

National narcissism: Internal dimensions and international correlates

Huajian Cai¹ and Peter Gries²

¹Key Laboratory of Behavior Science, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China, ²Institute for US–China Issues, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, USA

Abstract: In studies conducted in the United States and China, we explored the impact of national narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement, demonstrating that: (a) national narcissism was distinct from both individual narcissism and collective self-esteem (patriotism); (b) national entitlement and national grandiosity constituted two distinct dimensions of national narcissism; and (c) national narcissism, national grandiosity, and national entitlement, but not individual narcissism, were uniquely predictive of political attitudes, foreign policy preferences, and purchase intentions. Together, these findings provided convergent evidence for the utility of national narcissism and its two internal dimensions, national entitlement and national grandiosity.

Keywords: entitlement; grandiosity; narcissism; national narcissism; U.S.–China relations

Correspondence: Dr. Huajian Cai, Department of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 16 Lincui Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100101, China. Email: huajian.cai@gmail.com

Received 15 June 2012. Accepted 17 December 2012.

Twenge and Campbell (2009) have argued that a “narcissism epidemic” afflicts America today. “American culture’s focus on self-admiration has caused a flight from reality to the land of grandiose fantasy,” they write, “All this fantasy might feel good, but . . . inflated desires eventually crash to earth” (p. 4). Although few disagree about the harmful consequences of narcissism, whether or not a narcissism epidemic actually exists in America today has become a subject of hot debate among psychologists (see Donnellan, Trzesniewski, & Robins, 2009; Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2008; Twenge & Foster, 2008, 2010; Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008).

Given the recent scholarly and popular attention paid to narcissistic attachment to the self and its negative consequences for interpersonal relations, it is perhaps surprising that little attention has been given to the possibility of narcissistic identification with the nation and its possible negative consequences for international relations. Expanding on two extant but separate streams of scholarship on narcissism, this paper develops the construct of “national narcissism.”

In one line of research, de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, and Jayawickreme (2009) have suggested that narcissism at

the individual level can be conceptually extended to intergroup relations. They proposed the concept of “collective narcissism,” defined as an emotional investment in “an inflated image of an ingroup” (p. 1074). They developed a nine-item Collective Narcissism (CN) Scale, adapting individual level narcissism items by replacing “I” with “my group,” such as “My group deserves special treatment.” They found that their CN Scale correlated with a number of perceptual and behavioral measures, such as threat perception and support for aggressive action, concluding that “Collective narcissism is related to intergroup aggressiveness because it increases sensitivity to signs of criticism or unfair treatment in an intergroup context” (p. 1091). Their research included a case study of national collective narcissism. However, because the focus of their research was on collective narcissism in general, when de Zavala et al. sought to operationalize collective narcissism as, for example, a Pole, they did so indirectly, priming the participants’ national identity as a Pole only in the instructions before they completed the CN Scale containing the “my group” items. As a specific and important case of collective narcissism, we believe that a more direct measure and examination of national narcissism is warranted.

In a separate line of research, Brown, Budzek, and Tamborski (2009) have questioned the meaning and measurement of the narcissism that is captured by the standard Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979). Noting questions about the psychometric properties and validity of the NPI, such as the poor internal reliability of its subscales, they suggested that narcissism might be better operationalized as two separate dimensions, “intra-personal grandiosity” and “interpersonal entitlement,” each of which exhibits distinct patterns of association with other psychological constructs.

Drawing on these two streams of research, we loosely defined national narcissism as an inflated view of the importance and deservedness of one’s own nation. As a specific case of collective narcissism, we envisioned national narcissism as an individual differences variable involving an individual’s attachment to their nation. We further hypothesized that national narcissism consisted of two internal dimensions, national grandiosity and national entitlement, which differ in terms of their intranational and international orientations respectively. To take the American case, national grandiosity shifts the subject from “I am great” to “we Americans are great,” and national entitlement from “you owe me” to “the world owes us Americans.” We operationalized national narcissism, national entitlement, and national grandiosity using modified versions of the CN Scale (de Zavala et al., 2009), the Psychological Entitlement Scale (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004), and the Narcissistic Grandiosity Scale (Brown et al., 2009), respectively. For all scale items, the subject of the sentence was the individual’s national identity (such as “Americans” or “Chinese”). We sought to provide initial evidence of the validity of national narcissism and its two internal dimensions, national grandiosity and national entitlement. To do so, we examined their interrelationships and their ability to uniquely predict international attitudes and foreign policy preferences in two studies of United States (U.S.)–China relations. Study 1 examined national narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement among Americans with China as a target. Study 2 examined national narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement among Chinese with America as a target. Consistent with the idea of Brown et al. (2009) that narcissism is composed of the two internal dimensions of grandiosity and entitlement, we expected that both national grandiosity and national entitlement would predict national narcissism uniquely while moderately correlating with each other. Furthermore, we expected that national narcissism, national

grandiosity, and national entitlement would predict international outcome variables over and beyond other relevant constructs such as collective self-esteem (CSE) and individual narcissism.

We chose the case of U.S.–China relations for several reasons. First, America is an established superpower today while China is a former and rising superpower. As citizens of powerful nations, Americans and Chinese are more likely than people from other nations to maintain narcissistic feelings about their nations (Young & Pinsky, 2006). Second, because they are competing for global influence, both Americans and Chinese tend to view each other as peer competitors, and thus as threats to those high on national narcissism. Third, from a foreign policy perspective, U.S.–China relations are intrinsically important as the most consequential bilateral relationship of the 21st century. If national narcissism is found to operate in the context of U.S.–China relations, therapeutic interventions suggested in the narcissism literature may be able to contribute to the prevention of future U.S.–China conflict.

Study 1: National narcissism in the U.S.

Method

Participants

Three hundred and five participants from around the U.S. completed a brief online survey during the week of February 3–10, 2010. The participants were recruited by students enrolled in an undergraduate class at a mid-American state university. For course credit, students were instructed to send emails containing the survey URL to at least 12 U.S. citizens, seeking to avoid “data interdependence” by recruiting no more than one member of any nuclear family, and to maximize diversity in terms of sex, age, occupation, and geographical location (for information about Internet and nonprobability sampling, see Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004; Malhotra & Krosnick, 2007).

Given our interest in this study in national narcissism as an American, and its consequences for attitudes towards China, we first removed four participants who were not U.S. citizens, and four who were Chinese-Americans and may have only recently emigrated from China. We then removed 19 participants who did not follow the instructions. Our final sample of 279 Americans was well balanced in terms of sex, with 143 male and 136 female participants. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 66 years ($M = 30.80$ years, $SD = 13.77$ years), 85.7% were White, 31 U.S. states were

represented, and 45% were students. In terms of party identification, 27% identified as Democrats, 40% as Republicans, and 33% as “independent or none.” Further, 17% reported being either “liberal” or “very liberal,” while 32% reported being either “conservative” or “very conservative.” Together, these distributions suggest that our sample may have been slightly more conservative than the overall U.S. population, although it was remarkably balanced for a convenience sample.

Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all items were measured using 7-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Item sequencing was randomized on each web page.

Narcissistic Personality Inventory

We used a shortened 15-item NPI with good internal consistency and temporal stability (Schütz, Marcus, & Sellin, 2004). Forced choice items included choosing between “I have a natural talent for influencing people” or “I am not good at influencing people.” Scale reliability was adequate ($\alpha = .69$).

National Narcissism as an American

We adapted this nine-item scale from the CN Scale (de Zavala et al., 2009), substituting “America” for “my group” for each item (e.g., “I insist that America get the respect that is due to it”). It thus differs from uses of the CN Scale that prime nationality in the instructions only, referring to “my group” in the items themselves. The internal reliability of our National Narcissism Scale was very good ($\alpha = .85$). The full adapted scale appears in the Appendix.

Collective Self-Esteem as an American (patriotism)

Four items were adapted to the American case from the Private (e.g., “I’m glad to be American”) and the Importance to Identity (e.g., “Being American has very little to do with how I feel about myself” [reverse coded]) subscales of Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) CSE Scale. The internal reliability was adequate given the short length ($\alpha = .64$).

Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA)

Three items were taken from Altemeyer’s (1998) RWA Scale, which measures authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism, and has been shown to

powerfully predict negative attitudes towards outgroups. One item was “Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.” The internal reliability of our three items was extremely good for such a short scale ($\alpha = .85$).

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)

SDO (e.g., Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) measures an individual’s preference for “nonegalitarian social systems” (Crowson, DeBacker, & Thoma, 2005, p. 1275) and the desire to dominate other groups. Participants responded to a shortened four-item version with items such as “Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.” The scale’s internal reliability was good for its length ($\alpha = .77$).

Prejudice towards the Chinese people

This scale consisted of four “The Chinese people are . . .” statements. Two were negative (“devious” and “dishonest”), and two were positive (“friendly” and “trustworthy”) and were reverse coded. Internal reliability was good for its length ($\alpha = .78$). The full scale appears in the Appendix.

Negative attitudes towards the Chinese government

This scale consisted of the same four adjectives used in the Prejudice Scale, with the subject of each sentence changed from “The Chinese people are . . .” to “The Chinese government is. . .” Internal reliability was good ($\alpha = .78$). The full scale appears in the Appendix.

China policy

Four items were created to discover the respondents’ preferred China policy, such as “The U.S. government should pursue a tougher China policy” and “Our government should adopt a friendlier foreign policy towards China” (reverse coded). Higher scores indicated a preference for a tougher China policy. Scale reliability was good ($\alpha = .77$). The full scale appears in the Appendix.

National entitlement

Six items were adapted from the Psychological Entitlement Scale (Campbell et al., 2004), substituting “America” for “I.” Items included “Great things should come to America” and “America does NOT necessarily deserve special treatment” (reverse coded). Internal reliability was good ($\alpha = .78$). The full scale appears in the Appendix.

National grandiosity

The same 16 adjectives (perfect, prestigious, extraordinary, acclaimed, superior, prominent, heroic, high status, omnipotent, brilliant, unrivalled, dominant, authoritative, envied, glorious, and powerful) that Brown et al. (2009) used to measure narcissistic grandiosity were used, with the instructions adjusted to read “rate the extent to which the following traits apply to America in general.” The internal reliability of the scale was very good ($\alpha = .88$). The full scale appears in the Appendix.

Results

National narcissism: Descriptive statistics and discriminant validity

Table 1 reports the means and standard deviations for all 10 scales used in Study 1. One pair of mean scores is noteworthy: Attitudes towards the Chinese people (i.e., prejudice) were much more positive than attitudes towards the Chinese government, $t(278) = 25.44$, $p < .01$. This large difference is consistent with previous research on American attitudes towards China (Gries & Crowson, 2010) and is particularly noteworthy given that each of the four statements in the two scales differed only in a single word: “people” versus “government.”

Table 1 also reports the zero-order correlations among our scales. National narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement as an American showed low but statistically significant correlations with individual narcissism as measured using the NPI and moderate correlations with CSE as an American. National narcissism was significantly correlated with SDO and RWA. These findings were consistent with recent research on collective narcissism (de Zavala et al., 2009), and suggested that national narcissism was related to but distinct from the NPI, CSE, SDO, and RWA.

Internal dimensions: National entitlement and national grandiosity

As expected, national grandiosity and national entitlement were significantly but only moderately correlated with each other, suggesting that they were related but distinct constructs. Also as expected, both were strongly and positively correlated with national narcissism. To examine the unique associations between national entitlement and national grandiosity on the one hand, and national narcissism on the other, we regressed the latter onto the former. Both predicted national narcissism uniquely, $B = 0.61$ and 0.28 , $SE = 0.04$ and 0.06 , $t = 13.95$ and 5.02 for national entitlement and national grandiosity, respectively, both $ps < .01$. These results suggested that, just as entitlement and grandiosity are unique components of narcissism at the individual level (Brown et al., 2009), national entitlement and national grandiosity are unique components of national narcissism.

International correlates: China attitudes and policy preferences

National narcissism was significantly correlated with all outcome variables (see Table 1). Although both were correlated with China policy, national entitlement and national grandiosity were differentially correlated with our two China attitudes measures. National entitlement (but not national grandiosity) was correlated with prejudice, while national grandiosity (but not national entitlement) was correlated with negative attitudes towards the Chinese government. Consistent with previous research, CSE, SDO, and RWA predicted China policy preferences (Gries, Crowson, & Cai, 2012). However, CSE/patriotism was correlated with negative attitudes towards the Chinese government but not prejudice against the Chinese people, and SDO and

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics: Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-order Correlations (n = 279)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Narcissism (NPI)	6.14	3.01	1								
2. National narcissism	3.55	0.96	.15*	1							
3. Collective self-esteem	5.65	0.96	.09	.41*	1						
4. Social dominance orientation	2.61	1.23	.20*	.43*	.11	1					
5. Right-wing authoritarianism	3.05	1.51	.00	.47*	.24*	.51*	1				
6. Prejudice	2.85	0.90	.08	.24*	.06	.20*	.20*	1			
7. Negative attitudes towards the Chinese government	4.78	0.95	.03	.15*	.16*	-.08	.06	.08	1		
8. China policy	3.33	0.94	.06	.46*	.21*	.25*	.46*	.25*	.29*	1	
9. National entitlement	3.29	0.97	.21*	.71*	.32*	.44*	.34*	.28*	.05	.38*	1
10. National grandiosity	4.72	0.78	.22*	.47*	.45*	.24*	.27*	.13	.20*	.31*	.40*

* $p < .05$.

Table 2
Correlates of National Narcissism: Three Simultaneous Multiple Regressions

Outcome variable		Constant	Age	Sex	Narcissism	Collective self-esteem	Social dominance orientation	Right-wing authoritarianism	National narcissism
Prejudice towards Chinese people ($R^2 = .11$)	B	1.67	0.01	0.24	0.02	-0.07	0.08	0.02	0.16
	SE	0.37	0.00	0.11	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.07
	t	4.56	1.88	2.22	1.22	-1.17	1.46	0.55	2.38
	p	.00	.06	.03	.22	.24	.15	.58	.02
Negative attitudes towards Chinese government ($R^2 = .08$)	B	3.77	0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.07	-0.13	0.02	0.13
	SE	0.39	0.00	0.11	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07
	t	9.60	2.44	-0.30	1.10	1.09	-2.34	0.43	1.79
	p	.00	.02	.77	.27	.28	.02	.67	.08
Tougher China policy ($R^2 = .29$)	B	1.50	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00	-0.05	0.21	0.32
	SE	0.34	0.00	0.10	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.06
	t	4.40	0.23	0.77	0.54	-0.01	-1.04	4.99	4.99
	p	.00	.82	.44	.59	.99	.30	.00	.00

Table 3
Correlates of National Entitlement and National Grandiosity: Three Simultaneous Multiple Regressions

Outcome variable		Constant	Age	Sex	Narcissism	Collective self-esteem	Social dominance orientation	Right-wing authoritarianism	National entitlement	National grandiosity
Prejudice towards Chinese people ($R^2 = .13$)	B	1.61	0.01	0.22	0.02	-0.08	0.05	0.04	0.21	0.01
	SE	0.40	0.00	0.11	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.08
	t	4.01	2.11	2.05	0.94	-1.29	0.99	0.84	3.31	0.18
	p	.04	.04	.04	.35	.20	.32	.40	.00	.86
Negative attitudes towards Chinese government ($R^2 = .09$)	B	3.38	0.01	-0.06	0.02	0.04	-0.12	0.03	-0.01	0.22
	SE	0.43	0.00	0.11	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.09
	t	-7.83	2.66	-0.51	0.80	0.63	-2.09	0.62	-0.09	2.56
	p	.00	.01	.61	.43	.53	.04	.54	.93	.01
Tougher China policy ($R^2 = .28$)	B	1.20	0.00	0.03	0.02	-0.02	-0.06	0.23	0.23	0.16
	SE	0.38	0.00	0.10	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.08
	t	3.19	0.72	0.28	0.09	-0.28	-1.18	5.75	3.81	2.18
	p	.00	.48	.78	.93	.78	.24	.00	.00	.03

RWA were correlated significantly and positively with prejudice but not with attitudes towards the Chinese government.

To examine whether national narcissism would predict our China outcome variables over and beyond the effects of CSE/patriotism, SDO, and RWA, as well as narcissism at the individual level, we ran three separate simultaneous multiple regressions with narcissism, national narcissism, CSE, SDO, and RWA as predictors, and with prejudice, negative attitudes towards the Chinese government, and China policy preferences as the outcome variables. We also included sex and age as control variables. The results are shown in Table 2.

After controlling for age, sex, narcissism, CSE as an American (patriotism), SDO, and RWA, national narcissism still predicted all three China variables. Specifically, greater national narcissism was associated with more prejudice towards the Chinese people, more negative attitudes towards

the Chinese government, and preference for a tougher China policy.

To explore the unique contributions of national entitlement and national grandiosity to the China outcome variables, we again conducted three simultaneous multiple regressions, controlling for age, sex, narcissism, CSE, SDO, and RWA. The results are displayed in Table 3. Remarkably, national entitlement was a unique predictor of prejudice towards the Chinese people, while national grandiosity was a unique predictor of negative attitudes towards the Chinese government. Both were unique predictors of China policy preferences.

Study 2: National narcissism in China

Study 1 provided preliminary evidence for the validity of national narcissism as well as its two internal dimensions. National narcissism was correlated with but also distinct

from other theoretically relevant constructs, such as narcissism at the individual level and CSE. National entitlement and national grandiosity were correlated with each other but also uniquely associated with national narcissism. More importantly, national narcissism predicted all outcome variables over and beyond rival predictors, as did national grandiosity and national entitlement, although they were differentially predictive of attitudes toward the Chinese people and the Chinese government.

In Study 2, we explored whether these findings could be generalized to other nations and extended to economic outcomes, specifically, the intention to purchase products from a competing nation. We did this in China by examining Chinese national narcissism, national grandiosity, and national entitlement with the U.S. as the target. As SDO and RWA do not travel well to China, we did not use them as covariates in Study 2.

Method

Participants

We conducted the survey online using Survey Monkey. The survey link was posted on a bulletin board system used by multiple Beijing colleges. Four hundred and sixty-nine Chinese participated in the survey and 436 completed the entire survey (252 male and 184 female). Their ages ranged from 11 to 66 years, with a mean of 24.87 ($SD = 6.78$). Sixty-four percent of the participants were college students. All completed the survey voluntarily, increasing our confidence in the quality of their responses.

Measures

To measure individual narcissism, we used the same NPI used in Study 1 (Schütz et al., 2004). The internal reliability in the Chinese sample was good ($\alpha = .77$). For national narcissism ($\alpha = .73$), CSE ($\alpha = .64$), U.S. policy ($\alpha = .66$),

prejudice towards the American people ($\alpha = .81$), negative attitudes towards the U.S. government ($\alpha = .75$), national grandiosity ($\alpha = .94$), and national entitlement ($\alpha = .84$), we also used scales identical to those used in Study 1, substituting “China” and “Chinese” for “America” and “Americans,” respectively. We also used five new items to measure willingness to purchase American products, adapted from Klein, Ettenson, and Morris (1998) by replacing “Japan” and “Japanese” with “America,” “American,” or “Americans” (see Appendix). The 7-point disagree-agree items included “I would feel guilty if I bought an American product” and “Whenever possible, I avoid buying American products.” The scale’s internal reliability was desirable ($\alpha = .77$). All scales were translated from English to Chinese. A back-translation procedure was used to ensure the equivalence of the scales.

Results

National narcissism: Descriptive statistics and discriminant validity

Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations for each scale as well as the zero-order correlations among the scales. Similar to Study 1, Chinese participants had more negative attitudes towards the American government than towards the American people, $t(436) = 21.63$, $p < .01$. Also similar to Study 1, small but positive correlations, although not significant, were found between national narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement on the one hand and individual narcissism on the other hand. Replicating Study 1, national narcissism, national grandiosity, and national entitlement showed moderate and statistically significant correlations with CSE. These correlations replicate the finding of Study 1 that national narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement were related to but distinct from theoretically relevant constructs.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics: Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-order Correlations (n = 436)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Narcissism (NPI)	0.36	0.23	1							
2. National narcissism	4.50	0.96	.04	1						
3. Collective self-esteem	5.44	1.26	.09	.46*	1					
4. U.S. policy	4.51	1.42	.08	.49*	.22*	1				
5. Negative attitudes towards the U.S. government	5.09	1.11	-.01	.31*	.22*	.37*	1			
6. Prejudice	3.89	1.12	.00	.25*	.18*	.38*	.46*	1		
7. Purchase intentions	3.27	1.07	.01	.42*	.29*	.31*	.30*	.43*	1	
8. National entitlement	3.55	1.09	.08	.62*	.27*	.42*	.22*	.37*	.35*	1
9. National grandiosity	4.62	1.28	.11*	.58*	.59*	.35*	.27*	.23*	.36*	.47*

* $p < .05$.

Table 5
Correlates of National Narcissism: Four Simultaneous Multiple Regressions

Outcome variable		Constant	Age	Sex	Narcissism	Collective self-esteem	National narcissism
Prejudice towards American people ($R^2 = .30$)	B	2.75	0.00	0.29	-0.09	0.07	2.58
	SE	0.40	0.00	0.11	0.23	0.05	0.06
	<i>t</i>	6.83	0.18	2.67	-0.39	1.50	4.15
	<i>p</i>	.00	.86	.01	.70	.14	.00
Negative attitudes towards U.S. government ($R^2 = .35$)	B	4.09	-0.02	0.26	-0.18	0.08	0.31
	SE	0.39	0.01	0.10	0.22	0.05	0.06
	<i>T</i>	10.53	-2.07	2.57	-0.81	1.80	5.16
	<i>p</i>	.00	.04	.01	.42	.07	.00
Tougher U.S. policy ($R^2 = .48$)	B	1.17	0.02	0.34	0.42	-0.01	0.75
	SE	0.46	0.01	0.12	0.26	0.05	0.07
	<i>t</i>	2.56	1.65	2.84	1.62	-0.26	10.74
	<i>p</i>	.01	.10	.01	.11	.79	.00
Purchase intentions ($R^2 = .43$)	B	0.67	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.10	0.33
	SE	0.36	0.01	0.10	0.21	0.04	0.07
	<i>t</i>	1.87	1.01	0.27	-0.05	2.32	4.98
	<i>p</i>	.06	.31	.79	.96	.02	.00

Internal dimensions: National entitlement and national grandiosity

Replicating Study 1, national grandiosity and national entitlement were significantly and moderately correlated with each other. Both, moreover, were strongly and positively correlated with national narcissism. To examine the unique association of national grandiosity and national entitlement with national narcissism, we regressed national narcissism onto both simultaneously. Consistent with Study 1, both national entitlement and national grandiosity uniquely predicted national narcissism, $B = 0.39$ and 0.28 , $SE = 0.03$ and 0.03 , $t = 13.45$ and 9.57 , respectively, both $ps < .01$. As for Study 1, these results suggested that national entitlement and national grandiosity are unique components of national narcissism.

International correlates: Policy preferences and purchase intentions

As shown in Table 4, national narcissism, national grandiosity, and national entitlement were significantly correlated with all outcome variables. To examine the unique role of national narcissism, we performed four regression analyses with national narcissism, individual narcissism, CSE, sex, and age as predictors, and with U.S. policy, negative attitudes toward the U.S. government, prejudice against the American people, and purchase intentions as outcomes. The results are displayed in Table 5. After controlling for age, sex, individual narcissism, and CSE, national narcissism was still predictive of all outcome variables. Specifically, greater national narcissism as a Chinese was associated with a pref-

erence for a tougher U.S. policy, more negative attitudes towards the American government and the American people, and less willingness to buy American products. Replicating Study 1, these findings demonstrate the unique predictive power of national narcissism.

To explore the unique contributions of national entitlement and national grandiosity to our four outcome variables, we conducted four more simultaneous multiple regressions, with age, sex, individual narcissism, and CSE as covariates. The results are displayed in Table 6.

Replicating and extending Study 1, both national grandiosity and national entitlement were unique predictors of U.S. policy preferences. And national entitlement but not national grandiosity was a unique predictor of prejudice against the American people. However, unlike for Study 1, both national grandiosity and national entitlement uniquely predicted negative attitudes towards the U.S. government. Also new to Study 2, both national grandiosity and national entitlement uniquely predicted intentions to purchase American products, while higher narcissism was associated with lower purchase intentions.

Discussion

This paper turns our attention from the narcissism of the self to narcissistic identification with the nation and its possible harmful consequences for interstate relations. In this paper, we replicate and extend the concept of collective narcissism (de Zavala et al., 2009) to explore the specific case of national narcissism. We also demonstrate that, like

Table 6*Correlates of National Entitlement and National Grandiosity: Four Simultaneous Multiple Regressions*

Outcome variable		Constant	Age	Sex	Narcissism	Collective self-esteem	National entitlement	National grandiosity
Prejudice towards American people ($R^2 = .40$)	B	2.57	0.00	0.25	-0.19	0.06	0.34	0.05
	SE	0.37	0.01	0.10	0.22	0.05	0.05	0.05
	<i>t</i>	6.98	0.08	2.38	-0.85	1.14	6.45	0.88
	<i>p</i>	.00	.94	.02	.40	.26	.00	.38
Negative attitudes towards U.S. Government ($R^2 = .33$)	B	4.46	-0.02	0.27	-0.28	0.08	0.12	0.14
	SE	0.37	0.01	0.10	0.23	0.05	0.05	0.05
	<i>t</i>	11.93	-2.13	2.57	-1.14	1.66	2.23	2.57
	<i>p</i>	.00	.03	.01	.26	.10	.03	.01
Tougher U.S. policy ($R^2 = .53$)	B	1.94	0.01	0.32	0.26	0.03	0.41	0.22
	SE	0.45	0.01	0.13	0.27	0.06	0.06	0.06
	<i>t</i>	4.35	1.27	2.59	0.97	0.50	6.55	3.39
	<i>p</i>	.00	.21	.10	.33	.62	.00	.00
Purchase intentions ($R^2 = .44$)	B	1.03	0.01	0.04	-0.12	0.10	0.23	0.18
	SE	0.35	0.01	0.10	0.21	0.05	0.05	0.05
	<i>t</i>	2.98	0.85	0.36	-0.58	2.12	4.77	3.16
	<i>p</i>	.00	.39	.72	.56	.03	.00	.00

narcissism at the individual level (Brown et al., 2009), national narcissism has two internal dimensions, national grandiosity and national entitlement. We conducted two studies, one in the U.S. and one in China, which examined American national narcissism and Chinese national narcissism, respectively. The studies demonstrated the validity of national narcissism as well as its two internal dimensions, national grandiosity and national entitlement.

Consistent with previous research on collective narcissism (de Zavala et al., 2009), we found low correlations between national narcissism and individual narcissism, but moderate correlations with CSE (Study 1 and Study 2), as well as SDO and RWA (Study 1). The low to moderate correlations suggest that national narcissism is both conceptually and empirically distinct from these related constructs. National narcissism was the most stable and powerful predictor of variance in all outcome variables. Notably, it predicted not only political outcomes (such as international attitudes and foreign policy preferences, Study 1 and Study 2) but also an economic outcome (purchase intentions, Study 2) over and above individual narcissism, CSE, and variables such as SDO and RWA, which are well established as reliable predictors of attitudes and behaviors towards outgroups. By contrast, individual narcissism and national CSE did not contribute any unique variance to the political outcome variables. This suggests that individual narcissism does not impact attitudes towards international affairs and that national narcissism, an excessive love of one's nation, is more harmful than patriotism (national CSE), a more positive love of or loyalty to one's own country.

Drawing on Brown et al. (2009), we further hypothesized that national narcissism would be composed of two distinct internal dimensions, national grandiosity and national entitlement. Our data supported this idea. First, like national narcissism, both national grandiosity and national entitlement were positively and moderately correlated with national CSE (Study 1 and Study 2), SDO, and RWA (Study 1). Second, although national grandiosity and national entitlement were significantly correlated with each other, they both predicted national narcissism uniquely. Notably, this pattern held true in both China and the U.S., suggesting the robustness of the relations. These findings provide convergent evidence about the distinctiveness and relatedness of national entitlement and national grandiosity as two internal dimensions of national narcissism.

By using diverse outcome variables, we found ample evidence of the unique predictive power of national entitlement and national grandiosity. For policy preferences toward the competing nation, both national entitlement and grandiosity were uniquely predictive (in both the U.S. and China); for prejudice against the people of the competing nation, national entitlement was predictive (in both the U.S. and China), but national grandiosity was not; for negative attitudes toward the competing government, both national entitlement (in China) and national grandiosity (in both the U.S. and China) were predictive; and for purchase intentions, both national entitlement and national grandiosity (in China) were predictive. These findings suggest that both national entitlement and national grandiosity are useful and

distinctive, although their predictive ability varied by outcome variable and culture.

A strength of our study is that we used relatively diverse samples from two different cultures. Psychological research is increasingly criticized for relying too heavily on well educated and largely White college students, undermining the external validity of research findings (e.g., Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010; Kitayama, 2010). As noted above, only 44.8% of the Study 1 sample and 64% the Study 2 sample were college students, the participants' age ranged from 18 to 66 years (Study 1) and 11 to 66 years (Study 2), and our second sample was not White but Chinese. Replication in other countries, particularly those associated with different psychological distances (or those construed at different levels; Trope & Liberman, 2010), however, is still needed to determine whether the findings obtained in this study can be reliably generalized to other international contexts.

The findings reported in this study have important implications. Theoretically, we contribute to the extant literature by introducing and validating the concept of national narcissism and its two internal dimensions, national grandiosity and national entitlement. This has implications for both individual difference psychology and political psychology.

These findings also have foreign policy implications. If national narcissism and its internal dimensions appear to have a greater impact on international attitudes than even CSE, SDO, and RWA, might some of the therapeutic interventions suggested in the narcissism literature be applied to national narcissism? We hope that national narcissism can help bridge the gap between the social psychological and personality sciences on the one hand, and political psychology on the other hand, and perhaps even contribute to the reduction of global conflict.

Acknowledgments

This research was partly supported by grants from the Knowledge Innovation Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (KSCX2-EW-J-8), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31070919), and the Hundred Talents Program (Y1CX153003) awarded to Huajian Cai.

Huajian Cai would like to thank Xitong Yue and Yi Feng for their help in recruiting participants for Study 2 in China. Peter Gries would like to thank the students in his Spring 2010 "Chinese Foreign Policy" class for their help in gathering survey responses for Study 1.

References

- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47–92. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60382-2
- Brown, R. P., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the meaning and measure of narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(7), 951–964. doi:10.1177/0146167209335461
- 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. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04
- Crowson, H. M., DeBacker, T. K., & Thoma, S. J. (2005). Does authoritarianism predict post-9/11 attitudes? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 1273–1283. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.06.005
- de Zavala, A. G., 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
- Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (2009). An emerging epidemic of narcissism or much ado about nothing? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(3), 498–501. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.010
- Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about Internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, 59, 93–104. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.93
- Gries, P. H., & Crowson, H. M. (2010). Political orientation, party affiliation, and American attitudes toward China. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 15(3), 219–244. doi:10.1007/s11366-010-9115-1
- Gries, P. H., Crowson, H. M., & Cai, H. (2012). God, guns, and . . . China? How ideology impacts American attitudes and policy preferences toward China. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 12(1), 1–40. doi:10.1093/irap/lcr012
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83. doi:10.1017/S0140525X0999152X
- Kitayama, S. (2010). Editorial. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(1), 3–4. doi:10.1177/0146167209355127
- Klein, J. G., Ettenson, R., & Morris, M. D. (1998). The animosity model of foreign product purchase: An empirical test in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 89–100.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302–318. doi:10.1177/0146167292183006
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The effect of survey mode and sampling on inferences about political attitudes and behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to Internet surveys with nonprobability samples. *Political Analysis*, 15, 286–323. doi:10.1093/pan/mpm003
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590. doi:10.2466/pr0.1979.45.2.590
- Schütz, A., Marcus, B., & Sellin, I. (2004). Die Messung Von Narzissmus als Persönlichkeitskonstrukt: Psychometrische Eigenschaften einer Lang- und einer Kurzform des Deutschen NPI (Narcissistic Personality Inventory) [Measurement of narcissism as a personality construct: Psychometric properties of a long- and short-form of the German NPI (Narcissistic Personality Inventory)]. *Diagnostica, 50*(4), 202–218. doi:10.1026/0012-1924.50.4.202
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review, 117*, 440–463. doi:10.1037/a0018963
- Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M. B., & Robins, R. W. (2008). Do today's young people really think they are so extraordinary? An examination of secular trends in narcissism and self-enhancement. *Psychological Science, 19*(2), 181–188. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02065.x
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2008). Mapping the scale of the narcissism epidemic: Increases in narcissism 2002–2007 within ethnic groups. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*(6), 1619–1622. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.06.014
- Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students, 1982–2009. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*, 99–106. doi:10.1177/1948550609355719
- Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality, 76*(4), 875–902. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00507.x
- Young, S. M., & Pinsky, D. (2006). Narcissism and celebrity. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(5), 463–471. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.05.005

Appendix

National Narcissism Scale (American version)[†]

- 1 I wish other countries would more quickly recognize American authority.
- 2 America deserves special treatment.
- 3 I will never be satisfied until America gets all that it deserves.
- 4 I insist that America get the respect that is due to it.
- 5 It really makes me angry when others criticize America.
- 6 If America had a bigger say in the world, the world would be a much better place.
- 7 I do NOT get upset when people do NOT notice American achievements. (Reverse coded.)

- 8 Not many people seem to fully understand American importance.
- 9 America's true worth is often misunderstood.

[†]Adapted from the Collective Narcissism Scale developed by de Zavala et al. (2009).

National Entitlement (NE) Scale (American version)[†]

- 1 I honestly feel that America is more deserving than other countries.
- 2 Great things should come to America.
- 3 America does NOT necessarily deserve special treatment. (Reverse coded.)
- 4 Countries like America deserve an extra break now and then.
- 5 Things should go America's way.
- 6 America is entitled to more of everything.

[†]Adapted from the Psychological Entitlement Scale developed by Campbell et al. (2004).

National Grandiosity (NG) Scale (American version)[†]

Please rate the extent to which the following traits apply to *America in general*.

- 1 Perfect
- 2 Prestigious
- 3 Extraordinary
- 4 Acclaimed
- 5 Superior
- 6 Prominent
- 7 Heroic
- 8 High-status
- 9 Omnipotent
- 10 Brilliant
- 11 Unrivalled
- 12 Dominant
- 13 Authoritative
- 14 Envied
- 15 Glorious
- 16 Powerful

[†]Adapted from the Narcissistic Grandiosity Scale developed by Rosenthal et al. (2007).

Prejudice against the Chinese people

How much do you agree or disagree with the statements about Chinese people?

- 1 The Chinese people are devious.
- 2 The Chinese people are trustworthy.
- 3 The Chinese people are dishonest.
- 4 The Chinese people are friendly.

Negative attitudes towards the Chinese government

How would you characterize the Chinese government?

- 1 The Chinese government is devious.
- 2 The Chinese government is trustworthy.
- 3 The Chinese government is dishonest.
- 4 The Chinese government is friendly.

China policy

- 1 The U.S. government should engage China through an active diplomacy that seeks to improve the relationship between our two countries. (Reverse coded.)

- 2 The best way to deal with China is to build up our military to counter Chinese power.
- 3 The U.S. government should pursue a tougher China policy.
- 4 Our government should adopt a friendlier foreign policy towards China. (Reverse coded.)

Purchase intentions[†]

- 1 I would feel guilty if I bought an American product.
- 2 I would never buy an American car.
- 3 Whenever possible, I avoid buying American products.
- 4 Whenever available, I would prefer to buy products made in America.
- 5 I do not like the idea of owning American products.

[†]Adapted from the Purchase Intention Scale developed by Klein et al. (1998).