicz, M. (2007). History as an obstacle: Impact of temporal-based social categorizations on Polish-Jewish intergroup contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10, 551-563.
- Cohen, R., & Golub, J. L. (1991). *Attitudes toward Jews in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. A comparative survey*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Baumeister, R. F. , & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Narcissism as addiction to esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 206-209.

- Bergmann, W. (2008). Anti-Semitic attitudes in Europe: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 343-362.
- Bilewicz, M. (2007). History as an obstacle: Impact of temporal-based social categorizations on Polish-Jewish intergroup contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10*, 551-563
- Bizman, A., & Yinon, Y. (2001). Intergroup and interpersonal threats as determinants of prejudice: The moderating role of in-group identification. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 23*(3), 191-196.
- Bogardus, E.S. (1925). Measuring Social Distances. *Journal of Applied Sociology, 9*, 299-308.
- Bosson, J. K., Brown, R. P., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). Self-enhancement tendencies among people with high explicit self-esteem: The moderating role of implicit self-esteem. *Self and Identity, 2*, 169-187.
- 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 2/3*, 1415–1439.
- Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., Ellemers, N., & Doosje, B. (2002). Intragroup and intergroup evaluation effects on group behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28* (6), 744-753.
- 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, 24*, 641—657.

- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55* (3), 429-444.
- Britt, T.W., Boniecki, K.A., Vescio, T.K., Biernat, M., & Brown, L.M. (1996). Intergroup anxiety: A person \times situation approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(11), 1177-1188.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 745-778.
- Brown, R., Maras, P., Masser, B., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (2001). Life on the ocean wave: testing some intergroup hypotheses in a naturalistic setting. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 4*, 81-97.
- 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.
- Butz, D., Plant, E., & Doerr, C. (2007). Liberty and Justice for all? Implications of Exposure to the US Flag for Intergroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 396-408.
- Cichocka, A., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2010). *Collective narcissism as an obstacle in dealing with intergroup past*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Corenblum, B., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). White fears and Native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 33* (4), 251-268.
- Cohrs, J. C., Moschner, B., Maes, J., & Kielmann, S. (2005). Personal values and attitudes toward war. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 11*, 293-312.

- Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin, 130* (3), 392–414.
- 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.
- Demoulin, S., Cortes, B. P., Viki, G. T., Rodriguez, A. P., Rodriguez, R.T., Paladino et al. (2009). The role of in-group identification in infra-humanization. *International Journal of Psychology, 44*(1), 4-11.
- Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on out-group attitudes and their mediation by threat from competitiveness to out-groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 684-696.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. (2006). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality, 20*, 1-18.
- Eidelson, R. J., & Eidelson, J. I. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. *American Psychologist, 58*, 182–192.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 161-186.
- Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 11–17.
- Esses, V.M., Dovidio, J.F., Jackson, L.M., & Armstrong, T.L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 389-412.

- 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.
- Feshbach, S. (1994). Nationalism, patriotism, and aggression: a clarification of functional differences. In L. Huesmann (Ed.) *Aggressive Behavior: Current Perspectives* (pp. 275-291). New York: Putnam.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878-902.
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 473-491.
- Fritz, M. S., & Mackinnon, D. P. (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychological Science*, 18, 233-239.
- Glick, P. (2002). Sacrificial lambs dressed in wolves' clothing: Envious prejudice, ideology, and the scapegoating of Jews. In L. S. Newman & R. Erber (Eds.), *Understanding Genocide: The Social Psychology of the Holocaust* (pp. 113-142). Oxford University Press.
- Goff, P. A., Steele, C. M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 91-107.
- Golec de Zavala, A. (2007). *Collective narcissism and its social consequences*. Paper presented at the ISPP 30th Annual Scientific Meeting, Portland, USA.

- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2010). *National narcissism, positive national group regard and out-group enmity: How low and high collective self esteem predict intergroup negativity*. Manuscript in preparation.
- 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. (2010). *Collective narcissism increases intergroup hostility in response to threat to the group's positive image*. Manuscript under preparation.
- Golec de Zavala, A., & Cichocka, A. (2009b, July). *Collective narcissism as a moderator of the effects of threat on inter-group negativity: The role of threatened collective egotism*. Paper presented at the 12th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes: Threat and Intergroup Relations, Oppurg, Germany.
- Golec, A., & Federico, C. M. (2004). Understanding responses to political conflict: Interactive effects of the need for closure and salient conflict schemas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 750–762.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., et al. (1990). Evidence for terror management II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 308-318.
- Gross, J. T. (2008). *Fear: Anti-Semitism in Poland after Auschwitz. An essay in historical interpretation*. New York: Random House.
- Hayes, A. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical Mediation Analysis in the New Millennium. *Communication Monographs, 76(4)*, 408-420.

- Hayes, A. F., Preacher, K. J., and Myers, T. A. (in press). Mediation and the estimation of indirect effects in political communication research. In E. P. Bucy & R. L. Holbert (Eds), *Sourcebook for Political Communication Research: Methods, measures and analytical techniques*. New York: Routledge.
- Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time*. New York: Norton.
- Houston, D.M., & Andreopoulou, A. (2003). Tests of both corollaries of social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis in real group settings. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 357–370.
- 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.
- Imhoff, R. (2009). [Collective narcissism, in-group glorification and attachment as predictors of need for historical closure]. Unpublished raw data.
- Islam, M., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Intergroup attributions and affective consequences in majority and minority groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 936-950.
- Jordan, C.H., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2003). "I love me . . . I love me not": Implicit self-esteem, explicit self-esteem, and defensiveness. In S. J. Spencer, S. Fein, M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The Ontario Symposium: Vol. 9. Motivated social perception* (pp. 117- 145). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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(5), 693-702.
- Jordan, C.H., Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., Hoshino-Browne, E., & Correll, J. (2003). Secure and defensive self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 969-978.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375.
- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1-26.
- Kernis, M. H., Abend, T., Shrira, I., Goldman, B. M., Paradise, A., & Hampton, C. (2005). Self-serving responses as a function of discrepancies between implicit and explicit self-esteem. *Self and Identity*, 4, 311 – 330.
- 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.
- Kofta, M., & Sędek, G. (2005). Conspiracy Stereotypes of Jews During Systemic Transformation in Poland. *International Journal of Sociology*, 35 (1), 40–64.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.
- Kruglanski, A.W., Bar-Tal, D., & Klar, Y. (1993). A social cognitive theory of conflict. In K.S. Larsen (Ed.). *Conflict and social psychology* (pp. 45-56). London: Sage.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of mind: Seizing and freezing. *Psychological Review*, 103, 263–283.

- Krzemiński, I. (Ed.). (2004). *Antysemityzm w Polsce i na Ukrainie. Raport z badań.* [Anti-Semitism in Poland and Ukraine. A research report.] Cracow, Poland: Scholar.
- Lin, M. H., Kwan, V. S. Y., Cheung, A., & Fiske, S. T. (2005). Stereotype content model explains prejudice for an envied outgroup: Scale of Anti-Asian American Stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 34-47.
- Long, K. M., & Spears. (1998). Opposing effects of personal and collective self-esteem on interpersonal and intergroup comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 913-930.
- McGregor, H., Lieberman, J. D, Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Arndt, J., Simon, L, et al. (1998). Terror management and aggression: Evidence that mortality salience motivates aggression against worldview threatening others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 590-605.
- McLaren, L. M. (2003). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants. *Social Forces, 81*(3), 909-936.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unravelling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177-196.
- 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.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, 36*, 717-731.

- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in simple and multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40* (3), 879 – 891.
- Pyszczynski, T., Abdollahi, A., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Cohen, F., & Weise, D. (2006). Mortality salience, martyrdom, and military might: The Great Satan versus the Axis of Evil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 525-537.
- 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.
- Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Haslam, S. A., Ryan, M. K., Bizumic, B., & Subasic, E. (2007). Does personality explain in-group identification and discrimination? Evidence from the minimal group paradigm. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46*(3), 517-539.
- Riek, B.M., Mania, E.W., & Gaertner, S.L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(4), 336–353.
- Roccas, S., Klar, Y., & Liviatan, I. (2006). The paradox of group-based guilt: Modes of national identification, conflict vehemence, and reactions to the in-group's moral violations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 698–711.
- 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.

- Schatz, R., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism: Personality correlates and individual-group relations. In Bar-Tal, D., Staub, E. (Eds). *Patriotism: in the lives of individuals and nations*, (pp. 229-246). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 515-530.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic Racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.). *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum Press.
- Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S. & Pratto, F. (1997). The interface between ethnic and national attachment: Ethnic pluralism or ethnic dominance? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61*, 103-133.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology* (pp. 290-312). Washington DC: American Sociological Association.
- Spencer, S. J., Jordan, C. H., Logel, C. E. R., & Zanna, M. P. (2005). Nagging doubts and a glimmer of hope: The role of implicit self-esteem in self-image maintenance. In A. Tesser, J. V. Wood, & D. A. Stapel (Eds.). *On Building, Defending, and Regulating the Self: A Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 153-170). New York: Psychology Press.

- Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., et al. (2002). Racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(9), 1242-1254.
- Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*, 157-176.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Struch, N., & Schwartz, S.H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*(3), 364-373.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Cairns, E., & Christ, O. (2007). Cross-community contact, perceived status differences and intergroup attitudes in Northern Ireland: The mediating roles of individual-level vs. group-level threats and the moderating role of social identification. *Political Psychology*, *28*, 53-68.
- Tropp, L. R. , & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup Identification as the Inclusion of Ingroup in the Self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(5), 585-600.
- Viroli, M. (1995). *For love of country: An essay on patriotism and nationalism*. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Wright, S., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S.A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of crossgroup friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73 - 90.
- Wójcik, A. (2008). Historia stosunków polsko-żydowskich w oczach polskiej młodzieży. [History of Polish-Jewish relationships in the eyes of Polish youth]. In J. Żyndul (Ed.), *Różni razem. [Different together]*. (pp. 256-265). Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Yad Vashem (2009). The Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority. Downloaded on 11 September 2009 from http://www1.yadvashem.org/righteous_new/statistics.html
- Zeigler-Hill, V. (2006). Discrepancies between implicit and explicit self-esteem: Implications for narcissism and self-esteem instability. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 119–143.

Footnotes

¹ Collective and individual narcissism are positively associated, although this relationship is rather weak. Importantly, collective narcissism is related to intergroup hostility, whereas individual narcissism is associated with interpersonal aggressiveness, especially in the context of ego threat (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2009a; see also Golec de Zavala, et al, 2009; for results on individual narcissism see Baumeister & Bushman, 1998).

² Collective narcissism is also distinct from social dominance orientation (Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) or authoritarianism (e.g. Altemeyer, 1998) and independently predicts out-group negativity. We discuss these differences in more detail in a separate paper (Golec de Zavala et al, 2009). Summing up, collective narcissism and social dominance orientation overlap in the preoccupation with the in-group's greatness. However, for collective narcissists, any excuse, not only power, social status or economic dominance, is sufficient to support the belief in the uniqueness and greatness of the in-group. Collective narcissism is not related to opposition to equality, an important aspect of the social dominance orientation. Collective narcissism and authoritarianism are related because of the concern with the coherence and homogeneity of the in-group. For authoritarians, cohesiveness secures a predictable social environment and reduced cognitive uncertainty (e.g. Duckitt, 2006; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski & Sulloway, 2003; Kruglanski & Webster, 1996). For collective narcissists, it confirms the assumed, unanimously accepted greatness of the in-group. Authoritarians aggress against others to protect the group as a predictable social environment, collective narcissists – to protect the in-group's positive image.

³ Analysis controlling for group identification was also conducted. The pattern of results remained the same.

Table 1

Correlations of Collective Narcissism, Group Identification, Siege Beliefs, the Conspiracy Stereotype and Anti-Semitism (Study 2; N = 89)

Measures	1	2	3	4
1. Collective narcissism	--			
2. Group identification	.47***	--		
3. Conspiracy stereotype	.43**	.12	--	
4. Siege beliefs	.62***	.24*	.41**	--
5. Anti-Semitism	.21*	-.05	.51***	.36**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Mediation of the Effect of Collective Narcissism on Anti-Semitism Through Siege Mentality and the Conspiracy Stereotype (Study 2; N = 89)


Variable	Bootstrapped 95% BC Confidence Intervals	
	Lower	Upper
	Indirect effects	
Siege beliefs	.06	.54
Conspiracy stereotype	.04	.39
TOTAL	.16	.79
	Contrast	
Siege beliefs vs conspiracy stereotype	-.38	.16

Note. BC=bias corrected, 10.000 bootstrap samples.

Running head: COLLECTIVE NARCISSISM, SIEGE BELIEFS, CONSPIRACY
STEREOTYPE OF JEWS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Figure 1. Indirect effect of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism via siege beliefs (Study 1; $N = 149$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.



Running head: COLLECTIVE NARCISSISM, SIEGE BELIEFS, CONSPIRACY
STEREOTYPE OF JEWS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Figure 2. Indirect effects of collective narcissism on anti-Semitism via siege beliefs and the conspiracy stereotype (Study 2; $N = 89$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

