

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

OpenSIUC

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

9-1-2020

Narcissistic Group Orientation, Water-like Group Orientation, and Their Relations To In-group Identification

Richard Montoya

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, rmmonto@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Montoya, Richard, "Narcissistic Group Orientation, Water-like Group Orientation, and Their Relations To In-group Identification" (2020). *Dissertations*. 1856.

<https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations/1856>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION, WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION, AND
THEIR RELATIONS TO IN-GROUP IDENTIFICATION

by

Richard M. Montoya

B.S., Illinois State University, 2014
M.A., Southern Illinois University, 2017

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree

Department of Psychology
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
August 2020

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION, WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION, AND
THEIR RELATIONS TO IN-GROUP IDENTIFICATION

by

Richard M. Montoya

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of Psychology

Approved by:

Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee, Chair

Dr. Randall Davis

Dr. Liana Peter-Hagene

Dr. Steven Karau

Dr. Eric Jacobs

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 15, 2020

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Richard M. Montoya, for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology, presented on May 15, 2020, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION, WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION, AND THEIR RELATIONS TO IN-GROUP IDENTIFICATION

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee

Two studies were conducted to present two new theoretical constructs based on narcissistic personality and Daoist water-like personality research. Narcissistic group orientation (NGO) was developed to incorporate both the grandiose and vulnerable expressions of narcissism into a group-oriented social variable. NGO is pathological group orientation with two distinct expressions that share a common etiology in social identity monopolization. The conditions that promote social identity monopolization and ultimately increase the salience of the particular self-category, differ amongst the grandiose and vulnerable expressions of NGO. The grandiose expression increases salience of a particular self-category to facilitate opportunistic use for self-enhancement, while the vulnerable expression increases salience of a particular self-category to facilitate threat detection and avoidance. Water-like group orientation (WGO) was developed to provide a measure of secure in-group positivity which is in contrast to defensive in-group positivity. WGO is a prosocial group orientation that is based on the Daoist principle of wuwei (non-action) or underacting which is conceived here as a lack of desire for control.

Study 1 aimed to provide support for the factor structure of the newly developed scales and provide evidence of validity. The results of confirmatory factor analyses in Study 1 and Study 2 supported a two-factor NGO model and a two-factor WGO model. The two-factor NGO model is made up of a grandiose narcissistic group orientation (GNGO) factor and a vulnerable narcissistic group orientation (VNGO) factor. WGO Factor 1 (WGOF1) is an in-group

confidence and satisfaction factor, and WGO Factor 2 (WGOF2) is an out-group respect and altruism factor. Study 1 also gathered evidence of convergent validity for both the NGO and WGO constructs. Both GNGO and VNGO exhibited positive correlations with social dominance orientation and blind patriotism, and negligible correlations with constructive patriotism. WGOF1 exhibited positive correlations with social dominance orientation and blind patriotism, and a negligible correlation with constructive patriotism. WGOF2 exhibited negative correlations with social dominance orientation and blind patriotism, and a positive correlation with constructive patriotism.

Study 2 sought to gather support for the factor structure of NGO and WGO once again and to examine the relationship between GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, and WGOF2 with a multicomponent measure of in-group identification that includes solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity. GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 were positively related to all five in-group identification components, while WGOF2 was unrelated to all five in-group identification components.

The NGO and WGO scales may be used to study groups who are experiencing acute or ongoing intergroup conflict, intense scrutiny, or aggressive groups. These scales may be used to develop a greater understanding of group and environmental characteristics that lead to defensive in-group positivity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>CHAPTER</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| ABSTRACT..... | i |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | vi |
| CHAPTERS | |
| CHAPTER 1 - Introduction..... | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review..... | 6 |
| CHAPTER 3 - Study 1 | 45 |
| CHAPTER 4 - Study 1 Results..... | 53 |
| CHAPTER 5 - Study 1 Discussion..... | 59 |
| CHAPTER 6 - Study 2 | 61 |
| CHAPTER 7 - Study 2 Results..... | 66 |
| CHAPTER 8 - Study 2 Discussion..... | 71 |
| CHAPTER 9 - General Discussion | 74 |
| REFERENCES | 105 |
| APPENDICES | |
| APPENDIX A - Grandiose Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 115 |
| APPENDIX B - Vulnerable Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 116 |
| APPENDIX C - American Adapted Grandiose Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 117 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX D - American Adapted Vulnerable Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 118 |
| APPENDIX E - Water-like Group Orientation Scale | 119 |
| APPENDIX F - American Adapted Water-like Group Orientation Scale | 120 |
| APPENDIX G - Demographic Survey | 121 |
| APPENDIX H - Social Dominance Orientation Scale | 123 |
| APPENDIX I - Blind Patriotism Items..... | 124 |
| APPENDIX J - Constructive Patriotism Items..... | 125 |
| APPENDIX K - Attitudes Towards the U.S. and U.S. Values..... | 126 |
| APPENDIX L - Consent Form..... | 127 |
| APPENDIX M - Debriefing Form..... | 127 |
| APPENDIX N - Democrat Adapted Grandiose Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 129 |
| APPENDIX O - Democrat Adapted Vulnerable Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 130 |
| APPENDIX P - Republican Adapted Grandiose Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 131 |
| APPENDIX Q - Republican Adapted Vulnerable Narcissistic Group Orientation Subscale | 132 |
| APPENDIX R - Democrat Adapted Water-like Group Orientation Scale..... | 133 |
| APPENDIX S - Republican Adapted Water-like Group Orientation Scale..... | 134 |
| APPENDIX T - Multi-component Measure of In-group Identification | 135 |

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| VITA..... | 136 |
|-----------|-----|

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>TABLE</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Table 1 - Study 1 Participant Demographics | 79 |
| Table 2 - Study 1 Correlations Among GNGO Items..... | 80 |
| Table 3 - Study 1 Correlations Among VNGO Items..... | 81 |
| Table 4 - Study 1 Correlations Among WGO Items..... | 82 |
| Table 5 - Study 1 Standardizd Factor Loadings of Singl Factor NGO Model | 83 |
| Table 6 - Study 1 Standardizd Factor Loadings of Two Factor NGO Model..... | 84 |
| Table 7 - Study 1 Fit Indices for Competing NGO Models..... | 85 |
| Table 8 - Study 1 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor WGO Model..... | 86 |
| Table 9 - Study 1 Standardizd Factor Loadings of Two Factor WGO Model..... | 87 |
| Table 10 - Study 1 Fit Indices for Competing WGO Models..... | 88 |
| Table 11 - Study 1 Descriptive Statistics of GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, SDO, BP, CP | 89 |
| Table 12 - Internal Consistency of Study 1 Scales | 90 |
| Table 13 - Study 1 Correlations Among GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, SDO, BP, CP..... | 91 |
| Table 14 - Study 2 Participant Demographics | 92 |
| Table 15 - Study 2 Correlations Among GNGO Items..... | 93 |
| Table 16 - Study 2 Correlations Among VNGO Items..... | 94 |
| Table 17 - Study 2 Correlations Among WGO Items..... | 95 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 18 - Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor NGO Model | 96 |
| Table 19 - Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Two Factor NGO Model..... | 97 |
| Table 20 - Study 2 Fit Indices for Competing NGO Models..... | 98 |
| Table 21 - Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor WGO Model..... | 99 |
| Table 22 - Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Two Factor WGO Model..... | 100 |
| Table 23 - Study 2 Fit Indices for Competing WGO Models..... | 101 |
| Table 24 - Study 2 Descriptive Statistics of GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, Solidarity, Satisfaction, Centrality, Self-Stereotyping, and Homogeneity | 102 |
| Table 25 - Internal Consistency of Study 2 Scales | 103 |
| Table 26 - Study 2 Correlations Among GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, Solidarity, Satisfaction, Centrality, Self-Stereotyping, and Homogeneity | 104 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This work on group orientations attempts to use the social identity approach. Here, group orientations describe how individuals orient themselves in intergroup contexts behaviorally towards group goals (Lapinski, Rimal, DeVries, & Lee, 2007). This includes an interpretation of how group actions affect or will affect the individual which is context dependent. Part of the social context being group status, group attributes, intergroup status differentials, whether the individual is in an in-group majority or minority environment, and intergroup conflict. Therefore, group orientations impact how an individual perceives their in-group, relevant out-groups, and behaves in intergroup contexts. Most importantly, the group orientation expressed plays a role in the goal of achieving and maintaining positive social identity.

Narcissism can be defined generally as “one’s capacity to maintain a relatively positive self-image through a variety of self-, affect-, and field- regulatory processes, and it underlies individual’s needs for validation and affirmation as well as the motivation to overtly and covertly seek out self-enhancement experiences from the social environment” (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010, p. 3).

This capacity naturally extends to the group level as the self-concept includes social identities (Tajfel, 1974). Social identity theory handles the largely healthy functioning of this capacity to maintain positive identity. In the same way that the desire for positive identity and validation is driven by narcissistic motives, the desire for positive social identity which is maintained through positive social comparisons and promoted by in-group favoritism is driven by group narcissistic motives. However at both levels, these narcissistic motives can become dysfunctional when they involve the excessive maintenance and validation of inflated views of

the self and social self that are not based in reality. At the group level, in-group favoritism can devolve into defensive or narcissistic group positivity under the right conditions. In this way, the group membership becomes a selfobject or a representation that is in service to the self by providing an avenue for validation and admiration.

This research proposes that narcissistic motives manifest at the group level in two separate expressions. The first being grandiose narcissistic group orientation (GNGO) which describes one's capacity to maintain positive social identity through the hypersalience of a particular self-category that is used opportunistically across context and even in contexts that are inappropriate. Social contexts are viewed as opportunities for self-enhancement through group identity. In this case, the individual is prone to exaggerating positive in-group stereotypic content. High status or prestigious groups are likely to be susceptible to this group orientation. Examples may include exclusive professional or social clubs such as fraternities or sororities, Navy Seals, a popular social group in high school, top ranked universities, powerful nation states, or championship level sports teams' fan clubs.

The second being vulnerable narcissistic group orientation (VNGO) which describes one's capacity to maintain positive social identity through the hypersalience of a particular self-category in order to avoid threats to the in-group. Intergroup contexts are viewed as potentially hostile situations in which self-enhancement failure can occur through the group's weaknesses being exposed. Therefore, it is likely the individual will exaggerate hostile and threatening stereotypic content of out-groups. Self-categories that are immutable, low status, or important because it is the sole positive group identity of the individual are susceptible to VNGO. Examples may include white supremacists, feminists, vegans, metalheads/goths, or other niche groups. Daoism can generally be thought of as philosophy and psychology of the universe and

humanity's role within it (Lee, Han, Bryon, & Fan, 2008). The teachings of Daoism are found in the *Dao de Jing*. The Dao can be translated to meaning the roadway, method, path, teachings, or truths (Laozi, 2004). Laozi conceptualized the Dao to be “the general truth that there is a course all things follow and a force that guides them on it” (Laozi, 2004, p. 19). The de refers to virtue or moral authority (Laozi, 2004). In other words, we human beings need to be in harmony with nature (i.e., Dao) and with others (i.e., de).

This Daoist psychology is especially relevant to a leader's use of power and position as well as to human relations. That connection has resulted in the conceptualization of a water-like leadership style. The water-like leadership style promotes altruism, modesty, flexibility, honesty, and gentle persistence (Lee et al., 2008). Daoism is also connected to secure in-group positivity through relinquishing control and power. The principle of wuwei which refers to underacting or not striving is the basis for the water-like group orientation (WGO).

The growing interest in secure and defensive in-group positivity has led to a rich but young body of research. Specifically, defensive in-group positivity (i.e., collective narcissism) uniquely predicts the maintenance or restoration of an idealized in-group image as well as retaliation against transgressing out-groups (Frederic & Golec de Zavala, 2017; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Iskra-Golec, 2013b). Secure in-group positivity (i.e., in-group identification while controlling for collective narcissism) on the other hand has been shown to predict greater tolerance and acceptance of out-groups (Cichocka, Golec de Zavala, Marchlewska, Bilewicz, Jaworska, & Olechowski, 2017).

Advancements and improvements to the current measures however are now called for by researchers exploring these topics. First, the Collective Narcissism Scale in one study has been reported to possess a multidimensional factor structure which undermines the use of a composite

score (Montoya, 2017). Beyond this, Cichocka (2016), one of the foremost researchers on collective narcissism, has called for the dimensions of narcissistic vulnerability and grandiosity be incorporated in a group level measure. When it comes to secure in-group positivity, there is presently no direct measure of the construct. At this time, collective narcissism is partialled out from measures of in-group identification or collective self-esteem, however the drawbacks to this method have been noted (Cichocka et al., 2017).

Study 1 aimed to develop and validate a scale that measures narcissistic group orientation (NGO). The novel aspect of this scale development is that it answers the call to incorporate research and theory at the individual level into a group level measure. This will also resolve issues regarding the scoring method of the multidimensional Collective Narcissism Scale. The Narcissistic Group Orientation Scale (NGOS) includes a vulnerable dimension and a grandiose dimension.

Additionally, Study 1 aimed to develop and validate a scale that measures WGO. This also answers the call to construct a direct measure of secure in-group positivity. Extending the water-like interpersonal style to WGO creates a method for understanding a prosocial or secure in-group orientation. Rather than being overly concerned with the greatness of the in-group and displaying exhibitionist behavior, WGO promotes a humble, modest, and secure view of the identity of the in-group. Where NGO is inflexible and domineering in intergroup contexts, the water-like orientation is flexible. In intergroup contexts where NGO is callous and agentically assertive, WGO asserts its group with gentle persistence and altruism. Most importantly, where WGO honestly takes stock of the in-group, NGO promotes an inflated and exaggerated image of the in-group.

Study 2 provides initial evidence that the two constructs represent distinct group

orientations by demonstrating that narcissistic and water-like group orientations exhibit unique relations to a multicomponent measure of in-group identification. Specifically, it was expected that the magnitude of relationship should differ on measures of self-stereotyping, perceived in-group homogeneity, centrality, solidarity, and satisfaction.

This work adds to the group orientation literature by improving the measurement of secure and defensive in-group positivity. In the case of NGO, this work developed and validated a measure that is novel by its inclusion of a grandiose and vulnerable dimension. In the case of WGO, this work attempted to develop the first measure of secure in-group positivity. Beyond this, NGO and WGO's relations to measures of in-group identification has provided insights about how in-group identification is related to pathological and prosocial group orientations.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Narcissism

The term and concept of narcissism was derived from the Greco-Roman myth of Narcissus. The myth tells of a young man who was admired for his beauty from youth and was placed in high regard by the god Apollo. Narcissus received attention from multiple suitors of both sexes including the nymph, Echo, but rejected them all with disdain. Eventually, Nemesis, the god of retribution, answered the call of a crestfallen suitor and decided to punish him. When Narcissus went to drink from the river he saw his reflection and was entranced by his beauty. Narcissus was doomed as the object of his desire would not return his love. He stared at his own reflection in despair until his death. In Ovid's version of the myth, Narcissus simply turns into a narcissus flower due to his burning desire for his own image but other versions culminate in his suicide. Narcissism's relation to depression and suicidality would seem to be compatible with the latter version of the myth (Kaufman, Weiss, Miller, & Campbell, 2018).

The psychoanalysts would be among the firsts to take up the mantle of research and theory on narcissism. An important contribution made by Sigmund Freud was that the self-absorbed behavior of narcissism was not exclusive to the sexual domain but also plays a role in normal development and evolves as a part of the maturation process (Ronningstam, 2011). This idea became conceptualized as primary and secondary narcissism (Ronningstam, 2011). Primary narcissism being a stage that everyone experiences in infancy in which there is no differentiation between the self and other or between self and object. Therefore, libidinal or psychic energy is attached to the ego which encompasses the entirety of experience. Following a primary narcissism stage, the distinction between self and object occurs which allows for libidinal energy

to be attached to objects. Secondary narcissism describes the process by which libidinal energy is withdrawn from objects and is restored to the ego making the ego the object of love.

While the idea of primary narcissism was falsified because the assumption of an infant's inability to distinguish between self and other was later proven to be false, the idea of narcissistic motives as a normal part of psychological development remained. The notion that narcissistic motives drive normal requirements for self-cohesion and appropriate self-esteem would be continued by clinical theorists Kohut and Kernberg (as cited in Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). When self-development has gone awry, it results in the inability to maintain self-cohesion and regulate self-esteem which is indicative of pathological narcissism (Cain et al., 2008).

Freud and Rank also saw narcissism as serving a defensive function that prevented negative self-evaluation (Levy, Ellison, & Reynoso, 2011). Reich (as cited in Levy, 2011) would later contend that the narcissist uses self-inflation to avoid harm to the self-concept. Reich also observed that narcissists respond to threat or narcissistic injury with aggression in order to prevent further degradation of the self-concept. Narcissistic injury refers to any threat to the narcissist's inflated view of themselves or self-esteem.

Karen Horney built upon these theoretical advancements. She thought that healthy positive self-esteem was separate from pathological narcissism which is based upon positive self-esteem derived from the inflated version of the self (Levy et al., 2011). Contemporarily, the idea that narcissism has a crucial role of maintaining positive identity is still seen in definitions of narcissism as "one's capacity to maintain a positive self-image...and underlies individual's needs for validation and affirmation" (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010, p. 3). The concept of narcissistic motives as a component of healthy psychological functioning is also seen in the literature regarding adaptive and pathological narcissism (Pincus & Roche, 2011). However,

some researchers have incorrectly conceptualized the distinction between adaptive and pathological narcissism to be synonymous with the distinction between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. This conceptualization while incorrect, seems to reference the findings that vulnerable narcissism is generally related to psychopathological outcomes such as self-hate, anxious and avoidant attachment, depression, fatalistic view of the future, and suicide, whereas grandiosity is unrelated to these negative outcomes (Kaufman et al., 2018).

Horney's conception of two end-points, one being healthy self-esteem and the other being pathologically derived positive self-esteem, has informed the modern continuum view of narcissism. Healthy self-esteem derived from an objective view of the self inhabits one end of the continuum and pathological self-esteem derived from inflations and exaggerations of the self inhabits the other end. As one progresses along the continuum, the view of the self becomes less based in reality and because the source of self-esteem is the false self, the relation between self and self-esteem becomes dysfunctional. That is, esteem is derived from the inflated and grandiose representation of the self rather than the true self.

Paulhus (1998) provided some confirmation of this idea when he found narcissism and self-deceptive enhancement to be positively related to self-esteem. This provides support for the idea that narcissistic tendencies such as self-enhancement promote positive self-esteem from the inflated or false version of the self. While this may temporarily produce self-esteem benefits, it produces dysfunction in interpersonal relations. Individuals who self-enhance may be rated positively initially, but in follow-ups they are rated negatively by peers (Paulhus, 1998).

Horney's view that pathological narcissism is characterized by deriving self-esteem from an inflated representation of the self was also important to her perspective of narcissistic self-love. While others viewed the narcissist as experiencing an abundance of self-love, Horney saw

the narcissist as loving, admiring, and valuing a false and inflated self. Therefore, she saw the narcissist as unable to love their true self and others. In this way, narcissism is viewed as a defensive strategy that seeks to avoid exposing the vulnerable true self. The true self being vulnerable because it is unable to regulate self-esteem and cohesion appropriately.

Narcissism and the DSM

The concept of narcissism has existed long before it was first classified as a personality disorder in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition* (DSM-III; American Psychiatric Association, 1980). Narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) is defined as “a pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration, and lack of empathy, beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts...” by the DSM-5 (APA, 2013, p. 665).

The criteria for the DSM-III were not empirically or clinically driven, rather they were compiled and agreed upon by a committee’s review of the literature (Reynolds & Lejuez, 2011). These included grandiosity or uniqueness, grandiose fantasy, exhibitionism, rage or shame in response to criticism, entitlement, exploitativeness, and lack of empathy. Criticisms of these criteria grew as they resulted in diagnoses with poor reliability and substantial comorbidity (Reynolds & Lejuez, 2011). To address these concerns of comorbidity and reliability the DSM-IV NPD criteria were updated and informed by researchers doing work on narcissism (Reynolds & Lejuez, 2011). This led to a narrowing of the DSM-IV criteria and the exclusion of psychoanalytic ideas such as narcissistic injury (South, Eaton, & Krueger, 2011).

Rectifying problems with comorbidity eventually led to criteria that most have found to be too restrictive. The prevalence rates of NPD in community samples are anywhere from 0-6.2% but often 0% (APA, 2013; Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). Other criticisms of the DSM’s

criteria include moving away from the psychodynamic perspective of narcissism which provided the theoretical groundwork of how NPD operates.

Yet, another criticism of the NPD entry in the DSM includes the emphasis on grandiosity over vulnerability. While the descriptions of NPD in the DSM include vulnerability, vulnerable diagnostic criteria are absent. This is in stark contrast to clinical and empirical work which strongly suggests that vulnerability is a distinct expression of NPD and is pointed to as another reason for low prevalence rates in community samples (Cain, et al., 2008; Reynolds & Lejuez, 2011; South et al., 2011).

Grandiose and Vulnerable Narcissism

The need for validation and admiration that motivates self-enhancement experiences is a normal drive. When the need for validation and admiration is extreme, it leads to dysfunctional self-enhancement and entitlement indicative of pathological narcissism. Pathological attempts to garner validation and admiration include seeking self-enhancement as a primary goal in a wide range of contexts, seeking a high degree of self-enhancement, or self-enhancing through egregious distortions of reality (Pincus & Roche, 2011; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). When these extreme needs for self-enhancement include impaired regulatory capacities (i.e., self, affective, interpersonal), the narcissistic drive can be deemed pathological.

Research and clinical work in the area of narcissism has resulted in establishing two expressions or dimensions of the overarching construct (Miller, Lynam, Hyatt, & Campbell, 2017; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). These are known as grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. Differences and similarities on the two phenotypic expressions of narcissism can be evaluated in regard to their regulatory dysfunctions (i.e., self, affective, interpersonal), personality trait profiles, and clinical outcomes.

Both the grandiose and vulnerable narcissist have an excessive need for validation and admiration, and they are dependent upon it because of self-dysregulation (Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993). However, the root of their self-dysregulation differs. The grandiose narcissist believes they are superior or unique in some way, and this excessively positive self-image must be maintained by excessive and exceptional praise. In this case, the source of self-dysregulation lies in the exaggerated positive image which must be maintained by validation and admiration in order to fulfill self-esteem and self-cohesion needs. They are defensive because anything less than exceptional praise or recognition of their greatness depreciates their grandiose view of themselves. The maintenance of the grandiose image leads the grandiose narcissist to engage in exhibitionist behaviors that are used to self-enhance or garner admiration.

When self-enhancing exhibitionist behaviors are unsuccessful, the grandiose narcissist will respond with hostility and aggression towards their detractors. The aggression exhibited by grandiose narcissists is much more likely to be situational (e.g., response to ego threats) rather than dispositional (Maciantowicz & Zajenkowski, 2018). Further, they resist criticism through the repression or distortion of negative information (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Miller et al., 2017). The inability to appropriately regulate failed self-enhancements and criticisms is symptomatic of their affect dysregulation (Pincus & Roche, 2011). Their affect dysregulation can also cause experiences of intense envy when they are shown up or out done by another. Interpersonally, their grandiosity leads to entitled and exploitative behavior. Because the grandiose narcissists see themselves as superior or unique, they believe a special set of norms and rules apply to them. It is not so much that others are not worthy of respect and dignity, but rather that the needs of the narcissist supersede those of others.

The vulnerable narcissist's self-esteem dysregulation on the other hand stems from an

exceedingly negative self-image. In order to obscure feelings of inferiority and vulnerability, they will engage in grandiose fantasy or will emphasize their unique situation which is not understood by others. The grandiose fantasy is an idealistic version of the self that the vulnerable narcissist conjures up as a version of the self they find to be acceptable. This ideal is contrary to the actual self that they feel shame towards. To prevent further damage to their weak self-image they will avoid interpersonal relationships in fear of rejection and self-enhancement failures (Pincus & Roche, 2011).

In terms of affect dysregulation, the vulnerable narcissist is prone to the experience of shame as a result of self-enhancement failures or interpersonal rejections (Miller et al., 2017). The comparison of the ideal and grandiose fantasy of the self to the objective self is what underlies the shame experience. This comparison ultimately reveals a disparity between the two and can lead to depressive states.

The vulnerable narcissist's dysfunctional interpersonal behavior is related to their self-esteem dysregulation as well. Because the self-image is vulnerable and insecure, they exhibit a hostile attribution bias which makes them hypersensitive to threats. The vulnerable narcissist's hostile attribution bias skews their perception of otherwise innocuous events and behaviors as being hostile and threatening. Thus, the vulnerable narcissist's chronic anger is more likely a dispositional tendency that is driven by distrust and shame (Maciantowicz & Zajenkowski, 2018). This results in the vulnerable narcissist appearing paranoid of the negative and hostile intentions of others in interpersonal contexts and responding inappropriately with aggression.

The use of the Five Factor Narcissism Inventory (FFNI), which was developed from the five-factor model of personality, has aided in establishing the measurement of the grandiose and vulnerable dimensions as well as empirically delineating grandiose and vulnerable narcissism

(Glover, Miller, Lynam, Crego, & Widiger, 2012; Miller, Lynam, McCain, Few, Crego, Widiger, & Campbell, 2015). Examinations of narcissism using the five-factor model of personality shows that both expressions possess similar negative correlations with facets of agreeableness such as straightforwardness, altruism, and compliance. So it should be expected that narcissism in all of its forms shares a disagreeable interpersonal behavioral style described as egocentric, antagonistic, and callous (Miller et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2017; Paulhus, 2014).

It should be noted however that within the domain of trait agreeableness, vulnerable narcissism has been found to be most strongly negatively related to trust, while grandiose narcissism is most strongly negatively related to modesty (Campbell & Miller, 2013; Miller, Hoffman, Gaughan, Gentile, Maples, & Campbell, 2011). This suggests that although the observable behavioral styles of both expressions have outward similarities, there is substantial nuance and there are different motivational bases for their behavior (Miller et al., 2011). In the case of the vulnerable narcissist they are thought to exhibit an antagonistic interpersonal behavioral style because of hostile attribution bias where they are inclined to view behaviors as having hostile intentions. Here, the hostile attribution bias is indicative of mistrust in the intentions of others. The grandiose narcissist on the other hand is likely to exhibit an antagonistic behavioral style as part of a self-enhancement strategy to affirm their grandiosity. In this case, self-enhancement entails overt immodesty.

More pronounced differences are seen on trait neuroticism with vulnerable narcissism having strong positive relations to the facets of anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability whereas grandiose narcissism has weak positive or moderate negative correlations to these facets. Extraversion facets (i.e., warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, positive emotion) also serve to distinguish the two

expressions with grandiose narcissism having strong positive relations to extraversion facets, while vulnerable narcissism has negative correlations with most extraversion facets (Miller et al., 2017).

In summary, the two expressions of narcissism are similar regarding interpersonal antagonism (i.e., disagreeableness) but can be distinguished via differences in trait neuroticism and agentic extraversion. Those high in disagreeableness along with neuroticism are categorized as vulnerable narcissists, while those high in disagreeableness along with agentic extraversion are categorized as grandiose narcissists (Miller et al. 2015). In other words, one can think of vulnerable narcissists as disagreeable neurotics and of grandiose narcissists as disagreeable extraverts (Campbell & Miller, 2013).

The agentic extraversion of grandiose narcissism is manifested in a behavioral style that is characterized by overt immodesty, self-promotion, aggression, and dominance. The incentive of affirming their grandiosity leads them to be proactive, assertive, persistent, and antagonistic in their exhibitionist behavior (Miller et al., 2017; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). Vulnerable narcissism "...reflects a defensive and insecure grandiosity that obscures feelings of inadequacy, incompetence, and negative affect" (Miller et al., 2011, p. 1013). The vulnerable narcissist's neuroticism towards their fragile grandiosity is manifested in a behavioral style that is self-absorbed, distrustful, anxious, dependent, and fearful of rejection (Miller et al., 2014; Miller et al., 2017; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010).

The distinction between the two phenotypes is also seen in their related clinical outcomes. In general, grandiose narcissism is unrelated to psychopathological outcomes and is instead related to adaptive coping (Kaufman et al., 2018). Adaptive coping can be described as a constructive mastery of conflict. Grandiose narcissism is however related to image distortion

which is also known as splitting. This involves splitting the image of the self and other into good and bad or strong and weak.

Vulnerable narcissism on the other hand is related to a host of psychopathological outcomes. This includes self-hate guilt (e.g., belief that one is deserving of negative outcomes), anxious attachment style (i.e., worry about being rejected or unloved), avoidant attachment style (i.e., avoidance of intimacy and does not feel they can depend on others to be available when needed), self-hate, viewing the world as hostile place, a fatalistic view of the future, and maladaptive action patterns (i.e., inability to deal with one's impulses by taking constructive action).

Collective Narcissism

Recently, a social personality variable, collective narcissism has been established (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, & Jayawickreme, 2009). Collective narcissism is described as "...an in-group identification tied to an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief about the unparalleled greatness of an in-group" (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2009., p. 1). Collective narcissism is primarily manifested by an unachievable and idealized image of one's in-group, while individual narcissism is contained to the idealizations of the individualized self (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009).

There is overlap between narcissism at the individual and the group level as the self-concept is composed of both personal and social identities, however simply because someone is narcissistic about the individualized self does not mean they are necessarily narcissistic about their group memberships and vice versa (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Lyons, Coursey, Kenworthy, 2013). Golec de Zavala and colleagues (2009) reported a positive correlation between collective narcissism and individual narcissism but the two forms of narcissism have

distinctive nomological networks. Specifically, individual narcissism predicts interpersonal aggressiveness while collective narcissism does not, and collective narcissism predicts out-group directed negativity while individual narcissism does not (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala et al., 2013b). Further examinations of collective narcissism seeking distinction from individual narcissism resulted in similar findings. Psychological entitlement, a component of individual narcissism, is “a stable and pervasive sense that one deserves more and is entitled to more than others” (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004, p. 3). Correlations between collective narcissism and psychological entitlement are positive but weak, and psychological entitlement does not predict intergroup prejudice while collective narcissism does (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009).

Collective narcissism is uniquely related to behaviors that seek to maintain or restore the idealized image of the in-group (e.g., “Make America great again”) (Federico & Golec de Zavala, 2017). Collective narcissism in the British context predicted support for Brexit independent of the effects from blind patriotism, social dominance orientation, and right-wing authoritarianism (Golec de Zavala, Guerra, & Simao, 2017). Specifically, the link between collective narcissism and support for Brexit was mediated by perceived threat from immigrants (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2017). Support for Brexit in this context is an attempt at maintaining the purity or homogeneity of the in-group. The homogeneity of the in-group is a source of uniqueness for collective narcissists and they seek to avoid contaminating the homogeneous in-group with outsider phenotypes, values, and customs. Additionally, immigrants and foreigners might be seen as a threat to the in-group as nationals would be in competition with them for jobs and other public resources, which may be the source of other threatening epiphenomenon (Lyons et al., 2013).

The idealized perception of the in-group constantly puts collective narcissists on the defensive (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Even non-hostile actions by out-groups are readily appraised as threats to the in-group by collective narcissists (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012; Golec de Zavala, Peker, Guerra, & Baran, 2016). The handful of studies that explored collective narcissism's influence on appraisals of image threat to the in-group suggest that collective narcissists are constantly guarding the image of the in-group in an intergroup context (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012; Golec de Zavala et al., 2016).

Further, the research on perceived transgressions against the in-group has made it clear that collective narcissists are ready or even eager to retaliate against transgressing out-groups (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013a; Golec de Zavala et al., 2013b; Golec de Zavala et al., 2016). This is because collective narcissists are thought to place a greater emphasis on social identity in intergroup contexts (Golec de Zavala & Cichocka, 2012; Golec de Zavala et al., 2013a; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). The process is analogous to Turner's (1987; Turner & Reynolds, 2012) conception of switching focus to one's social identity in an intergroup context which comes at the expense of momentarily ignoring the individual self. Collective narcissists are believed to do this but to an even greater extent such that their social identity is the sole focus in an intergroup context (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Thus, the focus on group identity as a source of positive self-concept results in the group identity being something worth fighting for in the eyes of the collective narcissist.

Collective narcissism exclusively moderates the relationship between in-group threat and retaliatory out-group hostility where individual narcissism, social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, in-group identification, and constructive and blind patriotism do not (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013b). Further, it has been reported that the perception of personal

threat from in-group criticism mediates the relationship between collective narcissism and retaliatory aggression (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013b). This evidence corroborates the role of the collective narcissist's group membership in achieving positive self-concept.

The pattern of findings is even more important when you consider that collective narcissists exhibit hypervigilance in detecting in-group threats (Golec de Zavala et al., 2016). This hypersensitivity to threat can make otherwise innocuous events appear to be a slight towards the in-group. These imagined slights against the in-group underlie a conspiratorial thinking style that shapes how collective narcissists perceive intergroup events (Cichocka, Marchlewska, Golec de Zavala, & Olechowski, 2016). The focus and desire to maintain the idealized image of the in-group leaves collective narcissists paranoid that instances of intergroup behavior might create a social comparison that is detrimental to the image of their in-group. Therefore, it is reasonable to suspect that the collective narcissist suffers from a perceptual bias.

When the narcissist is attempting to extract narcissistic supply that validates them, they appear to dichotomize feedback as affirming their narcissistic conception of the group or as not affirming their narcissistic conception of the group which is then deemed insulting. Therefore, the narcissistic supply of validation must come in the form of exceptional praise (Vaknin, 2014). Anything other than exceptional praise or affirmation of the group's greatness or uniqueness is then viewed as threatening to the identity of the narcissist.

Taken together, the over perception of in-group criticisms taken as personally threatening followed by retaliatory aggression suggests that collective narcissism is an insecure and defensive form of in-group positivity (Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala et al., 2013). Retaliatory aggression is used as a means to restore the positive image of the in-group and consequently the social identity of the individual thereby reducing threat.

Recent research and theory have begun to explore individual level factors in attempts to understand the etiology of collective narcissism. These new developments have expanded upon the defensive and insecure nature of collective narcissism by incorporating personal control as an explanation for narcissistic orientations at the group level. It was found that manipulations of low personal control increased narcissistic in-group positivity, while manipulations of high personal control increased secure in-group positivity (Cichocka, Golec de Zavala, Marchlewska, Bilewicz, Jaworska, & Olechowski, 2017).

Narcissistic or defensive in-group positivity can be described as a belief in the in-group's greatness or uniqueness that requires external validation (Cichocka, 2016). It is not enough to simply be great or unique, but these qualities must be recognized by other individuals and groups at large. Secure in-group positivity on the other hand is "...a confidently held positive evaluation of one's in-group that is independent of the recognition of the group in the eyes of others" (Cichocka, 2016, p. 298). Individuals oriented towards their in-group in this manner are willing to divulge negative behaviors or aspects of the group because they are resilient to threats and criticisms but instead have hopes of improving the group (Cichocka, 2016). Similarly, the clinical literature of narcissism indicates that narcissists suffer from affective dysregulation which impacts how they regulate negative emotion experienced following failures, whereas others are able to effectively regulate the experience of negative emotion. WGO facilitates the ability to effectively regulate the experience of negative emotion and allows the individual to face deficits of their own group in order to improve it. Where narcissistic in-group positivity motivates self-serving payoffs, secure in-group positivity motivates unselfish goals of group improvement.

Theoretically, Cichocka (2016) makes the argument that if the need for personal control

cannot be satisfied at the individual level, they are motivated to satisfy this need via the social realm. If personal control cannot be achieved at the individual level of the self, then it can be at the social level of the self even if the benefits provided by narcissistic in-group positivity are fleeting (Cichocka et al., 2017; Sedikides & Gregg, 2001). Therefore, it is reasonable to suspect the pathological need for external confirmation of a positive self-concept may underlie the relationship between the need for personal control and defensive in-group positivity. That is, the group narcissist may view the positive social identity as something that can potentially be controlled because of the achievements, characteristics, or uniqueness of the group. Then defensive in-group positivity is utilized to ensure validation and admiration can be garnered.

This reasoning is in keeping with the social identity tradition but works within a pathological model of achieving positive self-concept. When satisfied through one's social identity, this leads to a defensive form of in-group positivity or a narcissistic in-group positivity. In essence, the compensatory nature of this process leads the in-group positivity to be defensive because the group membership becomes a vital source of positive identity.

Alternatively, Cichocka and colleagues (2017) found personal control to be positively related to secure in-group positivity. If lack of personal control is related to defensive in-group positivity and personal control is related to secure in-group positivity, then a lack of desire for control (distinct from lack of control) at the individual level might be an alternate route to achieving secure in-group positivity or non-narcissistic in-group positivity. Lack of desire for control or wuwei is endemic to the philosophy and psychology of Daoism and the WGO. Wuwei can be translated as under-acting; not striving or to pursue no end (Laozi, 2004).

Cichocka and colleagues (2017) also reported secure in-group positivity predicts positive out-group attitudes, which provides additional support for the hypothesis that WGO represents a

prosocial intergroup orientation. This sentiment is also found in Stanza 5 of the Dao de Jing:

Heaven and earth refuse kin-kindness:

Treating all things as dogs of straw.

Wise rulers too refuse kin-kindness:

Taking gentlefolk as dogs of straw. (Laozi, 2004, p. 38)

This stanza represents a crucial component of the WGO that is also in direct opposition to narcissism. Here Laozi is stating that we must not place ourselves and our groups above others. Rather, we should treat our in-group and out-groups similarly. By extension this promotes the idea of tolerance towards out-groups. Dogs of straw, which are adorned at one point and then trampled on, are not treated in this manner because of any preference or hate towards them but because it is merely a part of the ceremonial process. Like the straw dog, we should not place preference on our group as it is merely one taking part in a larger process.

Currently, there is no measure of secure in-group positivity (Cichocka, 2016). Secure in-group positivity is presently measured by controlling for collective narcissism and using in-group identification or collective self-esteem as a proxy measure of secure in-group positivity (Cichocka et al., 2017). The assumption here is that in-group identification implies a level of in-group favoritism, which is endemic to both forms of in-group positivity, and that controlling for the narcissistic component simply leaves secure in-group positivity. While this has proven to be a clever and useful method in uncovering motivational factors of collective narcissism, it is limited (Cichocka et al., 2017).

Cichocka and colleagues (2017) note their concern over the use of partialing out narcissistic in-group positivity from in-group identification as a method for uncovering the variance of secure in-group positivity. The reasoning for this was stated when Golec de Zavala

and colleagues (2013) acknowledge the social identity perspective that in-group identification implies in-group favoritism and a level out-group derogation in order to maintain positive identity. Consequently, Cichocka and colleagues (2017) acknowledge that measuring secure in-group positivity in this manner lacks generalizability in real world contexts as the two forms of in-group positivity, secure and defensive, are not likely to be mutually exclusive. This is because identification with a group brings about a certain level of secure and defensive in-group favoritism (Cichocka et al., 2017). Therefore, the Daoist perspective can provide an answer to this call by conceptualizing the WGO that is a secure and prosocial form of in-group positivity and stems from a lack of desire for control.

The incorporation of narcissistic vulnerability and grandiosity at group level has been called for by Cichocka (2016). This brings about the question of what expression of NGO does the Collective Narcissism Scale currently capture. Collective narcissism was found to be more strongly related to vulnerable narcissism compared to grandiose narcissism (Golec de Zavala, et al., 2016). This is interesting when you consider that the Collective Narcissism Scale was developed by adapting NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988), which primarily captures grandiose narcissism, and the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory III, which primarily captures vulnerable narcissism. Upon reviewing the Collective Narcissism Scale and the NPI, it appears that the majority of the retained items were adapted from the NPI which would seem to indicate that the Collective Narcissism Scale measures grandiose narcissism. Beyond this, the stronger relation to vulnerable narcissism reported by Golec de Zavala and colleagues (2016) seems to be contradicted by another finding. Montoya (2017) found that collective narcissism was negatively related to collective shame. This would seem to provide additional evidence that collective narcissism captures a grandiose form of NGO because grandiose narcissism is

negatively related to shame, while vulnerable narcissism is positively related to shame (Gramzow & Tangney, 1992; Hibbard, 1992; Montebanocci, Surcinelli, Baldaro, Trombini, & Rossi, 2004; Watson, Hickman, & Morris, 1996).

In short, at the present time it is unclear whether the Collective Narcissism Scale captures a grandiose or vulnerable NGO. An attempt to explain the mixed evidence led Montoya (2017) to conduct a series of factor analyses on the Collective Narcissism Scale which resulted in a multidimensional factor structure. This contradicts the claim that the Collective Narcissism Scale typically has a unidimensional factor structure (Cichocka, 2016; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Further, this supports Cichocka's (2016) hunch that narcissism at the group level is a multidimensional construct and that the Collective Narcissism Scale specifically has two dimensions. If the Collective Narcissism Scale does indeed measure a two dimensional construct, as some data would suggest (Montoya, 2017), the current use of composite score is problematic because it would confound measurement of the two dimensions.

Given these developments, there are a few dilemmas which must be addressed. First, the scoring method of the Collective Narcissism scale must be updated given the dimensionality of the measure. Second, the inclusion of both the grandiose and vulnerable dimension at the group level is warranted. This can be remedied with the development of the Narcissistic Group Orientation Scale (NGOS) that includes both dimensions. Third, there is currently no measure of secure in-group positivity which is based on personal control or a lack of desire for control. This can be remedied with the development of the Water-like Group Orientation Scale (WGOS).

Social Identity Theory and Narcissistic Group Orientation

Social identity theory describes the process through which the characteristics, values, and evaluative valences of a group membership are integrated into the self-concept of an individual

(Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Social identity theory also describes the impact of perceiving ourselves and others as a product of their group memberships. Categorization plays an integral role in this process of placing other individuals and the self into groups (Tajfel, 1981). In a given context, individuals are categorized into groups that are based upon the most relevant or salient stimuli. The salience of a category or a self-category is an interaction of between a perceiver's readiness (e.g., goals, values, and expectations) to utilize a specific category, background knowledge, and the contextual stimulus reality (Turner & Onorato, 1999). According to the metacontrast principle, individuals create groups in such a manner that maximizes the similarity within categories while maximizing the differences between categories (Tajfel, 1981). This has the consequence of improving the predictive power of the informational or stereotypic content related to those categories (Tajfel, 1981). According to self-categorization theory, stereotypic content associated with a given group is variable, contextual, and relative (Turner & Reynolds, 2012). In the context of a defensive or NGO this process is primarily used to identify out-groups and the threats they may pose to the in-group (Golec de Zavala et al., 2016). The potential threat posed by a given out-group is unique to that group and represented in the stereotypic content related to the given out-group.

The process by which individuals place themselves into groups is referred to as self-categorization (Turner et al., 1987). Individuals can self-categorize into an infinite number of groups at varying levels of abstraction but many of these group memberships are paid little attention to or are not identified strongly with. Social identity is composed of the group memberships that are chosen to be identified with and are sometimes chosen for strategic reasons (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987). In this way, group memberships that are

components of our social identity become extensions of the self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, the individual is not only able to receive material benefits from a group membership via reciprocal relations but is also able to receive identity benefits from the positive valence of a group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Categorization in a more general sense allows us to make sense of the chaotic world and provides us with action relevant information (Turner & Reynolds, 2012). Stereotypic content is associated with categories of individuals much in the same way it is associated with categories of objects (Lee, McCauley, & Jussim, 2013). For example, the categories of chair and table have two sets of non-mutually exclusive informational content associated with each category. The informational content might include activities you can perform with the object and typical characteristics of the objects within the category. The goal, whether it be to lay out a spread of food or to sit down, interacts with the informational content associated with the categories to inform successful action with a given object category.

It can also be said that a hierarchy exists among our goals with some such as survival and reproduction existing on the implicit level and operating across contexts, whereas some goals operate in a limited number of contexts. Consequently, overarching goals that exist across contexts enhance the salience of particular categorizations for events, objects, and people in a manner that is relevant to the goal. This is important to note because our group memberships are an integral component to our survival and quality of life (Cacioppo, Cacioppo, Capitanio, & Cole, 2015; Cacioppo, Hawkley, Norman, & Berntson, 2011; Cole, Hawkley, Arevalo, Sung, Rose, & Cacioppo, 2007; Hare, 2017). So much so that our psychology has evolved to interact within a social environment more than any particular physical environment (Cosmides & Toby, 2013). Because our group memberships are instrumental to survival and vitality in these ways,

we can assume that maintenance of group viability is a subdomain of the implicit goal to survive and reproduce. This can do much to explain the prevalence and benefit of in-group favoritism and out-group antagonism even in the absence of competition. Further, this can be thought to underlie the ‘social categorization-social identity-social comparison-positive distinctiveness’ sequence (Turner & Reynolds, 2012).

Categorization can occur at different levels of abstraction (Turner et al., 1987). The presence of specific factors in a given context promote the salience of different categorizations at higher or lower levels of abstraction (Turner & Onorato, 1999). The lowest level of abstraction is at the personal level which activates personal goals, attitudes, and self-perception in terms of individual idiosyncrasies, whereas higher levels of abstraction include shared goals, attitudes, and identities (Turner et al., 1987). When self-categorization at the social level occurs, an in-group membership’s related content is activated. If the evaluation of the content through social comparison in a given context is positive, this contributes to overall positive distinctiveness of the social identity. Evaluation of the overall social identity in this sense provides feedback about our overall social viability. In other words, it tells the individual about their group’s previous outcomes and the likelihood their group will be able to handle future challenges. Each group membership contributes to this evaluative feedback. As discussed earlier, each group’s contribution to the overall social identity is unequally weighted. The social identity is composed of a hierarchy of group memberships where some are more important than others and therefore contribute unequally to the evaluation of the social identity. Thus, the motivation to maintain positive social comparisons through in-group favoritism, out-group antagonism, and other intergroup processes becomes a function of a group membership’s importance in the social identity. Social comparisons are the comparison of one’s in-group to a similar out-group that

allows for the evaluation of the in-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social comparisons are that which ultimately warrant identity benefits or validate the positive distinctiveness of the in-group. This is similar to how self-enhancement opportunities are used by narcissists to derive positive identity.

In summary, the process of self- and social categorization into groups allows individuals to make sense of the social world and provides informational content related to goal approach. Specifically, the self-categorization process allows for depersonalization and self-stereotyping in terms of the chosen category (Turner & Onorato, 1999). Depersonalization of perception lets group members be viewed as embodiments of group prototypes rather than multidimensional individuals (Turner & Onorato, 1999). The group prototype follows the metacontrast principle in that it minimizes in-group differences while maximizing out-group differences. Further, this allows groups members to make sense of the world through the values, attitudes, and goals of the group. This includes maintaining or achieving positive identity of a given group membership. We are driven to evaluate the valence of our group by comparing the viability and benefits provided by our group to other groups in a process called social comparisons.

Realistic conflict theory states that in competitive environments, social comparisons are encouraged and elicit in-group favoritism and out-group antagonism (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961). From the minimal groups paradigm, we have learned that in-group favoritism and out-group antagonism is likely to occur even in the absence of competition and when groups are arbitrarily determined (Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). One can also reason that the arbitrary creation of groups allowed for the specific informational content associated with a given group to be controlled for. Therefore, in the absence of competition, participants were not influenced by stereotypic content associated with a specific group but were

left to make choices based upon the general group memberships of in-group and out-group. The stereotypic content associated with a general distinction of in-group and out-group was all that was needed to elicit in-group favoritism and out-group antagonism. These findings can be extended to infer that the basic distinction of in-group and out-group undergirds the relation between groups and the formation of higher level or group specific stereotypic content (Turner & Onorato, 1999; Turner & Reynolds, 2012). That is, the informational content associated with a specific out-group is likely to contain relevant information about the threats they may pose to the in-group.

When two or more individuals are acting in regard to a group membership or category, intergroup behavior occurs (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This leads to events being appraised in reference to group level categories. This process however can become dysfunctional when the individual's self-concept, which is comprised of individual and group components, becomes monopolized by a single group membership. According to self-categorization theory, the salience of a category or a self-category is an interaction between a perceiver's readiness (e.g., goals, values, and expectations) to utilize a specific category, background knowledge, and the contextual stimulus reality (Turner & Onorato, 1999). NGO involves the dysfunctional salience of a self-category resulting from a fluctuation in perceiver readiness by the degree to which the group is central and valued. This very generally describes NGO but the reason why perceiver readiness fluctuates explains variation in the expression of NGO. Changes in perceiver readiness for the grandiose expression increase the salience of a self-category for opportunistic use, while changes in perceiver readiness for the vulnerable expression increase the salience of a self-category for threat avoidance.

One instance of a single group membership comprising a large part of the social identity

is when a single group membership's exceptional positive valence is an abundant source of positive identity across contexts. This allows the individual to receive identity benefits to the extent they are able to self-categorize into this group membership across contexts.

Consequently, this makes the group membership hypersalient even in the absence of the appropriate contextual factors due to its ability to confer identity benefits.

Another instance is when the individual's social identity has an overall negative valence because of poor group memberships. Thus, the individual may be prompted to abandon those group memberships in preference for a sole positive. This circumstance may normally motivate social mobility according to social identity theory, however, in this case, although groups may be permeable the individual does not possess the means to change groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, intergroup behavior is prompted because the compelled commitment to the present group memberships resembles the social change end of the continuum. Thus, the individual must rely on a sole positive group membership. In this instance, the individual lacks group memberships with positive distinctiveness and therefore one positive group membership becomes an especially important component of the social identity of the individual. This motivates the individual to accentuate the positive or unique aspects of their sole positive group membership. The group membership's stereotypic content is likely to be exaggerated in intergroup contexts and efforts are made to validate the exaggerated in-group image.

The final instance is similar to what Tajfel and Turner (1979) describe under the social change end of the continuum in that the group membership cannot be escaped or it is a membership to which the individual is highly committed. This might be in the form of an immutable characteristic such as race, gender, or other innate characteristics. The group membership is unlikely to have a positive valence across contexts, but a unique experience or

victimization of the in-group is likely to be a source of grandiose idealization. Similar to what is described under social change by Tajfel and Turner (1979), the unique experience or victimization of the group is a new dimension on which social comparisons can be carried out. The inescapable quality of this group membership causes it to be a permanent fixture in the social identity of the individual and is therefore salient across contexts in order to avoid threats to the group's image. The combined effects of vulnerability and salience across contexts causes the individual to exaggerate the stereotypic content associated with out-group hostility towards the in-group.

The social realities described above relate to fluctuations in perceiver readiness which result in social identity monopolization and ultimately in the increased salience of the particular self-category. This prompts the individual to be overly concerned with validation of the in-group's positive identity through social comparisons and to garner admiration through intergroup behaviors that attempt promote the positive identity of the in-group. In the event that one group membership monopolizes or becomes a significant portion of the individual's social identity, the individual may become defensive towards their group membership in order to maintain its positive valence. In this case, the individual is likely to exhibit symptoms of narcissistic group identification (NGO) such as hypersensitivity to out-group threats or exhibitionism because the single group membership is paramount to the social identity of the individual. Leading to a superfluous number of events being appraised in reference to the group membership because threats at the group level must be recognized and social comparisons must be carried out for validation.

Instead of a healthy social identity which is comprised of a number of different group memberships from which the individual can maintain a positive social identity, NGO involves

the maintenance of a positive social identity which is dependent on a single or small number of group memberships. The dysfunctional social identity described here has two forms. The first unhealthy form of social identity, grandiose narcissistic group orientation (GNGO), is indicative of the first social reality case mentioned above. Here the individual is motivated to utilize the particular self-category opportunistically across contexts and even in contexts that are inappropriate. The latter two cases describe vulnerable narcissistic group orientation (VNGO), where the individual has a sole positive membership or where the individual is forced to self-categorize into a group, the individual experiences lack of choice or control in their self-categorization. The group membership in these cases becomes hypersalient due to threat avoidance making the individual defensive.

When there is a dysfunctional social identity the individual attempts to maintain and validate the social identity through dysfunctional means. Validation occurs through manipulations of reality by creating favorable out of context social comparisons. The intergroup context is viewed as an opportunity to achieve glory for the in-group leading to overtly immodest or exhibitionist intergroup behavior. Also, extreme degrees of in-group favoritism and out-group discrimination are used to enhance the image of the in-group. Other dysfunctional intergroup behaviors include a number of narcissistic symptoms such as rejection of negative evaluations of the in-group and rationalizations of negative in-group behaviors in order to maintain the positive evaluation of the in-group.

From this understanding of social identity theory, we can now formulate what NGO entails. Borrowing from the clinical definition of narcissism, NGO can be defined as one's capacity to maintain positive social identity through a variety of social self, affective, and intergroup processes. NGO underlies an individual's needs for positive social comparisons as

well as the motivation to overtly and covertly seek out social identity enhancement experiences in intergroup contexts. The primary dysfunction of NGO is the increased salience of a particular self-category across contexts that is coupled with the exaggeration of positive in-group stereotypic content and negative out-group stereotypic content in social comparisons.

The underlying causes for the increased salience of relevant in-group categorizations varies across the two phenotypic expressions of NGO. In the case of GNGO, the self-category is to be of high status and intergroup contexts are perceived as opportunities for self-enhancement as well as validation of the exceptional group identity. Therefore, GNGO is prone to exaggerating the positive in-group stereotypic content. In the case of VNGO, the self-category is perceived to be vulnerable and inadequate, and intergroup contexts are viewed as potentially hostile situations in which these characteristics may be exposed. Therefore, VNGO is likely prone to exaggerating hostile and threatening stereotypic content of the out-group.

Groups that are prestigious or high status are hypothesized to be especially prone to GNGO. This for example could include exclusive professional or social clubs such as fraternities or sororities, Navy Seals, a popular social group in high school, top ranked universities, powerful nation states, or championship level sports teams. Interactions with out-group members are characterized by boasting about the group's accomplishments or superiority as a basis for positive social comparisons. Interactions may also include exhibitions of the in-group's superior skills and qualities as part of a social identity enhancement strategy. The perceived homogeneity of the in-group is also likely to be a source of pride amongst those exhibiting GNGO. This homogeneity should be linked to a prestigious or unique characteristic or accomplishment (e.g., all students at our university are exceptionally smart).

Groups that are of low status and inescapable, groups that are minority groups in terms of

their popularity and/or membership count, or groups that are important to an individual but low status are hypothesized to be prone to VNGO. These groups are likely to feel victimized or as though their group does not receive the respect and appreciation it deserves. VNGO prone groups include those defined by immutable traits or those that are minority groups due to a unique ideology. Examples include white supremacists, feminists, vegans, metalheads/goths, or other niche groups. Those exhibiting VNGO are likely to have a paranoid thinking style and be apprehensive of out-groups in intergroup contexts. The perceived uniqueness of the group (e.g., characteristic, morality, victimization) is utilized as source of grandiose idealization (e.g., “most people are not moral enough to abstain from eating meat”). Individuals are likely to believe that their group is misunderstood or that out-group members do not understand or appreciate their group’s uniqueness (e.g., “pop music fans do not understand real music”). These are used as rationalizations for why their group might not be popular in terms of its membership or why the group is low status.

Understanding group orientations will include the integration of the social identity and self-categorization perspectives with in-group identification. A multicomponent model of in-group identification includes individual self-stereotyping, in-group homogeneity, solidarity, satisfaction, and centrality (Leach, van Zomeren, Zebel, Vliek, Pennekamp, Doosje, & Ouwerkerk, 2008). These five components fall within two dimensions, self-definition and self-investment. Self-stereotyping and in-group homogeneity fall under self-definition, while solidarity, satisfaction, and centrality fall under self-investment.

Self-stereotyping refers to the extent to which the individual’s perception of the self is consistent with their autostereotype of the group (Leach et al., 2008). The autostereotype refers to a group’s stereotype of its own members (Lee & Ottati, 1995; Ottati & Lee, 1995). Thus, the

autostereotype can be thought of as highlighting the defining features of the prototypical group member. Congruence between the individual self-stereotypes and the autostereotype of the group indicates self-categorization or group identification (Leach et al., 2008).

In-group homogeneity is focused on the perceived similarity of the entire group (Leach et al., 2008). The less variance on the relevant characteristics equaling greater homogeneity. This has clear connections to entitativity. Particularly in the way that Campbell's (1958) determination of entitativity is based on the comparison of intra-entity coefficients to inter-entity coefficients, in-group homogeneity is similarly based on the perception of greater similarity of in-group members compared to that of an out-group member.

Solidarity refers to a psychological bond with and commitment to in-group members (Leach et al., 2008). This includes an investment of the self in the group and its activities. While solidarity is not directly related to the theoretical perspectives mentioned, it still remains as an important component of group identification.

Satisfaction in the multicomponent model is the extent to which an individual has positive feelings about a group and their membership in it. This is a direct extension of one of the main points of social identity and self-categorization theory in that social identity is comprised of the group memberships that are chosen to be identified with in part for positive identity benefits. Therefore, satisfaction should be related to maintenance of a positive identity of the in-group. This is evidenced by the finding that high satisfaction levels negatively predict assessing guilt to the in-group for wrongdoing (Leach et al., 2008). In the case of narcissistic group identification, satisfaction is theorized to be derived from the idealized image of the in-group. Satisfaction derived from the idealized image of the in-group lends itself to a dysfunctional group identification as this unrealistic perception must be maintained.

Finally, centrality refers to the salience and importance of a group membership (Leach et al., 2008). From a social identity perspective this component is vital to understanding narcissistic group identification. It is hypothesized that narcissistic group identification in its primary or acute form to be characterized by an obsession with a particular group membership. In a technical sense this means the group membership is high in salience and importance in such a way that intergroup contexts are primarily appraised in their relevance to the group membership (Leach et al., 2008). The more central to one's social identity a group identity is, the greater relevance the group membership has in all contexts. This leading to dysfunctional intergroup behavior such as hypersensitivity to threats to the in-group in contexts where the group membership is irrelevant.

The five different components of group identification differentially and uniquely predict outcomes such as perceived in-group homogeneity and threat to the in-group (Leach et al., 2008). Therefore, understanding the theoretical perspectives provides insight as to how NGO might differ from WGO.

Daoist Big Five and Water-like Group Orientation

“Daoism is a way of life and human existence in relation to the universe rather than simply an ethical or religious way of behaving” (Lee et al., 2008, p. 85). Daoism places emphasis on a naturalistic way of life that is in harmony with nature (Lee et al., 2008; Lee, Haught, Chen, & Chan, 2013). The importance of harmonic existence also extends to behaving in a humanitarian way towards fellow man (Lee et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2013). “...Daoism teaches self-subordination and frugality and warns of the self-defeating consequences of assertiveness and aggrandizement, whether political, military, or personal” (Laozi, 2004, p. 1).

Daoism has provided a conceptual underpinning for the construction of the Daoist Big

Five or water-like personality scale (Lee et al., 2013). The first component is altruism. Water is altruistic in the sense that it gives life to all things but gets nothing in return (Lee et al., 2013). The second component is modesty. Water provides life but remains humble by naturally flowing to the lowest place (Lee et al., 2013). In this sense, water does not seek competition and is not driven by ego. The third component is flexibility. Water adapts itself to the shape of its container and follows the flow of nature (Lee et al., 2013). The fourth component is honesty. Water is transparent and clear, but mud makes it opaque. Like water, competition and ego can interfere with the individual's ability to remain transparent (Lee et al., 2013). The fifth component is perseverance. Water is gentle but its persistence over time will allow it to influence the shape of the land (Lee et al., 2013).

Research on the Daoist Big Five has included examining its relationship to positive and negative interpersonal orientations. This research found all five components of the Daoist Big Five to be negatively related to Machiavellianism (Lee, Xu, Lin, & Chen, 2015). Specifically, Machiavellianism was correlated with altruism, $r = -.429$; with modesty, $r = -.351$; with flexibility, $r = -.179$; with honesty, $r = -.195$; and with gentle & perseverance, $r = -.442$ (all $p < .01$).

Therefore, we should also expect narcissism to be negatively related to the Daoist Big Five's components as narcissism and Machiavellianism are similar in some areas. Namely, narcissism and Machiavellianism share the traits of emotional callousness and manipulation which run counter to the Daoist Big Five's components of altruism and honesty (Paulhus, 2014). We should also expect grandiose narcissism, which is in part characterized by overtly immodest exhibitionist behavior, to have strong negative relations with the modesty component of the Daoist Big Five. Both expressions of narcissism should also be negatively related to flexibility

because both expressions include self-centered cognitions and behaviors. Lastly, vulnerable narcissism should have a strong negative relation with the gentle and perseverance component because the vulnerable narcissist is likely to withdraw from situations where positive evaluation is not likely and engage in reactive aggression to criticisms.

The applications to intergroup contexts are clear. Particularly applicable is the principle of wuwei or under acting which is seen in Laozi's ideal leader. The ideal leader to Laozi is a sage who lacks the desire for control and allows for things to take their course. This sentiment is seen in Stanza 7:

The heavens last, the earth endures.

And the reason why they do?

By disowning what they yield,

Heaven can last and earth endure.

So, surely, does the world-wise lord,

Who puts his interest far behind

And ends up in the lead,

Who puts his interest to the side

And ends up safe and whole.

Is it not so:

That having nothing to own

He can achieve his goal? (Laozi, 2004, p. 43)

Here Laozi speaks of a leader who is impartial and not self-interested in increasing his own power and reputation. This is again contrary to the self-aggrandizement characteristic of narcissism. The principle of wuwei can be applied to those who try to exert control over their

reputation and increase its power. Those who seek to use their group as a vehicle for their own motives will not benefit the group, but those who put the interests of the group before themselves will allow the group to succeed. Laozi also advises against the use of power that seeks to control events because this ultimately leads to conflict.

Further, Daoist Big Five's positive relation to the Human Nature Scale also suggest that it is a measure of a positive interpersonal orientation (Lee et al., 2015). The Human Nature Scale measures the extent to which people live honestly, charitably, and the extent to which they believe others do so. All five of the Daoist Big Five's components were positively related to the Human Nature Scale. Specifically, the Human Nature Scale was correlated with altruism, $r = .400$; with modesty, $r = .349$; with flexibility, $r = .187$; with honesty, $r = .238$; and with gentle & perseverance, $r = .307$ (all $p < .01$).

From this, it is reasonable to say that Daoist psychology underlies secure in-group positivity as well as serving as a polar opposite to narcissism in many aspects.

WGO might manifest its altruism and flexibility by compromising with an out-group rather than perceiving the desire of the out-group as hostile demands. WGO lends itself towards win-win outcomes as opposed to win-lose outcomes that are indicative of the domineering attitude of defensive in-group positivity. Honesty is perhaps the most important component that will distinguish a defensive or NGO from a secure or WGO. Honesty is promoted by the principle of wuwei in that honest accounts do not seek to control reactions or outcomes. WGO is marked by an honest account of the in-group's achievements as well as their shortcomings. This allows for a realistic account of the social identity from which the individual can derive self-esteem. NGO on the other hand is marked by the promotion of a false or overly inflated image of the in-group's achievements and a denial of their shortcomings. Therefore, the self-

esteem derived from the identity of narcissistically oriented group memberships is dysfunctional and deluded.

The Present Study

Self-categorization at the group level of inclusiveness creates depersonalization in self-perception (Turner & Onorato, 1999). This depersonalization shifts our self-perception to be colored by stereotypic content associated with our in-group's prototype. The impact on behavior is that this allows us to momentarily shift focus from our personal goals and idiosyncrasies in interaction to the goals and attitudes of the group creating intergroup behavior. While self-categorization explains the basis of interpersonal versus intergroup behavior, the manner in which we orient ourselves within those groups can impact the categorization process including our perceptions of the in-group, out-groups, and consequently how we behave in intergroup contexts.

Just as narcissistic motives underlie our needs for maintenance of a positive and coherent self-image, they underlie our needs for positive social identity. This however can become pathological when our need to validate and affirm our social identities becomes excessive in terms of degree and/or frequency and include distortions of reality. Daoist psychology and the principle of wuwei underlies the relinquishment of control and power. In this sense, Daoist psychology promotes letting go of the need to control and manage our social identities, but instead focuses on honest evaluations of our groups. This honest and impartial evaluation also requires water-like flexibility in adapting to the necessary changes and improvements. In contrast to narcissism, the Daoist psychological components of honesty and modesty seek not what is best for the individual but what is ultimately best for the well-being of the group.

Research on collective narcissism has begun to conceptualize opposing group

orientations as secure and defensive in-group positivity. The work on collective narcissism has provided a foundation for exploring these opposing group orientations, however there is still work to be done. In regard to collective narcissism or defensive in-group positivity, connections between social identity theory and narcissism must be addressed. Namely, the social identity perspective including self-categorization can aid in understanding the general dysfunction of NGO and establishing the conceptual distinctions between the two phenotypic expressions of narcissism at group level.

The primary dysfunction of NGO is the heightened salience of a particular social category that may be inappropriate in terms of level of categorization (i.e., interpersonal versus intergroup perceptions and behavior) and/or social category (i.e., self-categorization into a contextually inappropriate social category). The root of this dysfunctional social identity process (i.e., hypersalience of a particular social category leading to inappropriate self-categorization and therefore inappropriate intergroup comparisons and behavior) is that the social identity is largely or almost entirely resting upon a single group membership. The underlying cause of social identity monopolization is where distinctions between the grandiose and vulnerable expression can be seen. In terms of the grandiose expression, social identity monopolization results primarily for the benefits and advantages a particular categorization provides. This group membership allows the individual to elevate themselves through categorization and consequently becomes hypersalient for opportunistic use. In terms of the vulnerable expression, social identity monopolization occurs because a particular categorization is inescapable (e.g., race, gender, height, etc.) or particularly important to the individual. In both vulnerable cases, the group membership is not likely to have high status or prestige. Because the group membership cannot simply be dispensed with for the aforementioned reasons, the categorization becomes

hypersalient in order to avoid further threats to the weak or sole positive group membership.

At the present time, collective narcissism is a unidimensional construct and lacks any distinction between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism at the group level. The collective narcissism scale was also constructed with a unidimensional construct in mind, however some data have not supported a unidimensional factor structure of the collective narcissism scale (Montoya, 2017). In addition, the individual level narcissism literature supports two distinct expressions of narcissism. When it comes to secure in-group positivity, it has been studied by partialing out the variance of collective narcissism from measures of in-group identification or collective self-esteem, but there is presently no sole measure that captures this construct. The philosophical and psychological principles of Daoism can contribute to establishing a conceptual basis for a measure of secure and prosocial in-group positivity or WGO.

Therefore, the two primary objectives of Study 1 were to develop the two-factor NGOS as well as develop the WGOS. The third objective of Study 1 was to establish evidence of convergent validity for the NGOS and the WGOS.

In order to establish evidence of convergent validity for the NGOS, bivariate correlations among related constructs were examined. Previous literature would suggest that the NGOS should be positively related to the constructs of social dominance orientation (SDO) and blind patriotism, while being negatively related to constructive patriotism.

SDO describes the extent to which one desires and supports group based hierarchies (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Social dominance theory holds that supporting the superiority of a single group over others serves to reduce conflict. In intergroup contexts SDO should predict whether one prefers the structure of relations amongst groups to be hierarchical or equal. In previous research SDO has been positively related to collective narcissism (r s ranging

from .08 to .53) (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). While SDO is characterized by a general preference for a dominant group exerting influence over inferior groups, NGO is particular concerned about the greatness of the in-group over other groups. There should be substantial overlap in their preference for unequal social relations amongst groups as well as the proclivity for dominance and aggression (Pratto et al., 1994).

Blind patriotism is described as a rigid and inflexible attachment to country, characterized by unquestioning positive evaluation, staunch allegiance, and intolerance of criticism (Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999). In previous research blind patriotism was found to be positively related to collective narcissism (r s ranging from .55 to .65) (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013a). It is expected that a similar relationship exists between NGO and blind patriotism as there is overlap in the glorification of one's nation and intolerance of criticism. In this sense, both constructs seem to represent a similar defensiveness towards the criticism of one's group.

Constructive patriotism is described as an attachment to country characterized by support for questioning and criticism of current group practices that are intended to result in positive change (Schatz et al., 1999). Contrary to constructive patriotism's questioning of the group and support for criticism, NGO is not likely to question the in-group's greatness, would reject criticism, and may distort criticisms.

Hypothesis 1: NGO (i.e., GNGO and VNGO) will be positively related to social dominance orientation.

Hypothesis 2: NGO will be positively related to blind patriotism.

Hypothesis 3: NGO will be negatively related to constructive patriotism.

In order to establish evidence of convergent validity for the WGOS, correlations among related constructs will be examined. Previous literature would suggest that the WGOS should be

positively related to the construct of constructive patriotism, while being negatively related to the constructs of social dominance orientation and blind patriotism (Cichocka, 2016; Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013).

WGO is characterized by altruism, modesty, flexibility, perseverance, honesty, and wuwei. The component of altruism and flexibility seem to be counter to the theoretical foundations of SDO. SDO promotes the degradation of lesser groups, while WGO is characterized by altruistic treatment of all groups, not preferential treatment. A rigid social hierarchy is also central to SDO, whereas flexibility is central to the description of WGO.

WGO's honesty, modesty, and flexibility also appears to be antithetical to blind patriotism's inflexible allegiance to country, rejection of criticism, and blind support. On the contrary, WGO promotes a lack of desire to control the in-group's image, modest allegiance to one's group, and honesty and flexibility in constructively improving the group.

WGO does seem to have some overlap with constructive patriotism. Modesty and honesty are endemic to both constructs in the willingness to recognize one's group can improve and admitting so. WGO's component of flexibility also is seen in constructive patriotism with the support for making changes that will improve one's group.

Hypothesis 4: WGO will be negatively related to social dominance orientation.

Hypothesis 5: WGO will be negatively related to blind patriotism.

Hypothesis 6: WGO will be positively related to constructive patriotism.

Study 2 explores how NGO and WGO are related to identification with groups. Political group will be used in Study 2 because political group is likely to be a more salient in-group compared to national identity. In addition, political group is the type of group whose members must actively decide to join unlike national in-group. Members of a political group are also

more active in constructing the values and actions of the group. Therefore, we should expect greater identification and attachment to the in-group. The primary objective of Study 2 was to explore the relationship between GNGO, VNGO, WGO, and a multicomponent measure of in-group identification.

Research Question 1: How is NGO related to the components of in-group identification (i.e., solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity)?

Research Question 2: How is WGO related to the components of in-group identification (i.e., solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity)?

In summary, the primary contributions of this research are to reconceptualize group narcissism as well as defining the expressions of the construct. The first contribution has been made by incorporating clinical research and theory on narcissism into the conceptualization of a two-dimensional NGO construct. The second major contribution of this work has been to explain the operation of NGO through the social identity process and self-categorization mechanisms. Namely, this research is the first to identify and explain the primary dysfunction of NGO. While others have established the idea of collective narcissism as a distinct concept, areas of that work needed additions and refinements. Blending clinical narcissism research and theory with the principles of SIT and SCT has allowed for a richer understanding of NGO as a pathological group orientation rooted in the social identity. The third major contribution of this work has been the incorporation of Daoism research as a basis for understanding secure in-group positivity. Particularly, the addition of wuwei as central feature of secure in-group positivity along with the components of the Daoist Big Five will provide a basis for a much needed measure of secure in-group positivity.

CHAPTER 3

STUDY 1

Overview

A goal of the present research was to develop and validate a measure of NGO that captures both dimensions of narcissism. A second goal of the present research was to develop and validate a measure of WGO based on the principle of wuwei.

The development of the NGOS is important for several reasons. The first being that the Collective Narcissism Scale in its current form and scoring method is an inadequate measure of narcissism at the group level. The scoring method relies on a composite score which is problematic given the multidimensional nature of the scale. Therefore, the NGOS will be the first measure that explicitly aims to assess both the grandiose and vulnerable dimensions of narcissism at the group level. This will also bring unity to research and theory on narcissism at both levels of analysis by incorporating the findings at the individual to the group level.

A Daoist group orientation scale is a useful addition to research and theory. As measures of dysfunctional group orientation have proliferated (e.g., collective narcissism, social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, etc.) little work has been done in terms of developing a prosocial or WGO. Daoism provides a strong basis for the exploration of a positive group orientation as Daoism promotes living not only in harmony with nature but also with fellow man (Lee et al., 2015). Daosim provides an Eastern philosophical perspective that can complement Western perspectives on intergroup relations. Perhaps, the Daoist perspective can even be used to shed light on managing intergroup situations where conflict is imminent, challenge zero-sum game perspectives, and promote win-win thinking styles (Lee et al., 2008). Therefore, the development and validation of the WGOS should prove to be of great utility.

Study 1 Methods

NGOS Item Generation

Beginning with the development of the NGOS, construct definitions were first established for GNGO and VNGO. These construct definitions were established from a review of the grandiose, vulnerable, and collective narcissism literatures and were used as a part of a deductive approach described by Hinkin (1998) to generate items for the two constructs.

Items developed for the NGOS were designed to capture self, affective, and intergroup dysfunction characteristic of GNGO and VNGO. GNGO subscale items were designed to capture self, affective, and intergroup dysfunction that included grandiosity (e.g., I cannot think of any flaw my group has), immodest self-enhancement (e.g., It is important that the achievements of my group outshine the achievements of other groups), entitlement (e.g., My group should have more influence compared to other groups), hostility towards criticism (e.g., It angers me when people criticize my group), distortion of negative information (e.g., Criticisms of my group are often inaccurate), and group exclusivity (e.g., Most members of my group are exceptional). VNGO subscale items were designed to capture self, affective, and intergroup dysfunction that included fragile and insecure grandiosity (e.g., Other people do not appreciate my group as much as they should), shameful reactions to self-enhancement failure (e.g., It is humiliating to see my group fail publicly), hypersensitivity to threat/hostile attribution bias (e.g., My group is constantly under attack), paranoid/distrustful thinking style (e.g., Other groups want to see my group fail), and intergroup avoidance (e.g., I would rather not interact with people from different groups because they would treat me unfairly).

The generated items for each scale were screened for representativeness and redundancy by the primary researcher and advisor. At this stage of scale development, 13 items were

retained for the GNGO subscale (Appendix A) and 10 items were retained for the VNGO subscale (Appendix B). These versions of the GNGO and VNGO subscales are general and can be adapted for use with other groups by replacing the terms ‘my group’ with the focal group name and ‘other groups’ with an identifier of the level of abstraction.

No midpoint was used in the NGOS. This was done to reduce satisficing where a participant selects the neutral response instead of a response that is not socially desirable. Also, to reduce satisficing where a participant selects the neutral response to reduce cognitive burden of having to think about responding to a novel situation. No midpoints were provided for any items of the major variables of interest. Chyung, Roberts, Swanson, and Hankinson (2017) provide a review of recommendations for midpoint use or see DeCastellarnu (2017).

The GNGO (Appendix C) and VNGO (Appendix D) subscales were adapted to accommodate America as the focal in-group for the purposes of this study. This was done in order to ensure adequate sample size in estimating parameters. In addition, national in-groups have been the primary focal in-group in previous studies with blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and social dominance orientation which justifies their utility in validation.

Item generation WGOS

A construct definition for WGO was established from a review of the Daoism research and the *Dao de Jing*. Nearly half of the WGOS items were adapted from the Daoist Big Five Leadership Scale but additional items were also generated. The adapted and generated items were designed to capture wuwei (e.g., I do not feel the need to change the way people see my group) along with the five components of the Daoist Big Five; altruism (e.g., My group should use its influence to help others), modesty (e.g., All groups are deserving of respect), flexibility (e.g., My group should be able to compromise with other groups), honesty (e.g., It is important

that my group is honest about our shortcomings), and gentle perseverance (e.g., My group can overcome difficult challenges).

The generated and adapted items were screened for representativeness and redundancy by the primary researcher and advisor. At this stage of scale development 13 items were retained for the WGOS (Appendix E). Items adapted from the Daoist Big Five include items one through six on the WGOS. All items that were adapted were done so in a manner to ensure consistency of perspective.

This version of the WGOS is general and can be adapted for use with other groups by replacing the terms ‘my group’ with the focal group name and ‘other groups’ with an identifier of the level of abstraction. The WGOS was adapted to accommodate America as the focal in-group (Appendix F).

Participants

The convenience sample of U.S. citizens was recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk and paid \$.75 for their participation. Participation was restricted to those over the age of 18 ($M = 40.5$, $SD = 12.5$) and to those who have completed over 1,000 HITS with an approval rating of 95% or higher. The sample contained 43.5% females and 56.5% males. In terms of ethnicity, the sample was made up 5.4% Asians, 9.1% Blacks, 3.8% Hispanics, 77.4% Whites, and 4.3% who were multiracial. Participants were presented a demographic survey (Appendix G) with items pertaining to age, sex, ethnicity, citizenship, education level, religious affiliation, political affiliation, military service, and income. A full breakdown of participant characteristics including political party, military experience, education, income, religion, and residence location can be found in Table 1.

Materials and Measures

Narcissistic Group Orientation Scale (NGOS).

NGO was measured with the initial 23 items generated for GNGO and VNGO subscales. The GNGO subscale contains 13 items while the VNGO subscale contains 10 items. The GNGO (Appendix C) and VNGO (Appendix D) subscales were adapted to have America as the focal in-group. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}$, $6 = \text{strongly agree}$). Higher scores on the NGOS indicate greater NGO.

Water-like Group Orientation Scale (WGOS).

WGO was measured with the initial 13 items generated. The WGOS was adapted to have America as the focal in-group (Appendix F). Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}$, $6 = \text{strongly agree}$). Higher scores on the WGOS indicate greater WGO.

Social Dominance Orientation Scale.

The Social Dominance Orientation Scale is a unidimensional measure of an individual's preference for inequality among social groups (e.g., Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups, Inferior groups should stay in their place, It is okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others). Previous research has found SDO to be related with attitudes towards affirmative action ($r = -.44$), civil rights ($r = -.59$), gay rights ($r = -.32$), the military ($r = .39$), decreased immigration ($r = .41$), equal pay for women ($r = -.29$), and the death penalty ($r = .34$). Evidence of convergent validity for the 16-item SDO scale comes from its positive relation ($r = .51$) with the sexism scale. The SDO scale has demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$).

SDO was measured using the 16-item SDO scale (Appendix H). The scale anchors have been modified to represent agreement or disagreement with the items to retain consistency across the scale in the present study. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ($1 =$

strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). Higher scores on the SDO scale indicate greater preference for inequality among social groups.

Blind patriotism measure.

The blind patriotism measure captures an attachment to country characterized by unquestioning positive evaluation, staunch allegiance, and intolerance of criticism. Evidence for convergent validity of the blind patriotism measure has been shown with positive relationships to nationalism ($r = .65$), national vulnerability ($r = .52$), and cultural contamination ($r = .53$) (Schatz et al., 1999). Evidence for divergent validity of the blind patriotism measure has been shown by being unrelated to political efficacy ($r = -.04$) and political knowledge ($r = -.09$) (Schatz et al., 1999). The 12 blind patriotism items have also exhibited good internal consistency ($\alpha = .88$)

Blind patriotism was measured using 12 items (Appendix I) from Schatz and colleagues (1999). Sample items include “People who do not wholeheartedly support America should live somewhere else”, “I would support my country right or wrong”, and “It is un-American to criticize this country”. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ($1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree$) with higher scores indicating greater blind patriotism.

Constructive patriotism measure.

The constructive patriotism measure captures an attachment to country characterized by support for questioning and criticism of current group practices that are intended to result in positive change. Evidence for convergent validity of the constructive patriotism measure has been shown with positive relationships to political efficacy ($r = .30$), political information gathering ($r = .18$), and political activism ($r = .15$) (Schatz et al. 1999). Evidence for divergent validity of the constructive patriotism measure has been shown by being unrelated to nationalism

($r = -.04$) and national vulnerability ($r = -.04$) (Schatz et al., 1999). The 6 constructive patriotism items have demonstrated acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .67$).

Constructive patriotism was measured using 6 items (Appendix J) from Schatz and colleagues (1999). Sample items include “If I criticize the United States, I do so out of love for my country”, “People should work hard to move this country in a positive direction”, and “I express my love for America by support efforts at positive change”. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ($1 = strongly disagree$, $6 = strongly agree$) with higher scores indicating greater constructive patriotism.

Attitudes towards the U.S. and U.S. values.

Four six-point items (Appendix K) that aim to assess participants’ identification as an American, general attitude towards the U.S., and attitude toward the founding values and ideals of the U.S. One example item includes, “To what extent do you identify as an American?”

Procedure

Those who accepted the Human Intelligence Task (HIT) on MTURK proceeded to the online survey via a hyperlink where they were presented with the consent form that provided them with information about the study (Appendix L). The entire study took participants approximately 15 minutes to complete. Participation was restricted to those who are United States’ citizens with an approval rating of 95% or higher. After providing consent, participants completed the NGOS (Appendix C and Appendix D) followed by the WGOS (Appendix F). Next, participants completed the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Appendix H), the blind patriotism measure (Appendix I), the constructive patriotism measure (Appendix J), and the attitudes towards the U.S. and U.S. values measure (Appendix K). Participants then were asked to provide demographic information (Appendix G) before reaching the debriefing form

(Appendix M). After debriefing, participants created a unique character code and entered that code both in the survey as well as in the HIT on MTURK. Participants who completed the study in its entirety and answered the attention checks correctly were compensated \$0.75 for their participation.

CHAPTER 4

STUDY 1 RESULTS

Assumption Testing

The NGO and WGO items were screened for outliers, multivariate normality, and multicollinearity. No outliers were present, there were no substantial departures from multivariate normality, and no multicollinearity was present. With no substantial departures from the assumptions, these data were deemed suitable for confirmatory factor analysis. The final sample size was reached ($N = 186$).

Item intercorrelations for the GNGO, VNGO, and WGO items can be seen in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4, respectively.

Model Specification of NGO Models

Previous research has suggested that narcissism presents itself in a grandiose and vulnerable form (Miller et al., 2017; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). This manner of presentation has also been previously hypothesized to exist at the group-level (Cichocka, 2016). Therefore, the hypothesized two factor NGO model was specified to include a GNGO factor that is correlated with a VNGO factor. All GNGO items (Appendix C) were specified to load onto the GNGO factor, and all VNGO items (Appendix D) were specified to load onto the VNGO factor. The variance of the GNGO factor and the VNGO factor were set to one. All factor loadings were freely estimated and were specified for no cross-loadings.

A residual correlation was specified for VNGO9 with VNGO10 because of similar wording (Appendix D). The residual correlation of VNGO9 with VNGO10 was significant, $r(184) = .533, p < .001$. The standardized covariance matrix of the parent model with no correlated residuals revealed a z-score of 6.46 for the residual covariance of VNGO9 with

VNGO10. This indicated that there was unexplained variance in these items that may have been due to similar wording. Further evidence was provided by a chi-square difference test. The chi-square difference test comparing the model with no correlated residuals to the model with a single correlated residual (i.e., VNGO9 with VNGO10) was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 186) = 100.265, p < .001$. This indicated that there was a significant improvement in model fit from the model with no correlated residuals to the model with a single correlated residual.

The hypothesized two factor NGO model was compared to a competing single factor NGO model with all GNGO and VNGO items loading onto a single factor. The variance of the single NGO factor was set to one. All factor loadings were freely estimated. A correlated residual was also specified for VNGO9 with VNGO10 as it was in the two factor model.

Evaluation of NGO Models

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using MPLUS software. Indices of model fit for the single factor NGO model indicated poor model fit, $\chi^2(229, N = 186) = 671.986, p < .001$; CFI = .845; TLI = .828; RMSEA = .102 (.093, .111); SRMR = .069. Factor loadings for the single factor NGO model can be seen in Table 5. Indices of model fit for the two factor NGO model also indicated less than acceptable model fit, $\chi^2(228, N = 186) = 588.190, p < .001$; CFI = .874; TLI = .860; RMSEA = .092 (.083, .101); SRMR = .067. The factor loadings in the two factor NGO model were strong (Table 6). There was also a strong positive correlation between GNGO and VNGO, $r(184) = .876, p < .001$.

AIC values can be used to compared non-nested models such as these. The two factor NGO model reported a smaller AIC value (AIC = 12570.911) compared to the single factor NGO model (AIC = 12652.707) which indicated the two factor model fit the data better. A comparison of indices of model fit can be seen in Table 7.

Model Specification of WGO Models

The present research on group-level water-like orientation included an additional wuwei component to the previous five components (i.e., perseverance, honesty, modesty, flexibility, and altruism). Therefore, a correlated two factor WGO model was hypothesized in addition to a single factor model. Items WGO1-WGO3, WGO12, WGO13 were specified to load onto WGO Factor 1 (WGOF1), and items WGO4, WGO5, WGO7 – WGO11 were specified to load onto WGO Factor 2 (WGOF2). The full list of items can be seen in Appendix F. The variance of WGOF1 and WGOF2 were set to one. All factor loadings were freely estimated and were specified for no cross-loadings.

Item WGO6 was excluded from the analysis because the reported item intercorrelations were low (i.e., only one correlation exceeding .3; Table 4). Residual correlations were specified for WGO8 with WGO11 and WGO9 with WGO10 because of similar wording (Appendix F). Estimating a model with these parameters revealed that the correlation for WGO9 with WGO10 was non-significant, $r(184) = -.025, p = .529$. When examining the parent model with no correlated residuals, the standardized residual covariance matrix revealed a z-score below 1.96 for the residual covariance of WGO9 with WGO10. Further evidence that this correlated residual was unnecessary was provided by a chi-square different test comparing the nested models. The chi-square difference test comparing the model with a single correlated residual (i.e., WGO8 with WGO11) to the model with two correlated residuals (i.e., WGO8 with WGO11 and WGO9 with WGO10) was non-significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 186) = 0.387, p > .05$. This indicated no significant improvement in the overall model fit from the model with a single correlated residual to the model with two correlated residuals.

The residual correlation of WGO8 with WGO11 did have a significant correlation, $r(184)$

= .206, $p < .001$. When examining the parent model with no correlated residuals, the standardized residual covariance matrix revealed a z-score of 4.137 for the residual covariance of WGO8 with WGO11. This indicated that there was unexplained variance in these items that may have been due to similar wording. Further evidence was provided by a chi-square difference test. The chi-square difference test comparing the model with no correlated residuals to the model with a single correlated residual (i.e., WGO8 with WGO11) was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 186) = 23.53, p < .001$. This indicated that there was a significant improvement in model fit from the model with no correlated residuals to the model with a single correlated residual.

The hypothesized two factor WGO model was compared to a competing single factor WGO model with 12 WGO items loading onto the single WGO factor. The variance of the single factor was set to one and all items were freely estimated. A correlated residual was also specified for WGO8 with WGO11 as it was in the two factor model.

Evaluation of WGO Models

Indices of model fit for the single factor WGO model indicated poor model fit, $\chi^2(53, N = 186) = 342.311, p < .001$; CFI = .648; TLI = .562; RMSEA = .171 (.154, .189); SRMR = .138. Factor loadings for the single factor WGO model can be seen in Table 8. Indices of model fit for the two factor WGO model indicated acceptable model fit, $\chi^2(52, N = 186) = 127.521, p < .001$; CFI = .908; TLI = .884; RMSEA = .088 (.069, .108); SRMR = .093. The factor loadings in the two factor WGO model for WGO Factor 1 (WGOF1) and WGO Factor 2 (WGOF2) were moderately strong (Table 9). There was also a negative correlation between WGOF1 and WGOF2, $r(184) = -.362, p < .001$.

AIC values can be used to compare non-nested models such as these. The two factor WGO model reported a smaller AIC value (AIC = 5844.262) compared to the single factor WGO

model (AIC = 6057.052) which indicated the two factor model fit the data better. A comparison of indices of model fit can be seen in Table 10.

Convergent Validity

GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, social dominance orientation (SDO), blind patriotism (BP), and constructive patriotism (CP) items were screened for outliers, univariate normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance. No substantial departures from the correlation assumptions were present.

Means and standard deviations for GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, SDO, BP, and CP can be seen in Table 11. All scales also demonstrated good internal consistency (Table 12). A full correlation matrix for these variables can be viewed in Table 13.

The hypothesis that GNGO and VNGO would be positively correlated to SDO and BP was supported. The hypothesis that GNGO and VNGO would be negatively related to CP was not supported. The results revealed that GNGO was positively related to SDO, $r(184) = .543, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to BP, $r(184) = .864, p < .01$. There was a negligible negative relation between GNGO and CP, $r(184) = -.150, p < .05$. VNGO was positively related to SDO, $r(184) = .554, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to BP, $r(184) = .771, p < .01$. There was a negligible negative relation between VNGO and CP, $r(184) = -.131, p = .074$.

The WGO correlation hypotheses were based on a single factor model, thus they cannot be supported. WGOF1 was positively related to SDO, $r(184) = .308, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to BP, $r(184) = .520, p < .01$. There was a negligible positive relation between WGOF1 and CP, $r(184) = .069, p = .349$. WGOF2 was negatively related to SDO, $r(184) = -.698, p < .01$. WGOF2 was negatively related to BP, $r(184) = -.580, p < .01$. WGOF2 was positively related to CP, $r(184) = .448, p < .01$.

Attitudes Towards the U.S. and U.S. Values

Correlation analyses were carried out on the relationship between GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, and WGOF2 with four items that aim to assess participants' general attitude towards the U.S., identification as an American, importance of American identity, and attitude toward the founding values and ideals of the U.S.

GNGO was positively related to general U.S. attitude, $r(184) = .682, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to American identification, $r(184) = .569, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to importance of American identity, $r(184) = .693, p < .01$. GNGO had a negligible relation to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(184) = .219, p < .01$.

VNGO was positively related to general U.S. attitude, $r(184) = .550, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to American identification, $r(184) = .475, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to importance of American identity, $r(184) = .589, p < .01$. VNGO had a negligible relation to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(184) = .217, p < .01$.

WGOF1 was positively related to general U.S. attitude, $r(184) = .701, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to American identification, $r(184) = .584, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to importance of American identity, $r(184) = .553, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(184) = .296, p < .01$.

WGOF2 was negatively related to general U.S. attitude, $r(184) = -.368, p < .01$. WGOF2 had a negligible relation to American identification, $r(184) = -.272, p < .01$. WGOF2 was negatively related to importance of American identity, $r(184) = -.331, p < .01$. WGOF2 had a negligible relation to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(184) = -.061, p = .406$.

CHAPTER 5

STUDY 1 DISCUSSION

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The confirmatory factor analysis results provided evidence in favor of previous speculations that a group-level narcissism construct has a grandiose and vulnerable expression. Namely, the two factor NGO model fit the data better than the single factor model and the factor loadings were stronger. The two factor model produced indices of model fit that were less than acceptable, however the factor loadings for the indicators of both GNGO and VNGO were strong. There was also a strong positive correlation between the factors which was expected as there is overlap in the two narcissistic expressions.

The confirmatory factor analysis of WGO produced two negatively related factors which was unexpected. The results from the single factor model indicated very poor model fit. There was also a mix of positive and negative factor loadings in the single factor model which indicated multidimensionality. A two factor model emerged from this analysis and fit the data much better than the single factor model. The two factor model alone had acceptable indices of model fit and exhibited strong factor loadings on WGOF1 and WGOF2.

WGOF1, which was composed of three perseverance items and two wuwei items, appears to capture in-group confidence and pride. WGOF2, which was made up of two modesty items, a single altruism item, two flexibility items, and two honesty items; appears to capture out-group respect and deference. The negative relationship between WGOF1 and WGOF2 was unexpected. This negative relation may be due to defensive in-group positivity being intertwined with secure in-group positivity in WGOF1. This would explain the positive relation of WGOF1 with GNGO and VNGO, as well as the negative relationship between WGOF1 and

WGOF2.

Convergent Validity

The hypotheses concerning evidence of convergent validity for GNGO and VNGO were supported for the most part. Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 predicted that GNGO and VNGO would be positively related to SDO and BP which was supported. Hypothesis 3 predicted that GNGO and VNGO would be negatively related to CP. GNGO was negatively correlated to CP, which was expected, however the size of the correlation coefficient was negligible. VNGO was also unrelated to CP which was unexpected.

Hypothesis 4 and Hypothesis 5 predicted WGO would be negatively related SDO and BP. Hypothesis 6 predicted that WGO would be positively related to CP. If Hypotheses 4-6 were solely applied to WGOF2, the hypotheses would be supported. WGOF2 was negatively related to SDO and BP, while being positively related to CP. WGOF1 on the other hand was positively related to SDO and BP, while being unrelated to CP. Given the nature of WGOF1, this pattern of correlations would be expected.

In summary, Study 1 provided evidence that NGO has a grandiose and vulnerable expression. In addition, Study 1 gathered evidence of convergent validity for GNGO and VNGO. Study 1 also provided evidence of a two factor WGO model. Evidence of convergent validity was gathered for WGOF1 and WGOF2. Study 2 will further explore the factor structure of the NGO and WGO constructs as well as examining their relations to a multi-component measure of in-group identification.

CHAPTER 6

STUDY 2

Overview

In Study 2, political affiliation was examined as the focal in-group to explore the psychometrics properties of the NGOS and WGOS outside the context of a national in-group. Political group will be used in Study 2 because political group is likely to be a more salient in-group with a salient out-group compared to national identity. In addition, political group is the type of group whose members must actively decide to join unlike national in-group. Members of a political group are also more active in constructing the values and actions of the group. Therefore, we should expect greater identification and attachment to the in-group.

Another important aspect to understanding the nature of group orientations includes how it may impact identification with one's in-group. In order to develop a greater understanding of narcissistic and water-like group orientation's relationship with in-group identification, Study 2 employed a multicomponent measure of in-group identification. This included examining the relationship between GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, and WGOF2 with solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and perceived in-group homogeneity. These correlation analyses were exploratory but the following research questions guided analysis.

Research Question 1: How is NGO related to the components of in-group identification (i.e., solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity)?

Research Question 2: How is WGO related to the components of in-group identification (i.e., solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity)?

Previous work on group orientations has primarily focused on behavioral outcomes while their relation to measures of in-group identification have not been examined. This work will

contribute to an enhanced understanding of group orientations by reporting the correlations of in-group identification components with GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, and WGOF2.

Study 2 Methods

Participants

The convenience sample of U.S. citizens who had some political leaning was recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk and paid \$.75 for their participation. Participation was restricted to those over the age of 18 ($M = 39$, $SD = 12.1$) and to those who have completed over 1,000 HITS with an approval rating of 95% or higher. The sample was made up of 54.4% Democrats, 24.5% Republicans, 19.6% independents, and 1.5% who belong to a different party. When independents and other party members were grouped with a major party by their political leaning, 67.2% of the sample was Democrat or leaning Democrat and 32.8% of the sample was Republican or leaning Republican. The sample was 40.7% females, 58.8% males, and .5% identifying as non-binary. In terms of ethnicity, the sample was 5.9% Asian, 12.3% Black, 4.4% Hispanic, 1% Native American, 68.1% White, and 8.3% multiracial. The demographic survey can be found in Appendix G and a full breakdown of participant characteristics including military experience, education, income, religion, and residence location can be found in Table 14.

Materials and Measures

Narcissistic Group Orientation Scale (NGOS).

NGO was measured with the GNGO and VNGO subscales validated in Study 1. The GNGO and VNGO subscales were adapted to have Democrats (Appendix N and Appendix O respectively) or Republicans (Appendix P and Appendix Q respectively) as the focal in-group with the opposing political group as the focal out-group. Participants rated items on a 6-point

Likert-type scale (*1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree*). Higher scores on the NGOS indicate greater NGO.

Water-like Group Orientation Scale (WGOS).

WGO was measured with the 12-item WGOS validated in Study 1. The WGOS was adapted to have Democrats (Appendix R) or Republicans (Appendix S) as the focal in-group. Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale (*1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree*). Higher scores on the WGOS indicate greater WGO.

Multicomponent in-group identification.

In-group identification was measured using a 14-item measure of in-group identification adapted to have Democrats or Republicans as the focal in-group (Appendix T). The multicomponent in-group identification measure validated by Leach and colleagues (2008) is made up of five components (i.e., solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, individual self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity) with two higher order factors. Solidarity (e.g., I feel a bond with Democrats/Republicans), satisfaction (e.g., I think that Democrats/Republicans have a lot to be proud of), and centrality (e.g., I often think about the fact that I am a Democrat/Republican) fall under the higher order factor of group-level self-investment. Individual self-stereotyping (e.g., I am similar to the average Democrat/Republican) and in-group homogeneity (e.g., Democrats/Republicans have a lot in common with each other) fall under the higher order factor of group-level self-definition.

The multicomponent measure of in-group identification has established concurrent validity through correlations with the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Group Attachment, Collective Self-Esteem, and Self-categorization scale (Leach et al., 2008, Study 3 & 4). Leach and colleagues (2008, Study 3 & 4) established positive relations between each component of the

multicomponent in-group identification scale with each of the related measures subscales. For the correlation matrices see Leach and colleagues (2008, Study 3 & 4). The in-group identification components solidarity ($\alpha = .89$), satisfaction ($\alpha = .88$), centrality ($\alpha = .86$), individual self-stereotyping ($\alpha = .91$), and in-group homogeneity ($\alpha = .88$) have demonstrated good internal consistency (Leach et al., 2008, Study 1).

Participants rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale (*1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree*). Higher scores on the measure indicate greater identification with the focal in-group. All in-group identification components had acceptable internal consistency in Study 2. Solidarity ($\alpha = .926$), satisfaction ($\alpha = .937$), centrality ($\alpha = .921$), individual self-stereotyping ($\alpha = .899$), and in-group homogeneity ($\alpha = .811$).

Procedure

Those who accepted the Human Intelligence Task (HIT) on MTURK proceeded to the online survey via a hyperlink where they were presented with the consent form (Appendix L) that provided them with information about the purpose of the study. The entire study took approximately 15 minutes for participants to complete. Participation was restricted to those who are United States' citizens over the age of 18. After providing consent, participants completed the NGOS with Democrats (Appendix N and Appendix O) or Republicans (Appendix P and Appendix Q) as the focal in-group depending on their political affiliation. Participants then completed the WGOS with Democrats (Appendix R) or Republicans (Appendix S) as the focal in-group depending on their political affiliation. Next, participants completed a multicomponent measure of in-group identification (Appendix T) proposed by Leach and colleagues (2008). This included measures of centrality, satisfaction, solidarity, individual self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity. Participants were then asked to provide demographic information

(Appendix G) before reaching the debriefing page (Appendix M). After debriefing, participants created a unique character code and entered that code both in the survey as well as in the HIT on MTURK. Participants who completed the entire study were compensated \$0.75.

CHAPTER 7

STUDY 2 RESULTS

Assumption Testing

The NGO and WGO items were screened for outliers, multivariate normality, and multicollinearity. No outliers were present, there were no substantial departures from multivariate normality, and no multicollinearity was present. With no substantial departures from the assumptions, these data were deemed suitable for confirmatory factor analysis. The final sample size was reached ($N = 204$).

Item intercorrelations for the GNGO, VNGO, and WGO items can be seen in Table 15, Table 16, and Table 17, respectively.

Model Specification of NGO Models

The two factor NGO model was specified to include a GNGO factor that is correlated with a VNGO factor. All GNGO items (Appendix N and Appendix P) were specified to load onto the GNGO factor, and all VNGO items (Appendix O and Appendix Q) were specified to load onto the VNGO factor. The variance of the GNGO factor and the VNGO factor were set to one. All factor loadings were freely estimated and were specified for no cross-loadings. A residual correlation was specified again for VNGO9 with VNGO10 because of similar wording (Appendix O and Appendix Q).

A competing single factor NGO model was estimated with all GNGO and VNGO items loading onto a single factor. The variance of the single NGO factor was set to one. All factor loadings were freely estimated. A correlated residual was also specified for VNGO9 with VNGO10 as it was in the two factor model.

Evaluation of NGO Models

Indices of model fit for the single factor NGO model indicated poor model fit, $\chi^2(229, N = 204) = 951.401, p < .001$; CFI = .697; TLI = .665; RMSEA = .124 (.116, .133); SRMR = .097. Factor loadings for the single factor NGO model can be seen in Table 18. Indices of model fit for the two factor NGO model also indicated poor model fit, $\chi^2(228, N = 204) = 922.938, p < .001$; CFI = .709; TLI = .677; RMSEA = .122 (.114, .131); SRMR = .097. The factor loadings in the two factor NGO model were moderately strong (Table 19). There was also a strong positive correlation between GNGO and VNGO, $r(202) = .900, p < .001$.

AIC values can be used to compare non-nested models such as these. The two factor NGO model reported a smaller AIC value (AIC = 14699.988) compared to the single factor NGO model (AIC = 14726.452) which indicated the two factor model fit the data better. A comparison of indices of model fit can be seen in Table 20.

Model Specification of WGO Models

A correlated two factor WGO model was specified again. Items WGO1-WGO3, WGO13 were specified to load onto WGOF1. Items WGO4, WGO5, WGO8-WGO11 were specified to load onto WGOF2. The full list of items can be seen in Appendix R and Appendix S. The variance of WGOF1 and WGOF2 were set to one. All factor loadings were freely estimated and were specified for no cross-loadings.

Item WGO7 and WGO11 were excluded from analysis because the reported item intercorrelations were low (i.e., only one or no correlations exceeding .3; Table 17). A residual correlation was specified again for WGO8 with WGO11.

The two factor WGO model was compared to a competing single factor model with 10 WGO items loading onto the single WGO factor. The variance of the single was set to one and all

items were freely estimated. A correlated residual was also specified WGO8 with WGO11 as it was in the two factor model.

Evaluation of WGO Models

Indices of model fit for the single factor WGO model indicated poor model fit, $\chi^2(34, N = 204) = 409.846, p < .001$; CFI = .573; TLI = .435; RMSEA = .233 (.213, .253); SRMR = .180.

Factor loadings for the single factor WGO model can be seen in Table 21. Indices of model fit for the two factor WGO model indicated good model fit, $\chi^2(33, N = 204) = 82.494, p < .001$; CFI = .944; TLI = .923; RMSEA = .086 (.063, .109); SRMR = .064. The factor loadings in the two factor WGO model for WGOF1 and WGOF2 were strong (Table 22). There was also a negligible positive correlation between WGOF1 and WGOF2, $r(202) = .116, p = .150$.

AIC values can be used to compared non-nested models such as these. The two factor WGO model reported a smaller AIC value (AIC = 5692.981) compared to the single factor WGO model (AIC = 6018.332) which indicated the two factor model fit the data better. A comparison of indices of model fit can be seen in Table 23.

Correlation Analyses

GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity were screened for outliers, univariate normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance. No substantial departures from the correlation assumptions were present. Means and standard deviations for GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity can be seen in Table 24. All scales also demonstrated good internal consistency (Table 25). A full correlation matrix for these variables can be viewed in Table 26.

Study 2 was exploratory in nature and did not have specific hypotheses concerning the

correlation analyses. GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 were all positively related to the in-group identification components, while WGOF2 was unrelated to all the in-group identification components. GNGO was positively related to solidarity, $r(202) = .663, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to satisfaction, $r(202) = .641, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to centrality, $r(202) = .673, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to self-stereotyping, $r(202) = .557, p < .01$. GNGO was positively related to in-group homogeneity, $r(202) = .533, p < .01$.

VNGO was positively related to solidarity, $r(202) = .449, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to satisfaction, $r(202) = .426, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to centrality, $r(202) = .406, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to self-stereotyping, $r(202) = .340, p < .01$. VNGO was positively related to in-group homogeneity, $r(202) = .339, p < .01$.

WGOF1 was positively related to solidarity, $r(202) = .763, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to satisfaction, $r(202) = .804, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to centrality, $r(202) = .578, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to self-stereotyping, $r(202) = .628, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to in-group homogeneity, $r(202) = .526, p < .01$.

WGOF2 was not related to solidarity, $r(202) = .045, p > .01$. WGOF2 was not related to satisfaction, $r(202) = .039, p > .01$. WGOF2 was not related to centrality, $r(202) = -.042, p > .01$. WGOF2 was not related to self-stereotyping, $r(202) = .076, p > .01$. WGOF2 was not related to in-group homogeneity, $r(202) = .010, p > .01$.

Attitudes Towards the U.S. and U.S. Values

Correlation analyses were carried out on the relationship between GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, and WGOF2 with four items that aim to assess participants' general attitude towards the U.S., identification as an American, importance of American identity, and attitude toward the founding values and ideals of the U.S.

GNGO had a negligible relation to general U.S. attitude, $r(204) = .203, p < .01$. GNGO had a negligible relation to American identification, $r(204) = .101, p = .149$. GNGO had a negligible relation to importance of American identity, $r(204) = .255, p < .01$. GNGO had a negligible relation to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(204) = .247, p < .01$.

VNGO had a negligible relation to general U.S. attitude, $r(204) = .034, p = .627$. VNGO had a negligible relation to American identification, $r(204) = -.045, p = .519$. VNGO had a negligible relation to importance of American identity, $r(204) = .110, p = .116$. VNGO had a negligible relation to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(204) = .151, p = .031$.

WGOF1 was positively related to general U.S. attitude, $r(204) = .430, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to American identification, $r(204) = .339, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to importance of American identity, $r(204) = .380, p < .01$. WGOF1 was positively related to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(204) = .429, p < .01$.

WGOF2 had a negligible relation to general U.S. attitude, $r(204) = .192, p < .01$. WGOF2 had a negligible relation to American identification, $r(204) = .245, p < .01$. WGOF2 had a negligible relation to importance of American identity, $r(204) = .168, p = .016$. WGOF2 had a negligible relation to identification with founding U.S. values and ideals, $r(204) = .070, p = .321$.

CHAPTER 8

STUDY 2 DISCUSSION

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The results of the confirmatory factor analysis provided further evidence that NGO is a multidimensional construct opposed to a unidimensional construct. The two factor model did fit the data better than a single factor model, however indices of model fit were poor. There was a substantial decline in model fit from Study 1 to Study 2 which may have been due to the application of the political intergroup context in Study 2. Despite poor model fit, factor loadings for the indicators were moderately strong. There was also a very strong positive correlation between GNGO and VNGO which was expected.

The confirmatory factor analysis of WGO indicated once again that a two factor model fit the data much better than a single factor model. The two factor WGO model produced good indices of model fit and had strong factor loadings. The deletion of WGO7 and WGO12 have contributed to this result because these items had low item intercorrelations in Study 2 and fairly low item intercorrelations in Study 1. Given the negative relation between WGOF1 and WGOF2 in Study 1, it was unexpected to find a negligible positive relation between WGOF1 and WGOF2 in Study 2. This unexpected finding might also be due to the change from a national intergroup context to a political intergroup context.

Correlation Analyses

GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 were all positively related to the in-group identification components, while WGOF2 was unrelated to all the in-group identification components. It is reasonable that WGOF2 would be unrelated to all of the in-group identification components because WGOF2 is focused on out-group respect and deference.

Solidarity, which captures a sense of belonging and attachment to the in-group, was most strongly related to WGOF1 and GNGO while being moderately related to VNGO. This is expected as WGOF1 captures in-group confidence and pride that most likely extend to the group's members. GNGO promotes approaching group based activity that may be used for self-enhancement which can explain the positive relation with solidarity. VNGO's smaller positive correlation might be explained by the fearful attachment style that is used to prevent association with failures of the in-group.

Satisfaction, which captures a positive evaluation of the in-group, was most strongly related to WGOF1 and GNGO while being moderately related to VNGO. This is expected as in-group confidence and pride of WGOF1 should be related to satisfaction. GNGO would also be expected to be positively related to satisfaction based on theory. Grandiose narcissists have high explicit self-esteem, are thought to repress negative representations, and distort evidence that confirms negative evaluations. VNGO should have a smaller positive relation to satisfaction as vulnerable narcissists have low explicit self-esteem and have trouble maintaining the inflated image of the self.

Centrality, which refers to the salience and importance of the in-group, was most strongly related to GNGO and WGOF1 while being moderately related to VNGO. This is expected as the hypothesized etiology of GNGO lies in social identity monopolization which creates an increased salience of a particular self-category for opportunistic use. The positive relation with VNGO is also expected because the hypothesized etiology is social identity monopolization for threat avoidance.

Individual self-stereotyping, which captures the extent to which an individual perceives themselves as similar to members of the in-group, was moderately related to WGOF1 and

GNGO while having a small relation with VNGO. This is expected as WGOF1 captures a prideful component and GNGO is thought to derive self-enhancement from the perceived similarity of the in-group's exceptional members and themselves. The low correlation between self-stereotyping and VNGO is expected because the manifestation of VNGO involves avoidance of narcissistic injury. Being able to be an in-group member while differentiating themselves from members may accomplish this.

In-group homogeneity, which is the degree to which the individual perceives their entire group as being similar, was moderately related to GNGO and WGOF1 while having a small relation to VNGO. This is expected as the grandiose orientation is suspected to derive grandiosity from the exceptional characteristics of the exclusive in-group. The vulnerable orientation on the other hand is expected to reduce associations with subgroups of the in-group who are responsible for the negative aspects of the group.

In summary, the correlation results provided some support for the GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 constructs. The out-group focus of WGOF2 was also supported by its lack of positive relation to any of the in-group identification components.

CHAPTER 9

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The major aims of this research were: to incorporate individual narcissism research and theory into a group level construct, to incorporate research on Daoism and water-like personality style into a group level secure in-group positivity construct, and to incorporate social identity and self-categorization theory into both group level constructs.

The primary goal of Study 1 was to provide support for the factor structure of the two novel group orientation constructs, NGO and WGO. Another goal of Study 1 was to provide evidence of convergent validity by examining correlations among NGO, WGO, SDO, BP, and CP. This was the first research to provide evidence of a two factor group-level narcissism construct. Namely, this research supports previous suggestions that a group-level narcissism construct should contain a grandiose and vulnerable factor. This research also was the first to explore a measure of secure in-group positivity based on the Daoist water-like personality. Unexpectedly, WGO was found to possess two factors which captured in-group confidence and pride, while the other factor captured out-group respect and deference. Study 1 was successful in providing initial evidence of convergent validity for these constructs.

The primary goal of Study 2 was to explore the relationships among the GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, and a multicomponent measure of in-group identification. The factor structure of the NGO and WGO constructs were supported once more in Study 2. There was a depreciation in model fit for the NGO model. This might have been due to the shift in the intergroup context from a national in-group to a political in-group. In particular, the focal out-group in the national intergroup context was “other nation”, while the political context had a specific focal out-group (i.e., Democrats or Republicans). On the other hand, the WGO model

saw improvements in model fit. This was primarily from the removal of indicators that had low item intercorrelations.

Study 2 found that GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 were all positively related to solidarity, satisfaction, centrality, self-stereotyping, and in-group homogeneity. These positive correlations provided some initial insights into how GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 are related to the individual's perception of themselves in relation to their in-group. These correlations analyses also reinforce speculations on the etiology of GNGO and VNGO. Specifically, GNGO was more strongly related to the components of in-group identification compared to VNGO. This supports the idea that GNGO represents grandiose idealizations of the in-group that seeks to utilize the in-group for opportunistic use, while VNGO struggles to maintain the idealizations of the in-group and instead seeks to avoid threat and narcissistic injury. WGOF1 was also strongly related to the in-group identification components because it represents in-group confidence and pride. WGOF2, which has a focus on out-group respect and deference, was unrelated to all measures of in-group identification.

Limitations and Future Directions

While the present studies did provide support for the two dimensional factor structure of NGO and WGO, the use of a convenience sample was limitation. Males, whites, and democrats were overrepresented in both samples.

There is also still a question of how the specific intergroup context and the focal in-group may impact measurement of the constructs. For this reason, it would be advisable to examine these constructs at different levels of intergroup abstraction and with specific out-groups. The term level of abstraction here is used how it is in social identity and self-categorization theory which means the greater the level of abstraction, the more inclusive the group.

Potential moderators such as entitativity and prestige should also be explored to understand how they impact levels of NGO and WGO. Aspects of entitativity such as experience of similar outcomes, similarity, and proximity may even be individually explored as moderators. These characteristics of a highly entitative group taken together create clear boundaries for what constitutes an in-group member and delineates in-group from out-group. The group narcissist may be drawn to these groups because the highly entitative group is one that has rigid boundaries for inclusion and exclusion. This may provide the individual with a sense of uniqueness and superiority provided by the special process, goal, innate characteristics, or proximity/location of the group. Such is the case with militant vegan groups who claim a unique and exceptional diet/morality which provides a rigid boundary for inclusion and exclusion. These groups are known for their grandiose and idealized vision of their in-group. In terms of innate characteristics, the white identitarian movement makes claims of superiority based upon exclusive and immutable characteristics. These are but a few examples of a large array of groups (e.g., religious fundamentalists, radical feminists, Navy Seals, New Yorkers, etc.) that make claims of superiority based upon a single or multiple entitative characteristic. Taken together, a highly entitative group that consumes an individual's social identity is at high risk for NGO.

Prestige is another potential moderator that would be particularly interesting to explore as support for the etiology of GNGO. We should expect that GNGO would be more prevalent among high prestige groups in order to facilitate opportunistic self-categorization and thereby self-enhancement. Some examples of how prestige could be examined would be university affiliation by academic rank, sports teams by current season ranking, or social groups such as fraternities or sororities by peer rankings.

Research on threat detection and NGO is another area that would be useful to explore the

etiology of VNGO. VNGO is expected to facilitate threat detection and avoidance via the increased salience of a particular self-category. Microaggression research may serve as useful area for exploring threat detection as microaggressions tend to be otherwise innocuous social stimuli that are perceived as threats and derogations towards the in-group. Responses to perceived microaggressions may further delineate these constructs. Where the NGO constructs might facilitate aggressive or withdrawn responses, the out-group respect and deference that is characteristic of WGOF2 may provide understanding responses.

In summary, the results of confirmatory factor analyses in Study 1 and Study 2 supported a two-factor NGO model and a two-factor WGO model. Study 1 also gathered evidence of convergent validity for both the NGO and WGO constructs. Both NGO factors exhibited positive correlations with social dominance orientation and blind patriotism, and negligible correlations with constructive patriotism. WGOF1 exhibited positive correlations with social dominance orientation and blind patriotism, and a negligible correlation with constructive patriotism. WGOF2 exhibited negative correlations with social dominance orientation and blind patriotism, and a positive correlation with constructive patriotism. In Study 2 GNGO, VNGO, and WGOF1 were positively related to all five in-group identification components, while WGOF2 was unrelated to all five in-group identification components.

Inquiry into a group level narcissism construct began with Zavala and colleagues' (2009) research and has continued to grow recently. This work has contributed to the social psychological literature by improving the measurement of secure and defensive in-group positivity. Namely, this research developed and validated a measure of NGO that is novel by its inclusion of a grandiose and vulnerable dimension. The inclusion of a grandiose and vulnerable dimension has also brought unity to clinical and social research on narcissism. In the case of

WGO, this work attempted to develop the first measure of secure in-group positivity. Most importantly, this work has used the social identity approach to develop an understanding of the etiology of NGO. This research has only begun to explore the nature of NGO and WGO, and there are many potential research questions that remain unanswered.

Table 1

Study 1 Participant Demographics (N = 186)

| Characteristic | Response | Frequency/Mean | Percent / (Standard Deviation) |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Sex | Female | 81 | 43.5% |
| | Male | 105 | 56.5% |
| Age | | 40.54 | (12.51) |
| Ethnicity | Asian | 10 | 5.4% |
| | Black | 17 | 9.1% |
| | Hispanic | 7 | 3.8% |
| | White | 144 | 77.4% |
| | Multiracial | 8 | 4.3% |
| Political Party | Democrat | 90 | 48.4% |
| | Republican | 48 | 25.8% |
| | Independent | 45 | 24.2% |
| | Other Party | 3 | 1.6% |
| Military Experience | Active Duty | 20 | 10.8% |
| | Training | 1 | .5% |
| | No Experience | 165 | 88.7% |
| Education | Less than high school | 1 | .5% |
| | High school degree | 16 | 8.6% |
| | Some college | 43 | 23.1% |
| | Associates Degree | 33 | 17.7% |
| | Bachelor Degree | 74 | 39.8% |
| | Graduate or Professional degree | 19 | 10.2% |
| Income | < \$25,00 | 34 | 18.3% |
| | \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 21 | 11.3% |
| | \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 38 | 20.4% |
| | \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 43 | 23.1% |
| | \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 31 | 16.7% |
| | \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 15 | 8.1% |
| | \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 3 | 1.6% |
| | \$200,000 > | 1 | .5% |
| Religion | Atheist Agnostic | 84 | 45.2% |
| | Buddhist | 2 | 1.1% |
| | Christian | 95 | 51.1% |
| | Jewish | 2 | 1.1% |
| | Muslim | 1 | .5% |
| | Other | 2 | 1.1% |
| Residence | Rural | 44 | 23.7% |
| | Urban | 61 | 23.8% |
| | Suburban | 81 | 43.5% |

Table 2

Study 1 Correlations Among GNGO Items (N = 186)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----|
| 1. GNGO1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. GNGO2 | .512** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. GNGO3 | .656** | .491** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. GNGO4 | .556** | .354** | .596** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. GNGO5 | .700** | .493** | .622** | .504** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 6. GNGO6 | .715** | .605** | .654** | .498** | .760** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 7. GNGO7 | .679** | .477** | .643** | .549** | .663** | .660** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 8. GNGO8 | .682** | .431** | .621** | .556** | .660** | .655** | .636** | 1 | | | | | |
| 9. GNGO9 | .695** | .468** | .554** | .571** | .698** | .650** | .673** | .641** | 1 | | | | |
| 10. GNGO10 | .642** | .540** | .455** | .506** | .483** | .578** | .562** | .490** | .613** | 1 | | | |
| 11. GNGO11 | .518** | .407** | .438** | .427** | .445** | .514** | .500** | .459** | .519** | .537** | 1 | | |
| 12. GNGO12 | .532** | .407** | .490** | .383** | .544** | .541** | .519** | .396** | .467** | .383** | .300** | 1 | |
| 13. GNGO13 | .720** | .546** | .627** | .502** | .694** | .740** | .649** | .609** | .597** | .530** | .395** | .541** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation.

Table 3

Study 1 Correlations Among VNGO Items (N = 186)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----|
| 1. VNGO1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. VNGO2 | .652** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. VNGO3 | .391** | .342** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 4. VNGO4 | .433** | .330** | .641** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 5. VNGO5 | .641** | .524** | .381** | .439** | 1 | | | | | |
| 6. VNGO6 | .631** | .439** | .343** | .294** | .506** | 1 | | | | |
| 7. VNGO7 | .557** | .341** | .226** | .226** | .422** | .587** | 1 | | | |
| 8. VNGO8 | .564** | .391** | .228** | .254** | .383** | .602** | .665** | 1 | | |
| 9. VNGO9 | .495** | .360** | .165* | .253** | .331** | .389** | .461** | .471** | 1 | |
| 10. VNGO10 | .353** | .235** | .074 | .236** | .280** | .322** | .310** | .377** | .719** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation.

Table 4

Study 1 Correlations Among WGO Items (N = 186)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|-----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----|
| 1. WGO1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. WGO2 | .552** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. WGO3 | .474** | .569** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. WGO4 | .018 | .059 | -.116 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. WGO5 | -.232** | -.170* | -.333** | .404** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 6. WGO6 | .042 | .074 | -.023 | .020 | .123 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 7. WGO7 | -.082 | .066 | -.137 | .464** | .441** | .066 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 8. WGO8 | .148* | .153* | -.091 | .244** | .350** | .297** | .346** | 1 | | | | | |
| 9. WGO9 | -.126 | -.105 | -.286** | .440** | .582** | .194** | .512** | .414** | 1 | | | | |
| 10. WGO10 | -.026 | -.002 | -.138 | .527** | .556** | .261** | .511** | .393** | .584** | 1 | | | |
| 11. WGO11 | -.015 | .034 | -.199** | .321** | .423** | .319** | .381** | .532** | .404** | .402** | 1 | | |
| 12. WGO12 | .292** | .261** | .270** | -.174* | -.367** | -.088 | -.264** | -.105 | -.295** | -.336** | -.244** | 1 | |
| 13. WGO13 | .428** | .563** | .674** | -.156* | -.424** | -.146* | -.189** | -.118 | -.338** | -.276** | -.311** | .299** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. WGO = Water-like group orientation.

Table 5

*Study 1 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor
NGO Model*

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|-------------|------------------------|
| NGO | |
| GNGO1 | 0.850 |
| GNGO2 | 0.615 |
| GNGO3 | 0.773 |
| GNGO4 | 0.689 |
| GNGO5 | 0.789 |
| GNGO6 | 0.829 |
| GNGO7 | 0.813 |
| GNGO8 | 0.777 |
| GNGO9 | 0.803 |
| GNGO10 | 0.689 |
| GNGO11 | 0.618 |
| GNGO12 | 0.593 |
| GNGO13 | 0.793 |
| VNGO1 | 0.827 |
| VNGO2 | 0.715 |
| VNGO3 | 0.447 |
| VNGO4 | 0.505 |
| VNGO5 | 0.634 |
| VNGO6 | 0.623 |
| VNGO7 | 0.552 |
| VNGO8 | 0.595 |
| VNGO9 | 0.552 |
| VNGO10 | 0.418 |

Note. NGO = Narcissistic group orientation. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation. VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation.

Table 6

*Study 1 Standardized Factor Loadings of Two Factor
NGO Model*

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| GNGO | |
| GNGO1 | 0.860 |
| GNGO2 | 0.624 |
| GNGO3 | 0.770 |
| GNGO4 | 0.675 |
| GNGO5 | 0.815 |
| GNGO6 | 0.846 |
| GNGO7 | 0.813 |
| GNGO8 | 0.779 |
| GNGO9 | 0.805 |
| GNGO10 | 0.693 |
| GNGO11 | 0.607 |
| GNGO12 | 0.607 |
| GNGO13 | 0.808 |
| VNGO | |
| VNGO1 | 0.889 |
| VNGO2 | 0.711 |
| VNGO3 | 0.472 |
| VNGO4 | 0.511 |
| VNGO5 | 0.696 |
| VNGO6 | 0.710 |
| VNGO7 | 0.640 |
| VNGO8 | 0.662 |
| VNGO9 | 0.569 |
| VNGO10 | 0.424 |

Note. NGO = Narcissistic group orientation. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation. VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation.

Table 7

Study 1 Fit Indices for Competing NGO Models (N = 186)

| Model | χ^2 | <i>df</i> | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR | AIC |
|---------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Single Factor | 671.986* | 229 | 0.845 | 0.828 | .102 (.093, .111) | 0.069 | 12652.707 |
| Two Factor | 588.190* | 228 | 0.874 | 0.860 | .092 (.083, .101) | 0.067 | 12570.911 |

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit statistic; *df* = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Square Root Mean Residual. * Indicates χ^2 values are statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Table 8

Study 1 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor WGO Model

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| WGO | |
| WGO1 | -0.240 |
| WGO2 | -0.199 |
| WGO3 | -0.415 |
| WGO4 | 0.563 |
| WGO5 | 0.764 |
| WGO7 | 0.626 |
| WGO8 | 0.451 |
| WGO9 | 0.762 |
| WGO10 | 0.732 |
| WGO11 | 0.544 |
| WGO12 | -0.454 |
| WGO13 | -0.511 |

Note. WGO = Water-like group orientation.

Table 9

*Study 1 Standardized Factor Loadings of Two Factor
WGO Model*

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| WGOF1 | |
| WGO1 | 0.600 |
| WGO2 | 0.708 |
| WGO3 | 0.811 |
| WGO12 | 0.386 |
| WGO13 | 0.812 |
| WGOF2 | |
| WGO4 | 0.607 |
| WGO5 | 0.731 |
| WGO7 | 0.660 |
| WGO8 | 0.492 |
| WGO9 | 0.774 |
| WGO10 | 0.770 |
| WGO11 | 0.545 |

Note. WGO = Water-like group orientation. WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1. WGOF1 is made up of three Perseverance items (i.e., WGO1, WGO2, WGO3) and two Wuwei items (i.e., WGO12, WGO13). WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2. WGOF2 is made up of two Modesty items (i.e., WGO4, WGO5), a single Altruism item (i.e., WGO 7), two Flexibility items (i.e., WGO8, WGO9), and two Honesty items (i.e., WGO10, WGO11).

Table 10

Study 1 Fit Indices for Competing WGO Models (N = 186)

| Model | χ^2 | <i>df</i> | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR | AIC |
|---------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Single Factor | 342.311* | 53 | 0.648 | 0.562 | .171 (.154, .189) | 0.138 | 6057.052 |
| Two Factor | 127.521* | 52 | 0.908 | 0.884 | .088 (.069, .108) | 0.093 | 5844.262 |

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit statistic; *df* = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Square Root Mean Residual. * Indicates χ^2 values are statistically significant ($p < .001$). WGO = Water-like group orientation. In the two factor model, Factor 1 was composed of three Perseverance items (i.e., WGO1, WGO2, WGO3) and two Wuwei items (i.e., WGO12, WGO13). Factor 2 was made up of two Modesty items (i.e., WGO4, WGO5), a single Altruism item (i.e., WGO 7), two Flexibility items (i.e., WGO8, WGO9), and two Honesty items (i.e., WGO10, WGO11).

Table 11

Study 1 Descriptive Statistics of GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, SDO, BP, CP (N = 186).

| Variable | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. GNGO | 3.19 | 1.12 |
| 2. VNGO | 3.13 | 0.92 |
| 3. WGOF1 | 4.51 | 0.84 |
| 4. WGOF2 | 5.01 | 0.73 |
| 5. SDO | 2.24 | 1.17 |
| 6. BP | 2.69 | 1.04 |
| 7. CP | 5.02 | 0.73 |

Note. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation, VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation, WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1, WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2, SDO = Social dominance orientation, BP = Blind patriotism, CP = Constructive patriotism.

Table 12

Internal Consistency of Study 1 Scales

| Construct | Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|
| GNGO | 13 | .943 |
| VNGO | 10 | .872 |
| WGOF1 | 5 | .772 |
| WGOF2 | 7 | .838 |
| SDO | 16 | .968 |
| BP | 12 | .932 |
| CP | 6 | .856 |

Note. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation, VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation, WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1, WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2, SDO = Social dominance orientation, BP = Blind patriotism, CP = Constructive patriotism.

Table 13

Study 1 Correlations Among GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, SDO, BP, CP (N = 186).

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|
| 1. GNGO | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2. VNGO | .801** | 1 | | | | | |
| 3. WGOF1 | .638** | .451** | 1 | | | | |
| 4. WGOF2 | -.552** | -.564** | -.315** | 1 | | | |
| 5. SDO | .543** | .554** | .308** | -.698** | 1 | | |
| 6. BP | .864** | .771** | .520** | -.580** | .515** | 1 | |
| 7. CP | -.150* | -.131 | .069 | .448** | -.288** | -.303** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation, VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation, WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1, WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2, SDO = Social dominance orientation, BP = Blind patriotism, CP = Constructive patriotism. WGOF1 is made up of three Perseverance items (i.e., WGO1, WGO2, WGO3) and two Wuwei items (i.e., WGO12, WGO13). WGOF2 is made up of two Modesty items (i.e., WGO4, WGO5), a single Altruism item (i.e., WGO7), two Flexibility items (i.e., WGO8, WGO9), and two Honesty items (i.e., WGO10, WGO11).

Table 14

Study 2 Participant Demographics (N = 204)

| Characteristic | Response | Frequency/Mean | Percent / (Standard Deviation) |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Sex | Female | 83 | 40.7% |
| | Male | 120 | 58.8% |
| | Other | 1 | .5% |
| Age | | 39 | (12.12) |
| Ethnicity | Asian | 12 | 5.9% |
| | Black | 25 | 12.3% |
| | Hispanic | 9 | 4.4% |
| | Native American | 2 | 1.0% |
| | White | 139 | 68.1% |
| | Multiracial | 17 | 8.3% |
| Political Party | Democrat | 111 | 54.4% |
| | Republican | 50 | 24.5% |
| | Independent | 40 | 19.6% |
| | Other Party | 3 | 1.5% |
| Political Leaning | Democrat or Lean left | 137 | 67.2% |
| | Republican or Lean right | 67 | 32.8% |
| Military Experience | Active Duty Service | 19 | 9.3% |
| | No experience | 185 | 90.7% |
| Education | Less than high school | 1 | .5% |
| | High school degree | 23 | 11.3% |
| | Some college | 43 | 21.1% |
| | Associates Degree | 24 | 11.8% |
| | Bachelor Degree | 95 | 46.6% |
| | Graduate or Professional degree | 18 | 8.8% |
| Income | < \$25,00 | 33 | 16.2% |
| | \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 25 | 12.3% |
| | \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 40 | 19.6% |
| | \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 50 | 24.5% |
| | \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 33 | 16.2% |
| | \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 15 | 7.4% |
| | \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 6 | 2.9% |
| | \$200,000 > | 2 | 1.0% |
| Religion | Atheist Agnostic | 91 | 44.6% |
| | Buddhist | 3 | 1.5% |
| | Christian | 103 | 50.5% |
| | Hindu | 1 | .5% |
| | Jewish | 2 | 1.0% |
| | Muslim | 1 | .5% |
| | Other | 3 | 1.5% |
| Residence | Rural | 47 | 23.0% |
| | Urban | 61 | 29.9% |
| | Suburban | 96 | 47.1% |

Table 15

Study 2 Correlations Among GNGO Items (N = 204)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----|
| 1. GNGO1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. GNGO2 | .322** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. GNGO3 | .408** | .514** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. GNGO4 | .522** | .293** | .522** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. GNGO5 | .400** | .380** | .419** | .304** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 6. GNGO6 | .329** | .500** | .557** | .285** | .498** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 7. GNGO7 | .613** | .314** | .464** | .410** | .427** | .413** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 8. GNGO8 | .390** | .462** | .474** | .473** | .427** | .407** | .390** | 1 | | | | | |
| 9. GNGO9 | .465** | .248** | .220** | .317** | .489** | .348** | .428** | .290** | 1 | | | | |
| 10. GNGO10 | .272** | .473** | .239** | .100 | .251** | .373** | .248** | .246** | .304** | 1 | | | |
| 11. GNGO11 | .442** | .268** | .284** | .298** | .335** | .357** | .451** | .156* | .456** | .337** | 1 | | |
| 12. GNGO12 | .517** | .436** | .490** | .360** | .418** | .551** | .426** | .475** | .276** | .356** | .221** | 1 | |
| 13. GNGO13 | .423** | .561** | .528** | .418** | .418** | .572** | .400** | .632** | .285** | .316** | .172* | .532** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation.

Table 16

Study 2 Correlations Among VNGO Items (N = 204)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----|
| 1. VNGO1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. VNGO2 | .539** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. VNGO3 | .441** | .430** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 4. VNGO4 | .456** | .309** | .619** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 5. VNGO5 | .371** | .310** | .353** | .466** | 1 | | | | | |
| 6. VNGO6 | .565** | .495** | .330** | .357** | .254** | 1 | | | | |
| 7. VNGO7 | .423** | .411** | .223** | .060 | .133 | .590** | 1 | | | |
| 8. VNGO8 | .378** | .323** | .220** | .051 | .025 | .477** | .671** | 1 | | |
| 9. VNGO9 | .308** | .337** | .339** | .372** | .216** | .408** | .368** | .453** | 1 | |
| 10. VNGO10 | .262** | .226** | .256** | .264** | .150* | .336** | .232** | .345** | .679** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation.

Table 17

Study 2 Correlations Among WGO Items (N = 204)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------|----|
| 1. WGO1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. WGO2 | .498** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. WGO3 | .568** | .584** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. WGO4 | .034 | .087 | -.019 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 5. WGO5 | .083 | .135 | .050 | .571** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 6. WGO7 | .221** | .136 | .263** | -.021 | .053 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 7. WGO8 | .088 | .142* | .067 | .501** | .440** | .093 | 1 | | | | | |
| 8. WGO9 | .054 | .170* | .022 | .613** | .439** | .043 | .685** | 1 | | | | |
| 9. WGO10 | .156* | .302** | .140* | .590** | .512** | .137 | .641** | .664** | 1 | | | |
| 10. WGO11 | .159* | .211** | .140* | .168* | .199** | .305** | .389** | .279** | .437** | 1 | | |
| 11. WGO12 | .056 | .092 | .009 | .056 | .007 | -.095 | -.094 | .012 | -.112 | -.131 | 1 | |
| 12. WGO13 | .611** | .558** | .683** | -.054 | -.028 | .183** | .035 | -.055 | .088 | .071 | .037 | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. WGO = Water-like group orientation.

Table 18

*Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor
NGO Model*

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| NGO | |
| GNGO1 | 0.707 |
| GNGO2 | 0.600 |
| GNGO3 | 0.712 |
| GNGO4 | 0.617 |
| GNGO5 | 0.588 |
| GNGO6 | 0.643 |
| GNGO7 | 0.703 |
| GNGO8 | 0.633 |
| GNGO9 | 0.525 |
| GNGO10 | 0.406 |
| GNGO11 | 0.491 |
| GNGO12 | 0.668 |
| GNGO13 | 0.680 |
| VNGO1 | 0.788 |
| VNGO2 | 0.627 |
| VNGO3 | 0.604 |
| VNGO4 | 0.604 |
| VNGO5 | 0.459 |
| VNGO6 | 0.629 |
| VNGO7 | 0.456 |
| VNGO8 | 0.428 |
| VNGO9 | 0.502 |
| VNGO10 | 0.463 |

Note. NGO = Narcissistic group orientation. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation. VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation.

Table 19

*Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Two Factor
NGO Model*

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| GNGO | |
| GNGO1 | 0.700 |
| GNGO2 | 0.619 |
| GNGO3 | 0.714 |
| GNGO4 | 0.612 |
| GNGO5 | 0.609 |
| GNGO6 | 0.670 |
| GNGO7 | 0.692 |
| GNGO8 | 0.653 |
| GNGO9 | 0.527 |
| GNGO10 | 0.427 |
| GNGO11 | 0.487 |
| GNGO12 | 0.685 |
| GNGO13 | 0.705 |
| VNGO | |
| VNGO1 | 0.803 |
| VNGO2 | 0.662 |
| VNGO3 | 0.616 |
| VNGO4 | 0.600 |
| VNGO5 | 0.465 |
| VNGO6 | 0.688 |
| VNGO7 | 0.523 |
| VNGO8 | 0.480 |
| VNGO9 | 0.526 |
| VNGO10 | 0.446 |

Note. NGO = Narcissistic group orientation. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation. VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation.

Table 20

Study 2 Fit Indices for Competing NGO Models (N = 204)

| Model | χ^2 | <i>df</i> | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR | AIC |
|---------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Single Factor | 951.401* | 229 | 0.697 | 0.665 | .124 (.116, .133) | 0.097 | 14726.452 |
| Two Factor | 922.938* | 228 | 0.709 | 0.677 | .122 (.114, .131) | 0.097 | 14699.988 |

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit statistic; *df* = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Square Root Mean Residual. * Indicates χ^2 values are statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Table 21

Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Single Factor WGO Model

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| WGO | |
| WGO1 | 0.154 |
| WGO2 | 0.270 |
| WGO3 | 0.124 |
| WGO4 | 0.713 |
| WGO5 | 0.607 |
| WGO8 | 0.770 |
| WGO9 | 0.811 |
| WGO10 | 0.840 |
| WGO11 | 0.404 |
| WGO13 | 0.059 |

Note. WGO = Water-like group orientation.

Table 22

*Study 2 Standardized Factor Loadings of Two Factor
WGO Model*

| Scale Items | Standardized Estimates |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| WGOF1 | |
| WGO1 | 0.717 |
| WGO2 | 0.696 |
| WGO3 | 0.819 |
| WGO13 | 0.829 |
| WGOF2 | |
| WGO4 | 0.724 |
| WGO5 | 0.608 |
| WGO8 | 0.775 |
| WGO9 | 0.822 |
| WGO10 | 0.826 |
| WGO11 | 0.389 |

Note. WGO = Water-like group orientation. WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1. WGOF1 is made up of three Perseverance items (i.e., WGO1, WGO2, WGO3) and one Wuwei item (i.e., WGO13). WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2. WGOF2 is made up of two Modesty items (i.e., WGO4, WGO5), two Flexibility items (i.e., WGO8, WGO9), and two Honesty items (i.e., WGO10, WGO11).

Table 23

Study 2 Fit Indices for Competing WGO Models (N = 204)

| Model | χ^2 | <i>df</i> | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR | AIC |
|---------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Single Factor | 409.846* | 34 | 0.573 | 0.435 | .233 (.213, .253) | 0.180 | 6018.332 |
| Two Factor | 82.494* | 33 | 0.944 | 0.923 | .086 (.063, .109) | 0.064 | 5692.981 |

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit statistic; *df* = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Square Root Mean Residual. * Indicates χ^2 values are statistically significant ($p < .001$). WGO = Water-like group orientation. In the two factor model, Factor 1 was composed of three Perseverance items (i.e., WGO1, WGO2, WGO3) and one Wuwei item (i.e., WGO13). Factor 2 was made up of two Modesty items (i.e., WGO4, WGO5), two Flexibility items (i.e., WGO8, WGO9), and two Honesty items (i.e., WGO10, WGO11).

Table 24

Study 2 Descriptive Statistics of GNGO, VNGO, WGOF1, WGOF2, Solidarity, Satisfaction, Centrality, Self-Stereotyping, and Homogeneity (N = 204)

| Variable | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|
| 1. GNGO | 3.43 | 0.92 |
| 2. VNGO | 3.85 | 0.87 |
| 3. WGOF1 | 4.76 | 0.89 |
| 4. WGOF2 | 4.41 | 0.99 |
| 5. Solidarity | 4.29 | 1.17 |
| 6. Satisfaction | 4.51 | 1.07 |
| 7. Centrality | 3.64 | 1.45 |
| 8. Self-Stereotyping | 4.10 | 1.13 |
| 9. Homogeneity | 4.16 | 1.01 |

Note. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation, VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation, WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1, WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2.

Table 25

Internal Consistency of Study 2 Scales

| Construct | Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| GNGO | 13 | .891 |
| VNGO | 10 | .841 |
| WGOF1 | 4 | .846 |
| WGOF2 | 7 | .820 |
| Solidarity | 3 | .926 |
| Satisfaction | 4 | .937 |
| Centrality | 3 | .921 |
| Self-Stereotyping | 2 | .899 |
| Homogeneity | 2 | .811 |

Note. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation, VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation, WGOF1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1, WGOF2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2.

Table 26

Study 2 Correlations Among GNGO, VNGO, WGO1, WGO2, Solidarity, Satisfaction, Centrality, Self-Stereotyping, and Homogeneity (N = 204)

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|----------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| 1. GNGO | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2. VNGO | .770** | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 3. WGO1 | .582** | .412** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 4. WGO2 | -.404** | -.495** | .118 | 1 | | | | | |
| 5. Solidarity | .663** | .449** | .763** | .045 | 1 | | | | |
| 6. Satisfaction | .641** | .426** | .804** | .039 | .876** | 1 | | | |
| 7. Centrality | .673** | .406** | .578** | -.042 | .809** | .741** | 1 | | |
| 8. Self-Stereotyping | .557** | .340** | .628** | .076 | .738** | .770** | .697** | 1 | |
| 9. Homogeneity | .533** | .339** | .526** | .010 | .578** | .638** | .589** | .673** | 1 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. GNGO = Grandiose narcissistic group orientation, VNGO = Vulnerable narcissistic group orientation, WGO1 = Water-like group orientation Factor 1, WGO2 = Water-like group orientation Factor 2. WGO1 is made up of three Perseverance items (i.e., WGO1, WGO2, WGO3) and one Wuwei item (i.e., WGO13). WGO2 is made up of two Modesty items (i.e., WGO4, WGO5), two Flexibility items (i.e., WGO8, WGO9), and two Honesty items (i.e., WGO10, WGO11).

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd edition). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th edition). Washington, DC: Author.
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 351-368. DOI: 10.1093/pan/mpr057
- Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., Capitanio, J. P., & Cole, S. W. (2015). The neuroendocrinology of social isolation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 733-767. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015240.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hawkey, L. C., Norman, G. J., & Berntson, G. G. (2011). Social isolation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1231(1), 17-22. DOI: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06028.x
- Cain, N. M., Pincus, A. L., & Ansell, E. B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 638-656. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2007.09.006
- Campbell, D. T. (1958). Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of persons as social entities. *Behavioral Science*, 3(1), 14-25.
- Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J., (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 83(1), 29-45.

- Chyung, S. Y., Roberts, K., Swanson, I., & Hankinson, A. (2017). Evidence-based survey design: The use of a midpoint on the Likert scale. *Performance Improvement*, 56(10), 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21727>
- Cichocka, A. (2016). Understanding defensive and secure in-group positivity: The role of collective narcissism. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 27(1), 283-317. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2016.1252530>
- Cichocka, A., Golec de Zavala, A., Marchlewska, M., Bilewicz, M., Jaworska, M., & Olechowski, M. (2017). Personal control decreases narcissistic but increases non-narcissistic in-group positivity. *Journal of Personality*, 86, 465-480. DOI: 10.1111/jopy.12328
- 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, 556-576. DOI:10.1111/bjop.12158
- Clifford, S., Jewell, R. M., & Waggoner, P. D. (2015). Are samples drawn from Mechanical Turk valid for research on political ideology? *Research and Politics*, 1-9. DOI: 10.1177/2053168015622072
- Cole, S. W., Hawkey, L. C., Arevalo, J. M., Sung, C. Y., Rose, R. M., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2007). Social regulation of gene expression in human leukocytes. *Genome Biology*, 8(9), 1-13. DOI: 10.1186/gb-2007-8-9-
- Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (2013). Evolutionary psychology: New perspectives on cognition and motivation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 201-229. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131628

- DeCastellarnau, A. (2017). A classification of response scale characteristics that affect data quality: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(4), 1523-1559. DOI: [10.1007/s11135-017-0533-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0533-4)
- Federico, C. M., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2018). Collective narcissism and the 2016 US presidential vote. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(1), 110-121. DOI:10.1093/poq/nfx048
- Glover, N., Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Crego, C., & Widiger, T. A. (2012). The five-factor narcissism inventory: A five-factor measure of narcissistic personality traits. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94(5), 500-512. DOI: 10.1080/00223891.2012.670680
- Golec de Zavala, A., & Cichocka, A. (2012). Collective narcissism and anti-Semitism in Poland. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 15(2), 213-229. DOI: 10.1177/1368430211420891
- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2013a). The paradox of in-group love: Differentiating collective narcissism advances understanding of the relationship between in-group and out-group attitudes. *Journal of Personality*, 81(1), 16-28. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00779.x
- 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. DOI: 10.1037/a0016904
- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., Iskra-Golec, I. (2013b). Collective narcissism moderates the effect of in-group image threat on intergroup hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(6), 1019-1039. DOI: 10.1037/a0032215
- 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, 1-14. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02023
- 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. DOI: 10.1002/per.2067
- Hare, B. (2017). Survival of the friendliest: Homo sapiens evolved via selection and prosociality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 155-186. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201
- Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2016). Attentive Turkers: MTurk participants perform better on online attention checks than do subject pool participants. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(1), 400-407. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-015-0578-z
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2(1), 104-121. DOI:10.1177/109442819800100106
- Huff, C., & Tingley, D. (2015). “Who are these people?” Evaluating the demographic characteristics and political preferences of MTurk survey respondents. *Research and Politics*, 1-12. DOI: 10.1177/2053168015604648
- Kaufman, S. B., Weiss, B., Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2018). Clinical correlates of vulnerable and grandiose narcissism: A personality perspective. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 32, 1-24.
- Laozi (2004). *Dao de jing: The book of the way*, translation and commentary by M. Roberts. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vilek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 144-165. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144
- Lee, Y. T., Han, A. G., Byron, T. K., & Fan, H. X. (2008). Daoist leadership: Theory and application. In C. Chen & Y. T. Lee (Eds.), *Leadership and management in China: Philosophies, theories, and practices* (83-107). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511753763.005
- Lee, Y. T., Haught, H., Chen, K., & Chan, S. (2013). Examining Daoist big-five leadership in cross-cultural and gender perspectives. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 4(4), 267-276. DOI: 10.1037/a0035180
- Lee, Y. T., McCauley, C., & Jussim, L. (2013). Stereotypes as valid categories of knowledge and human perceptions of group differences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 7(7), 470-486. DOI: 10.1111/spc3.12039
- Lee, Y. T., & Ottati, V. (1995). Perceived in-group homogeneity as a function of group membership salience and stereotype threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(6), 610-619.
- Lee, Y. T., Xu, C., Liu, Y., & Chen, W.T. (2015). The Chinese Daoist theory of water-like personality: A correlational study of Daoist big-five leadership, Machiavellianism, and good human nature. *American Review of China Studies*, 16(2), 27-48.
- Levay, K. E., Freese, J., & Druckman, J. N. (2016). The demographic and political composition of Mechanical Turk samples. *SAGE Open*, 1-17. DOI: 10.1177/2158244016636433

- Levy, K. N., Ellison, W. D., & Reynoso, J. S (2011). A historical review of narcissism and narcissistic personality. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (3-13). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lyons, P. A., Coursey, L. E., & Kenworthy, J. B. (2013). National identity and group narcissism as predictors of intergroup attitudes toward undocumented Latino immigrants in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 35(3), 323-335. DOI: 10.1177/0739986313488090
- Maciantowicz, O., & Zajenkowski, M. (2018). Is narcissistic anger fueled by neuroticism? The relationship between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, neuroticism, and trait anger. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9866-y>
- Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 79(5), 1013-1042. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00711.x
- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Hyatt, C. S., & Campbell, W. K. (2017). Controversies in narcissism. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 13, 291-315. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-045244>
- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., McCain, J. L., Few, L. R., Crego, C., Widiger, T. A., & Campbell, W. K. (2015). Thinking structurally about narcissism: An examination of the five-factor narcissism inventory and its components. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 29, 1-18. DOI: 10.1521/pedi_2015_29_177

- Montoya, R. M. (2017). *Do collective narcissists feel shame too? An investigation of national in-group transgression and in-group directed hostility* (Unpublished master's thesis). Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Exploration in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(6), 668-676.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12(4), 177-196.
- Ottati, V., & Lee, Y. T. (1995). Accuracy: A neglected component of stereotype research. In Y. T. Lee, L. Jussim, & C. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (29-59). Washington, D.C., American Psychological Association.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1197-1208.
- Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(6), 421-426. DOI: 10.1177/0963721414547737
- Pincus, A. L., & Lukowitsky, M. R. (2010). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 6, 421-446.
- Pincus, A. L., & Roche, M. J. (2011). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (31-40). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- 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(4), 741-763.

- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 890-902.
- Reynolds, E. K., & Lejuez, C. W. (2011). Narcissism in the DSM. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (14-21). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ronningstam, E. (2011). Psychoanalytic theories on narcissism and narcissistic personality. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (41-55). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rouse, S. V. (2015). A reliability analysis of Mechanical Turk data. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 43, 304-307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.004>
- Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2001). Narcissists and feedback: Motivational surfeits and motivational deficits. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12(4), 237-239.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman, Oklahoma: The University Book Exchange.
- Smith, S. M., Roster, C. A., Golden, L. L., & Albaum, G. S. (2016). A multi-group analysis of online survey respondent data quality: Comparing a regular USA consumer panel to MTURK samples. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 3139-3148.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.12.002>

- South, S. C., Eaton, N. R., & Krueger, R. F. (2011). Narcissism in official psychiatric classification systems. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (22-30). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13(2), 65-93.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/053901847401300204>
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, 96-102.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (144-167). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thomas, K. A., & Clifford, S. (2017). Validity and Mechanical Turk: An assessment of exclusion methods and interactive experiments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77, 184-197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.038>
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., & Onorato, R. S. (1999). Social identity, personality, and the self-concept: A self-categorization perspective. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer, & O. P. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (11-46). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Turner, J. C., & Reynolds, K. J. (2012). Self-categorization theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (399-417). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Vaknin, S. (2014). *Narcissistic supply: The narcissist's drug*. Prague: Narcissus Publications

Wallace, H. M, & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 819-834.

APPENDIX A

GRANDIOSE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. My group is objectively better than most other groups.
2. I cannot think of any flaws my group has.
3. It angers me when people criticize my group.
4. Criticisms of my group are often inaccurate.
5. I like having my group at the center of attention.
6. I like to show off my group membership when I get the opportunity.
7. It is important that the achievements of my group outshine the achievements of other groups.
8. My group deserves praise for all that we have accomplished
9. My group should have more influence compared to other groups.
10. My group should not have to follow the same rules as other groups.
11. It is fine if other groups must suffer for mine to succeed.
12. There is a high standard set for individuals to be a part of my group.
13. Most members of my group are exceptional.

APPENDIX B

VULNERABLE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Other people do not appreciate my group as much as they should.
2. My group would be more popular if people understood what we truly stand for.
3. It is humiliating to see my group fail publicly.
4. It is embarrassing to hear people criticize my group.
5. A lot of people do not even realize when they are insulting members of my group.
6. My group is constantly under attack.
7. Other groups want to see my group fail.
8. I do not trust the intentions of other groups.
9. I would rather not interact with people from different groups because they would treat me unfairly.
10. For members of my group, it is not worth interacting with people from different groups.

APPENDIX C

AMERICAN ADAPTED GRANDIOSE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION

SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. America is objectively better than most other nations.
2. I cannot think of any flaws America has.
3. It angers me when people criticize America.
4. Criticisms of America are often inaccurate.
5. I like having America at the center of attention.
6. I like to show off that I am an American when I get the opportunity.
7. It is important that the achievements of America outshine the achievements of other nations.
8. America deserves praise for all that we have accomplished
9. America should have more influence compared to other nations.
10. America should not have to follow the same rules as other nations.
11. It is fine if other nations must suffer for America to succeed.
12. There is a high standard set for individuals to become American.
13. Most Americans are exceptional.

APPENDIX D

AMERICAN ADAPTED VULNERABLE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION

SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Other people do not appreciate America as much as they should.
2. America would be more popular if people understood what we truly stand for.
3. It is humiliating to see America fail publicly.
4. It is embarrassing to hear people criticize America.
5. A lot of people do not even realize when they are insulting Americans.
6. America is constantly under attack.
7. Other nations want to see America fail.
8. I do not trust the intentions of other nations.
9. I would rather not interact with people from different nations because they would treat me unfairly.
10. For Americans, it is not worth interacting with people from different nations.

APPENDIX E

WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION SCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. My group continues forward regardless of failure or success.
2. My group can overcome difficult challenges.
3. My group works hard for our achievements.
4. All groups are deserving of respect.
5. It would bother me to see another group suffer because of my group.
6. Most of the people in my group are just ordinary individuals.
7. My group should use its influence to help others.
8. It is important that my group remains open to opposing ideas.
9. My group should be able to compromise with other groups.
10. My group should operate fairly with other groups.
11. It is important that my group is honest about our shortcomings.
12. I do not feel the need to change the way people see my group.
13. I enjoy being a member of my group no matter what anyone else thinks.

APPENDIX F

AMERICAN ADAPTED WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION SCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. America continues forward regardless of failure or success.
2. America can overcome difficult challenges.
3. America works hard for its achievements.
4. All nations are deserving of respect.
5. It would bother me to see another nation suffer because of America.
6. Most of the people in America are just ordinary individuals.
7. America should use its influence to help others.
8. It is important that America remains open to opposing ideas.
9. America should be able to compromise with other nations.
10. America should operate fairly with other nations.
11. It is important that America is honest about our shortcomings.
12. I do not feel the need to change the way people see America.
13. I enjoy being an American no matter what anyone else thinks.

APPENDIX G

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Please answer the following demographic questions. Your answers will be used to compile a demographic summary of participants in the study. All responses will remain confidential.

1. What is your age (in years): _____
2. What is your sex:
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other
3. What is your race or ethnicity? *Please check all that apply.*
 - a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - b. Asian
 - c. Black or African American
 - d. Hispanic or Latino
 - e. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - f. White
 - g. Other (please specify _____)
4. Are you a United States citizen?
 - a. Yes, born in the United States
 - b. Yes, born in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Northern Marianas
 - c. Yes, born abroad of U.S. citizen parent or parents
 - d. Yes, U.S. citizen by naturalization
 - e. No, not a U.S. citizen
5. (If c, d, or e on #4) What is your country of birth? : _____
6. (If c or d on #4) When did you come to live in the United States? *Print numbers in boxes:* (YYYY) _____
7. What is your current country of residence? : _____
8. In what state or U.S. territory do you live? (dropdown menu)
9. Which of the following would best describe the location of your current residence?
 - a. Rural
 - b. Urban
 - c. Suburban
10. What is the highest level of education or degree you have received?
 - a. Less than high school degree
 - b. High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
 - c. Some college but no degree
 - d. Associates Degree (i.e., A.A.)
 - e. Bachelor Degree (e.g., B.A., B.S.)
 - f. Graduate or Professional degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D., M.D.)
 - g. Other _____
11. What was your total household income before taxes during the past 12 months?
 - a. Less than \$25,000
 - b. \$25,000 to \$34,999
 - c. \$35,000 to \$49,999
 - d. \$50,000 to \$74,999
 - e. \$75,000 to \$99,999

- f. \$100,000 to \$149,999
 - g. \$150,000 to \$199,999
 - h. \$200,000 or more
12. Have you ever served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, military Reserves, or National Guard? *Active duty does not include training for the Reserves or National Guard, but DOES include activation, for example, for the Persian Gulf War.*
- a. Yes, on active duty now
 - b. Yes, on active duty in the past
 - c. No, but currently training for Reserves or National Guard
 - d. No, never served in the military
13. What is your current religious affiliation?
- a. Atheist or Agnostic
 - b. Buddhist
 - c. Christian (e.g., Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, etc.)
 - d. Hindu
 - e. Jewish
 - f. Muslim
 - g. Other (please specify _____)
14. (If b-g on #10) How religious do you consider yourself to be?
- a. Not religious
 - b. Slightly religious
 - c. Moderately religious
 - d. Very religious
15. Which best describes your current political affiliation?
- a. Democrat
 - b. Republican
 - c. None
 - d. Other (please specify _____)
16. Generally speaking, to what extent would you consider yourself to be liberal or conservative?
- a. Very conservative
 - b. Conservative
 - c. Somewhat conservative
 - d. Neither liberal nor conservative
 - e. Somewhat liberal
 - f. Liberal
 - g. Very Liberal

APPENDIX H

SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION SCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
2. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
3. It is okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
4. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
5. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
6. It is probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
7. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
8. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
9. It would be good if groups could be equal. (R)
10. Group equality should be our ideal. (R)
11. All groups should be given an equal chance in life. (R)
12. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups. (R)
13. Increased social equality is something we should strive for. (R)
14. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally. (R)
15. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible. (R)
16. No one group should dominate in society. (R)

APPENDIX I

BLIND PATRIOTISM ITEMS

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Somewhat Disagree

4 = Somewhat Agree

5 = Agree

6 = Strongly Agree

1. People who do not wholeheartedly support America should live somewhere else.
2. The United States is virtually always right.
3. I would support my country right or wrong.
4. The anti-Vietnam war protesters were un-American.
5. For the most part, people who protest and demonstrate against U.S. policy are good, upstanding, intelligent people. (R)
6. I believe that U.S. policies are almost always the morally correct ones.
7. If another country disagreed with an important United States policy that I knew little about, I would not necessarily support my country's position. (R)
8. People should not constantly try to change the way things are in America.
9. I support U.S. policies for the very reason that they are the policies of my country.
10. There is too much criticism of the U.S. in the world, and we its citizens should not criticize it.
11. It is un-American to criticize this country.
12. We should have complete freedom of speech even for those who criticize the country. (R)

APPENDIX J

CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM ITEMS

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Somewhat Disagree

4 = Somewhat Agree

5 = Agree

6 = Strongly Agree

1. People should work hard to move this country in a positive direction.
2. If you love America, you should notice its problems and work to correct them.
3. If I criticize the United States, I do so out of love for my country.
4. I oppose some U.S. policies because I care about my country and want to improve it.
5. I express my love for America by supporting efforts at positive change.
6. My love of country demands that I speak out against popular but potentially destructive policies.

APPENDIX K

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE U.S. AND U.S. VALUES

Please answer the following questions.

1. To what extent is your overall attitude towards the U.S. favorable or unfavorable?
 - 1) Very unfavorable
 - 2) Unfavorable
 - 3) Somewhat unfavorable
 - 4) Somewhat favorable
 - 5) Favorable
 - 6) Very favorable
2. To what extent do you identify as an American?
 - 1) Not at all
 - 2) A small extent
 - 3) Some extent
 - 4) A moderate extent
 - 5) A great extent
 - 6) A very great extent
3. To what extent is your identity as an American important to you?
 - 1) Not important
 - 2) Slightly important
 - 3) Moderately important
 - 4) Important
 - 5) Very important
4. To what extent do you identify with the founding values and ideals (e.g., individual liberty/human rights, self-government/democracy, equality, social mobility) of America?
 - 1) Not at all
 - 2) A small extent
 - 3) Some extent
 - 4) A moderate extent
 - 5) A great extent
 - 6) A very great extent

APPENDIX L
CONSENT FORM

DEAR PARTICIPANT:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. The purpose of this survey is to understand how people orient themselves within their groups. During this study you will be asked to respond to questions regarding your group membership as an American or an American political group. It should take you about 20 minutes to complete. However, we ask you to take as much time as you need to complete the project completely and accurately. Your reading of the material is very important therefore you will be evaluated and compensated (\$0.75) based on your reading comprehension. Compensation will also require completeness of responses.

INFORMED CONSENT:

This survey is open to all participants over the age of 18 who meet the criteria of the study and your participation is completely voluntary. If at any time you wish to stop participating, you reserve the right to do so without explanation or penalty. There are no foreseeable personal risks and only a potential for slight discomfort involved with participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

This survey is carried out for academic research purposes only. The data will be collected and analyzed by the researchers in aggregate form. Although anonymity cannot be guaranteed, as with any academic research, your answers are strictly confidential and any information reported to others will not contain any information that can be used to uniquely identify you or your individual responses. Furthermore, your data will only be viewed by the researchers and will be stored electronically on a secure server. Electronic data will be destroyed after 5 years.

CONTACT:

This research is being conducted by Richard Montoya, a graduate student in Applied Psychology at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, under the supervision of Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee, Professor, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the content or administration of this research, please contact Richard Montoya (rmmonto@siu.edu) or Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee (leey@siu.edu).

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Research Compliance, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4344. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

BY CLICKING THE “I CONSENT – PROCEED WITH THE SURVEY” BUTTON BELOW, YOU ARE GRANTING YOUR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

X – I CONSENT – PROCEED WITH THE SURVEY

APPENDIX M
DEBRIEFING FORM

Dear Participant,

During this study, you completed questions to assess your group orientation. The purpose of this study was to validate a measure that aims to assess the extent to which individuals orient themselves defensively or securely within their groups.

If you have any concerns about your participation or the data you provided in light of this disclosure, please discuss this with us. We will be happy to provide any information we can to help answer questions you have about this study.

If your concerns are such that you would now like to have your data withdrawn, we will do so.

To ensure that the results of other participants are not influenced, please do not share this statement or any details regarding the study with anyone. Again, thank you for your participation.

If you have questions about this survey or the procedures in this project, you may contact the project researchers, Richard Montoya, Graduate Student, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 62901-6502, rmmonto@siu.edu or Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 62901-6502, leey@siu.edu.

Thank you again for your participation in this study.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Research Compliance, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4344. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

APPENDIX N

DEMOCRAT ADAPTED GRANDIOSE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION

SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Democrats are objectively better than Republicans.
2. I cannot think of any flaws that Democrats have.
3. It angers me when people criticize Democrats.
4. Criticisms of Democrats are often inaccurate.
5. I like having Democrats at the center of attention.
6. I like to show off that I am a Democrat when I get the opportunity.
7. It is important that the achievements of Democrats outshine the achievements of Republicans.
8. Democrats deserve praise for all that we have accomplished
9. Democrats should have more influence compared to Republicans.
10. Democrats should not have to follow the same rules as Republicans.
11. It is fine if Republicans must suffer for Democrats to succeed.
12. There is a high standard set for individuals to be a Democrats.
13. Most Democrats are exceptional.

APPENDIX O

DEMOCRAT ADAPTED VULNERABLE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION

SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Other people do not appreciate Democrats as much as they should.
2. Democrats would be more popular if people understood what we truly stand for.
3. It is humiliating to see Democrats fail publicly.
4. It is embarrassing to hear people criticize Democrats.
5. A lot of people do not even realize when they are insulting Democrats.
6. Democrats are constantly under attack.
7. Republicans want to see Democrats fail.
8. I do not trust the intentions of Republicans.
9. I would rather not interact with Republicans because they would treat me unfairly.
10. For Democrats, it is not worth interacting with Republicans.

APPENDIX P

REPUBLICAN ADAPTED GRANDIOSE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION

SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Republicans are objectively better than Democrats.
2. I cannot think of any flaws that Republicans have.
3. It angers me when people criticize Republicans.
4. Criticisms of Republicans are often inaccurate.
5. I like having Republicans at the center of attention.
6. I like to show off that I am a Republican when I get the opportunity.
7. It is important that the achievements of Republicans outshine the achievements of Democrats.
8. Republicans deserve praise for all that we have accomplished
9. Republicans should have more influence compared to Democrats.
10. Republicans should not have to follow the same rules as Democrats.
11. It is fine if Democrats must suffer for Republicans to succeed.
12. There is a high standard set for individuals to be a Republican.
13. Most Republicans are exceptional.

APPENDIX Q

REPUBLICAN ADAPTED VULNERABLE NARCISSISTIC GROUP ORIENTATION

SUBSCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Other people do not appreciate Republicans as much as they should.
2. Republicans would be more popular if people understood what we truly stand for.
3. It is humiliating to see Republicans fail publicly.
4. It is embarrassing to hear people criticize Republicans.
5. A lot of people do not even realize when they are insulting Republicans.
6. Republicans are constantly under attack.
7. Democrats want to see Republicans fail.
8. I do not trust the intentions of Democrats.
9. I would rather not interact with Democrats because they would treat me unfairly.
10. For Republicans, it is not worth interacting with Democrats.

APPENDIX R

DEMOCRAT ADAPTED WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION SCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Democrats continue forward regardless of failure or success.
2. Democrats can overcome difficult challenges.
3. Democrats work hard for their achievements.
4. Republicans are deserving of respect.
5. It would bother me to see Republicans suffer because of Democrats.
6. Most Democrats are just ordinary individuals.
7. Democrats should use their influence to help others.
8. It is important that Democrats remain open to opposing ideas.
9. Democrats should be able to compromise with Republicans.
10. Democrats should operate fairly with Republicans.
11. It is important that Democrats are honest about their shortcomings.
12. I do not feel the need to change the way people see Democrats.
13. I enjoy being a Democrat no matter what anyone else thinks.

APPENDIX S

REPUBLICAN ADAPTED WATER-LIKE GROUP ORIENTATION SCALE

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. Republicans continue forward regardless of failure or success.
2. Republicans can overcome difficult challenges.
3. Republicans work hard for their achievements.
4. Democrats are deserving of respect.
5. It would bother me to see Democrats suffer because of Republicans.
6. Most Republicans are just ordinary individuals.
7. Republicans should use their influence to help others.
8. It is important that Republicans remain open to opposing ideas.
9. Republicans should be able to compromise with Democrats.
10. Republicans should operate fairly with Democrats.
11. It is important that Republicans are honest about their shortcomings.
12. I do not feel the need to change the way people see Republicans.
13. I enjoy being a Republican no matter what anyone else thinks.

APPENDIX T

MULTI-COMPONENT MEASURE OF IN-GROUP IDENTIFICATION

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Rate your response to each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Somewhat Disagree
- 4 = Somewhat Agree
- 5 = Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

Group Level Self-Investment

Solidarity

- 1. I feel a bond with (Democrats/Republicans).
- 2. I feel solidarity with (Democrats/Republicans).
- 3. I feel committed to (Democrats/Republicans).

Satisfaction

- 4. I am glad to be a (Democrat/Republican).
- 5. I think that (Democrats/Republicans) have a lot to be proud of.
- 6. It is pleasant to be a (Democrat/Republican).
- 7. Being a (Democrat/Republican) gives me a good feeling.

Centrality

- 8. I often think about the fact that I am a (Democrat/Republican).
- 9. The fact that I am a (Democrat/Republican) is an important part of my identity.
- 10. Being a (Democrat/Republican) is an important part of how I see myself.

Group Level Self-Definition

Individual Self-Stereotyping

- 11. I have a lot in common with the average (Democrat/Republican).
- 12. I am similar to the average (Democrat/Republican).

In-Group Homogeneity

- 13. (Democrats/Republicans) have a lot in common with each other.
- 14. (Democrats/Republicans) are very similar to each other.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Richard M. Montoya

Rmmonto@siu.edu

Illinois State University
Bachelor of Science, Psychology, May 2014

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Master of Arts in Psychology, Applied Psychology, May 2017

Dissertation Paper Title:
Narcissistic Group Orientation, Water-like Group Orientation, and Their Relations to In-group Identification

Major Professor: Dr. Yueh-Ting Lee