



INSTITUTO
UNIVERSITÁRIO
DE LISBOA

Uncertainty in times of COVID-19 pandemic: an exploratory analysis of the predictors of collective narcissism

Raquel Carvalheiro

Master in Psychology of Intercultural Relations

Supervisor:

Doctor Rita Guerra, Integrated researcher,

ISCTE - University Institute of Lisbon

October, 2021



CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS
E HUMANAS

Uncertainty in times of COVID-19 pandemic: an exploratory analysis of the predictors of collective narcissism

Raquel Carvalheiro

Master in Psychology of Intercultural Relations

Supervisor:

Doctor Rita Guerra, Integrated researcher,

ISCTE - University Institute of Lisbon

October, 2021

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Rita Guerra, for all her support and care during this journey. Thank you for everything I had a chance to learn with you, for the time invested, for being always present for all my doubts and concerns and for the help in making my abstract ideas transforming into this work.

Thank you, all my participants, for taking a bit of your precious time to participate in my study.

A special thank you to all the beautiful people that I have around me. For all the philosophical conversations about people and societies that led to my idea for my dissertation. Thanks, to all of you that helped me in the process of making this thesis, for your comments, corrections, and insights. Thanks, for all of you that made me laugh, that made me food and for the love. All of you were really important to me.

Thank you to my family for encouraging me, for the help and support since the beginning. A special thank you to my brother that listen to my 1000 complains and made me go out of the house for a coffee.

I am grateful for the process of making this dissertation, for making me grow and for making me think differently.

Resumo

A pandemia da COVID-19 criou um contexto de incerteza sem precedentes, com consequências evidentes nas relações intergrupais. O presente estudo visa compreender melhor a dinâmica da identificação social, nomeadamente relativamente ao próprio grupo nacional, perante um contexto de grande incerteza derivado da pandemia do COVID-19. Mais especificamente, examina como os diferentes motivos para a identidade estão relacionados com as diferentes formas de positividade do endogrupo (ou seja, satisfação endogrupal e o narcisismo coletivo) e as suas consequências para as relações intergrupais. Os dados foram recolhidos através de um questionário online (N=227). Os resultados mostraram que os motivos: significado, distintividade e eficácia estão positivamente relacionados com o narcisismo coletivo. Enquanto que os motivos: significado e a autoestima estão positivamente relacionados com a satisfação endogrupal. Contrariamente ao esperado, o motivo de pertença apresentou-se negativamente relacionado com a satisfação endogrupal e a incerteza pessoal não se encontrou relacionada nem com a satisfação endogrupal nem com o narcisismo coletivo. Os diferentes motivos para a identidade também demonstraram estar indiretamente relacionados com diferentes consequências intergrupais, através do narcisismo coletivo e da satisfação endogrupal. Enquanto que os motivos: significado e eficácia estavam relacionados com a hostilidade para com exogrupo através do narcisismo coletivo; os motivos auto-estima, significado e pertença estavam relacionados com a solidariedade durante a pandemia da COVID-19 através da satisfação endogrupal. Estes resultados permitem enriquecer o conhecimento sobre os preditores do narcisismo coletivo.

Palavras-chave: narcisismo coletivo, satisfação do endogrupo, incerteza pessoal, motivos para a identificação, relações intergrupais.

Códigos Classificação APA:

3020 Grupo e Processos Interpessoais

2900 Processos Pessoais e Problemas Sociais

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has created an unprecedented context of uncertainty, posing pronounced consequences on intergroup relations. The present study aims at better understanding the dynamics of social identification, specifically towards one's national ingroup, under a context of high uncertainty driven by the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, it examines whether and how different identity motives are related with different forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., ingroup satisfaction and collective narcissism) and its consequences for intergroup relations. Data was collected via online questionnaires (N=227). The overall results showed that the motives meaning, distinctiveness and efficacy positively predicted collective narcissism. Whereas the motives meaning and self-esteem positively predicted ingroup satisfaction. Contrary to expect the belonging motive negatively predicted ingroup satisfaction and self-uncertainty was not related to neither ingroup satisfaction nor collective narcissism. The different identity motives also showed to be indirectly related with different intergroup consequences, via collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction. While meaning and efficacy were related with outgroup hostility via collective narcissism; self-esteem, meaning and belonging were related to solidarity during COVID-19 pandemic via ingroup satisfaction. These findings advanced the knowledge on the predictors of collective narcissism.

Keywords: collective narcissism, ingroup satisfaction, self-uncertainty, identity motives, intergroup relations

PsychINFO codes:

3020 Group & Interpersonal Processes

2900 Social Processes & Social Issues

Table of contents:

Acknowledgments	i
Resumo	ii
Abstract	iii
Index of tables	v
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1 Literature review	3
1.1.1 Collective narcissism and Ingroup satisfaction.....	3
1.1.2 Identity Motives	5
1.1.3 Self-uncertainty in times of COVID-19 pandemic	8
1.2 Present Study.....	10
Chapter 2. Method.....	12
2.1. Participants	12
2.2 Procedure.....	12
2.3 Measures	13
Chapter 3. Results	15
3.1 Discriptive and Correlational analysis.....	15
3.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis.....	15
3.3 Indirect Effects of Idedity Motives.....	21
Chapter 4. Discussion.....	24
4.1 Collective narcissism.....	24
4.2 Ingroup satisfaction	27
4.3 Self-Uncertainty.....	29
4.4 Limitation	30
4.5 Conclusion.....	31
References	32
Appendix A	39

Index of tables

Table 3.1	17
Table 3.2.....	18
Table 3.3.....	20
Table 3.4.....	22
Table 3.5.....	23

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

On the 11th of March 2020, the World Health Organization declared the COVID-19 virus a global pandemic. According to the general secretary of the United Nations, António Guterres, this current pandemic is the most crucial worldwide crisis since the Second World War (UN, 2020). Its consequences and repercussions are being felt worldwide. Up until now, millions of people around the world have died (see John Hopkins University's Coronavirus Resource Centre), bringing along a grand amount of collective suffering and lost. As the pandemic persists, not only health related concerns, but also noticeable economic, political, and social concerns have emerged.

The COVID-19 pandemic has had an extreme effect on global economy, with a great number of workers losing their jobs and many sectors closing, mostly due to forced travel restrictions and lockdown measures aimed to reduce the spread of the virus. Economists foresee a global recession in the next years. International and political relations have also been affected by the consequences of the pandemic, posing numerous challenges on the attempts for international collaborations, with exacerbated political tensions, conflicts, and polarizations (Bonotti & Zech, 2021).

Indeed, the pandemic's effects on the social sphere are still quite unknown but expected to be long-lasting. Recent research suggested that the COVID-19 pandemic triggered increased outgroup hostility, with results showing that thinking about the pandemic increased feelings of exclusion towards people of other nations (Bartoš et al., 2020). A possible explanation for the increase of xenophobia and negative attitudes towards immigrants may be the feelings of uncertainty, lack of control and the rise of authoritarianism triggered by the perception of threat and competition (Esses & Hamilton, 2021). The current pandemic created an unprecedented context of uncertainty for the general-public, thereby increasing and exacerbating social problems and hence raising several theoretical and practical questions for social psychological research (e.g., group processes and intergroup relations, political ideologies and morality and ethics) (Rosenfeld et al., 2021). Thus, researchers highlighted the importance of conducting research in this unprecedented time, since COVID-19 pandemic presented to also be a social phenomenon, hence able to influence human behavior (Jetten, et al., 2021; Rosenfeld et al., 2021).

Social psychological research has shown that high self-uncertainty (i.e., uncertainty about one's feelings, perceptions, and values, that are important in a specific context) is associated with several detrimental outcomes (e.g., increased anxiety, stress and discomfort and reduced feelings of control) (Hogg, 2007, 2012). Recent meta analytical evidence supports the proposal that individuals who are highly self-uncertain cope with this by identifying more strongly with social groups and categories (Choi & Hogg, 2020). Individual's group membership and social identification influence their intergroup behaviors (Tajfel and Turner 1979; Amiot & Sansfac, 2011). Therefore, in the context of a pandemic, which creates high uncertainty, one can expect that individuals may show stronger group identification. However, research shows that individuals have different positive beliefs about the groups they identify with, which ultimately trigger different intergroup consequences (Amiot & Aubin, 2013; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009).

Hence, experiencing a crisis as the current pandemic may depict a suitable ground to foster negative intergroup consequences. The current research seeks to better understand the dynamics of social identification, specifically towards one's national ingroup, under a context of high uncertainty, by examining several predictors of different forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., ingroup satisfaction and collective narcissism) and its consequences for intergroup relations. Specifically, this study focuses on two different forms of ingroup positivity: national ingroup satisfaction and national collective narcissism. National ingroup satisfaction refers to one's positive feelings about the national ingroup and one's membership in it (Leach et al., 2008), and has been conceptualized as a genuine, non-narcissistic and confident positive evaluation of the ingroup (Chichoska, 2016; Golec de Zavala et al., 2013). National collective narcissism on the other hand refers to the belief that the national ingroup's exceptionality and greatness are not sufficiently recognized by others (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Recent research shows that although both refer to positive beliefs about one's national group, they have different consequences for intergroup relations. Whereas collective narcissism is consistently related to hostility, aggression, and prejudice towards the outgroup, national ingroup satisfaction is not (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013; Golec de Zavala, 2020; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Recent work on collective narcissism within the current pandemic context showed that whereas collective narcissism predicted reduced social solidarity in the face of the global pandemic, ingroup satisfaction predicted increased solidarity (Federico et al., 2020).

While the consequences and intergroup outcomes of these different forms of ingroup positivity are well established, less is known about their predictors. There is evidence that individuals with low self-esteem tend to manifest hostility towards the outgroup, and this relation is mediated by collective narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b). Recent research also showed

that perceived intergroup threat (i.e., integrated and distinctiveness threat) is an important predictor of collective narcissism, which then triggers negative intergroup outcomes (Guerra et al., 2020). Building on the theoretical framework of the Multiple Motives of Identity Construction (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012; Vignoles et al., 2006), that proposes six motives involved on identity construction (i.e., self-esteem, meaning, distinctiveness, continuity, belonging, efficacy) we suggest that these motives can also be associated with different forms of ingroup positivity. Thus, this research aims at extending the current knowledge on predictors of collective narcissism by: a) examining which identity motives are associated with collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction during the current context of high uncertainty; and b) how these identity motives relate to different intergroup outcomes, such as outgroup hostility and solidarity, via collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction.

The COVID-19 pandemic represents a severe challenge for societies, having profound consequences at many levels, being group processes one of them (Bonotti & Zech, 2021; Rosenfeld et al., 2021). Using a social psychological lens to explore the triggers and consequences of different forms of national positivity within the ongoing pandemic context, ultimately contributes to a better understanding of these dynamics and possible ways to mitigate its negative outcomes.

Next, we present the main theoretical constructs examined in this study. First, we will dwell on the constructs of collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction, and its relationship with the different identity motives and Self-Uncertainty Theory. The following chapters present the method and results of the study, and finally in the last chapter we discussed the results found, limitations and the future research directions.

1.1 Literature review

1.1.1 Collective Narcissism and Ingroup Satisfaction

Collective narcissism describes the enduring belief that one's ingroup is exceptional and entitled to privileged treatment but not sufficiently recognized by others (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a). Different than individual narcissism, which happens on an individual level, collective narcissism focuses on a social level of the self, implying the demand of special recognition and privilege on a group level (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). The term collective narcissism was first used by scholars of the "Frankfurt school", such as Theodor Adorno and Erich Fromm, and it was inspired by the psychoanalytic interpretation of

social problems. However, current conceptualizations of collective narcissism are not anchored in psychoanalytic approaches and collective narcissism is not seen a pathology, a psychological trait or as originating in unconscious causes, contrary, it is viewed as a belief about one's social group (Zavala et al., 2019a).

Collective narcissism has been found to predict various negative outcomes: the use of perceived immigrant threat rhetoric in the Brexit campaign's in the UK (Golec de Zavala et al., 2017); the election of president Trump in the USA and the increase of conspiracy thinking (Golec de Zavala & Federico, 2018); the European's rejection of Syrian refugees (Dyduch-Hazar et al., 2019) and even the support for the election of populist governments in Eastern Europe (Marchlewska et al., 2018), such as the voting for Victor Orban in Hungary (Forgas & Lantos, 2019). Besides these negative consequences, collective narcissism has also been recently associated with decreased group-based solidarity and collective action intentions towards a disadvantaged outgroup (Górska et al., 2020). These findings clearly provide consistent evidence for the proposal that endorsement of collective narcissism has many detrimental consequences on intergroup relations.

In the context of the current global pandemic, results of a survey conducted with a sample of Polish adults showed that endorsement of national collective narcissism undermined the attempts to unite and mobilize people to work together against a global public-health crisis. On the other hand, feelings of satisfaction and pride for being a member of one's national ingroup (i.e., ingroup satisfaction) were associated with a higher desire to act in solidarity with the ones in need (Federico et al., 2020).

Indeed, previous research shows that both types of ingroup positivity represent different forms of positive beliefs about the ingroup and are associated with different outcomes. Ingroup satisfaction is a belief that one's ingroup is highly valued, without the narcissistic component. That is, it is a form of love for one's ingroup that is not contingent on others recognition, it is related with outgroup positivity (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020; Zavala et al., 2013) and with a stronger resistance to threat, feelings of happiness and pride, and also with the promotion of tolerant attitudes towards outgroups (Cichocka, 2016). Collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction are different forms of expressing ingroup positivity and relate differently to several intergroup outcomes.

In other words, collective narcissism is an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief that the ingroup is exceptional, therefore demanding constant admiration, acknowledgment, and privilege (Golec de Zavala, 2019a; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Since this inflated image of

the ingroup is contingent of external validation and the need of social recognition is never satisfied, individuals high on collective narcissism are more hypersensitive to threats to the group recognition, status or anything that undermines their ingroup position (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020, Golec de Zavala et al., 2016), than individuals with high ingroup satisfaction. Thus, they express a greater concern of how the group image reflects on their own, which may be explained by the complex link of collective narcissism and self-esteem. Low self-esteem was found to be related with outgroup derogation via increased collective narcissism, when the overlap with national ingroup satisfaction was partialled out (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b). This suggests that an undermined self-esteem can motivate people to sustain collective narcissist beliefs about their ingroup as an attempt of enhancing the positive evaluation of the ingroup, and ultimately of the self. However, studies showed that higher collective narcissism does not lead to higher self-esteem (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b). Besides self-esteem, other individual level variables have also been shown to predict collective narcissism. For instance, research shows that collective narcissism is predicted by a decreased sense of personal control (Cichocka et al., 2018) and by vulnerable narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a).

Recent research focusing on the intergroup predictors of collective narcissism showed that different forms of intergroup threat, specifically, integrated and distinctiveness threats predicted both collective narcissism and national ingroup satisfaction, but only collective narcissism mediated the relation between threat and negative emotions and hostile behavioral intentions, when the overlap with ingroup satisfaction was partialled out (Guerra et al., 2020). Despite this recent evidence, most research has focused on the consequences of collective narcissism, and less is known about what predicts collective narcissism and other forms of ingroup positivity such as national ingroup satisfaction. Thus, understanding the different motivations that underlie collective narcissism and national ingroup satisfaction may help to shed light on why different forms of national ingroup positivity are differently related to intergroup outcomes (Amiot & Aubin, 2011). Building on the theoretical framework of the Multiple Motives of Identity Construction (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012; Vignoles et al., 2006), the present study aims at exploring the underlying identity motives of collective narcissism and national ingroup satisfaction during the context of high uncertainty emerging from the Covid-19 pandemic.

1.1.2 Identity Motives

The literature on motivated identity construction is vast, seeking to explain what motivates people to identify with a certain social group. For example, in Social Identity Theory, Tajfel and

Turner (1979) proposed that establishing a positive distinctiveness of the ingroup in relation to a relevant outgroup is one way to achieve a positive social identity, that leads to a sense of self-esteem and pride that people try to sustain and maintain. Abram and Hogg (1988) suggested the Self-esteem Hypothesis, which is rooted in the Social Identity Theory, and postulates that people strive to maintain a positive self-esteem, which they achieve by making an ingroup positively distinct from an outgroup, thereby enhancing the group's self-image and hence also their own self-esteem. However, this focus on self-esteem as the main motive for identification has been questioned by various scholars over time (Abram & Hogg, 1988; Vignoles et al, 2002; Vignoles et al, 2006).

Indeed, other scholars proposed that identity construction is driven by a need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) or by a need for distinctiveness (Vignoles et al., 2000). The optimal distinctiveness theory suggested that individuals can satisfy these two opposing needs through social identification. The need to belong can be satisfied through ingroup inclusion and the need for distinctiveness through inter-group differentiation, and the optimal balance of satisfaction of these two needs helps people develop adaptive personal and social identities (Brewer, 1991). Besides belonging and distinctiveness, the literature also suggested that people are motivated to identify with a group that provides a sense of connection across time and situations, that is are motivated by a need for continuity (Breakwell, 1987). Moreover, under conditions of subjective uncertainty people seek to identify with social groups, especially the ones that have clearly defined meanings (i.e., self-uncertainty need, see Hogg, 2007, 2012).

The present study builds on the theoretical framework of the Multiple Motives of Identity Construction (MICT; Vignoles, et al., 2006; Vignoles, 2011), that appeared to be particularly suitable to studying the underlying predictors of different forms of ingroup positivity, such as collective narcissism. This model aims at integrating predictions from several established theories of the motivations underlying social identification. Specifically, it proposes that there are six fundamental psychological motives that guide people to identify towards a certain social group and away from others (Vignoles et al., 2006). The self-esteem motive which refers to how people are motivated to construct identities that allow them to see themselves in a positive way. The meaning motive, that refers to the fact that people are motivated to construct identities that give them a sense that their life is meaningful. The distinctiveness motive suggests that people are motivated to construct and maintain identities that are distinct from others. The continuity motive proposes that people are motivated to construct identities that connect their past, present, and future identities across time. The belonging motive suggests that people are motivated to construct identities that give them a sense of inclusion or acceptance by important

others. Finally, the efficacy motive, proposing that individuals are motivated to construct identities that make them feel competent and capable of influencing their environment.

The motives are defined as psychological motivations that guide people towards identifying with certain groups instead of others, to achieve a certain sense of self (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012). Those aspects of one's identity (e.g., being a father, a professor, a feminist, a student) that best satisfied these motivations are seen as more central to self-definition, thus people tend to identify with groups that better satisfy these motivations and avoid the ones that frustrate them (Vignoles et al., 2006). The authors found that the motives are differently involved in different identity processes (i.e., identity definition and identity enactment) (Vignoles et al., 2006).

Processes of identity definition refer to cognitive processes of defining oneself as a symbolic object with particular characteristics and descriptive labels, whereas processes of identity enactment refer to behavioral processes of expressing aspects of a certain identity. In other words, those identity aspects that best satisfy the six motives tend to be perceived as more central and important to a self-defining identity and are more likely to be presented in a social interaction (Vignoles, 2011). Vignoles and colleagues (2006, study 4), found that the motives for self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, and meaning, were more involved in self-defining processes, whereas the motives for self-esteem, belonging, and efficacy were directly involved with processes of identity enactment. The motive for self-esteem showed to directly influence both definition and enactment processes. Research also showed that people tended to desire future versions of themselves that satisfy the motives of self-esteem, efficacy, meaning and continuity while fearing the ones that frustrate these same motives (Vignoles et al., 2008).

Vignoles and Moncaster (2007) created a new methodology to measure individual differences in ingroup favoritism using the strength of identity motives. In other words, the authors calculated the ratings of perceived centrality and motive satisfaction of multiple identity aspects for each individual as strength scores and used them to measure individual differences of the six identity motives, examining its relation with ingroup favoritism. The results showed that the strength of both distinctiveness and belonging motives predicted national ingroup favoritism, and this relation was moderated by ingroup identification. However, belonging and distinctiveness were differently associated with evaluations of the national ingroup and outgroup: belonging predicted positive evaluations of the ingroup, whereas distinctiveness predicted negative evaluations of the outgroup.

A five-wave longitudinal study investigated if the satisfaction of different motives was related with different types of groups memberships (i.e., newly formed interpersonal network

groups and abstract social categories). The results showed that individuals identify with newly formed interpersonal network groups (university flat mates) if the behavioral interactions with the group members provide them with a sense of efficacy, belonging, and self-esteem (involving processes of identity enactment). Whereas individuals identify with established social categories (university halls of residences) if they associate group membership with motives of meaning, self-esteem, and distinctiveness (involving processes of identity definition). The results suggested not just that there were different motives involved in identifying with different types of groups memberships but also related these various motives with different identity processes (i.e., identity definition and identity enactment) (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012).

Finally, MICT proposes that the identity motives are universal, although, different cultures may develop different ways of satisfying each of the motives and thus result in different consequences across cultural settings (for review see Vignoles, 2011; Becker et al., 2010).

To our knowledge, no previous studies examined the role of identity motives on collective narcissism. The MICT is useful for this purpose because it offers an integrated model of different identity motivations and appeared to be related with different identity processes and with different groups memberships (Vignoles et al., 2006; Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012). Hence, we propose that identity motives associated with a certain aspect of one's identity (i.e., national identification) can also predict different forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction) (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020).

Moreover, since this study was conducted during the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, we further explore how feelings of self-uncertainty can also predict collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction (Hogg, 2007; Abrams et al., 2021).

1.1.3 Self-Uncertainty in times of COVID-19 pandemic

Besides the six motives discussed above as part of MICT (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012; Vignoles et al., 2006), the present study further explored self-uncertainty motive, as proposed by the theory of motivated social identification, Self-uncertainty Theory (SUT: Hogg., 2000, 2007, 2012). The SUT suggests that under high self-uncertainty (i.e., uncertainty about one's feelings, perceptions, attitudes, and values, that are important in a specific context) people will be motivated to identify strongly with a self-inclusive group. As individuals tend to strive for a reduction of uncertainty, the identification within a certain social group may serve this goal (see Hogg, 2012, 2007). Thus, we suggest that the uncertainty driven by the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, can be related to both forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., collective narcissism and

ingroup satisfaction), since enhancing ingroup positivity may be a mean of uncertainty reduction.

The SUT relied on the idea that social identification is associated with self-categorization. That is, self-categorization is an important process involved with identification and uncertainty reduction, since, when an individual self-categorizes as a member of a specific group, certain attributes and labels are assigned to them. Thus, one is viewed as representative of the group prototype, rather than as a unique individual. This process is called depersonalization and is a key process of group identification and uncertainty reduction (Hogg, 2007).

The conformation to the group prototype describes and prescribes how the individual should act, behave, and feel. Thus, group identification provides a sense of self and validation of worldview, since the same prototype of “us” and “them” is shared, which may reduce uncertainty. In other words, high levels of self-uncertainty will enhance social identification (Abrams & Hogg, 2010). Another proposition of the theory is that people seek out highly entitative groups to identify with (i.e., groups with distinct and coherent structure and with clear intergroup boundaries). The identification with a highly entitative group is better at reducing uncertainty than with a low entitative group, because it provides a simple, coherent and distinct group prototype, making one’s own and other’s behaviors more predictable (Hogg et al., 2007).

Since self-uncertainty can be triggered by contextual sources, we propose that the unprecedented pandemic context can induce feelings of self-uncertainty, and thus influence the processes of social identification (Hogg, 2007, 2012; Abrams et al., 2021). As the pandemic persists, the external environment becomes less predictable and stable and thus, self-uncertainty is likely to increase. Individuals desire a degree of self-certainty necessary for their psychological well-being and for living in a stable environment (Hogg, 2007, 2012). Thus, facing a highly uncertain and unprecedented crisis like the COVID-19 pandemic may encourage people to compensate their decreased self-certainty by identifying more strongly with a superordinate category (e.g., national group), guiding them to internalize a shared group identity and prototype (Abrams et al., 2021).

Additionally, research also suggests that circumstances of extreme uncertainty can trigger a desperate need for belonging and recognition, which in turn can strengthen identification with extremist groups and identities, populist ideologies and with autocratic leaders (Hogg, 2012, 2020). Since these extreme forms of identity foster protective agendas grounded in extremist group structures, giving them distinct and clear boundaries of the group, they may function to compensate the self-uncertainty. However, extremist, and populist identities were found to promote hostility and violence (Hogg et al., 2010; Hogg, 2020), underlining the dangers that self-

uncertainty and the consequent high identification with such groups bring along. Ultimately high self-uncertainty can increase prejudices towards minority groups as outgroup derogation may help maintaining the ingroup positivity, thus reducing self-uncertainty, which is what individuals strive for after all (Abrams, et al., 2021).

In sum, the current pandemic and the high levels of uncertainty associated with it can impact group identification processes and intergroup outcomes, beyond other identity motives considered within MICT. Thus, it is important to understand whether self-uncertainty motivates different forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction).

1.2 Present Study

This study aims at exploring the motives that underlay different forms on ingroup positivity (i.e., collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction). Building on the framework of MICT (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012; Vignoles et al., 2006), we explored whether and how different identity motives are related with collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction. Considering that the current pandemic context can increase levels of uncertainty worldwide (Hogg, 2007; Abrams et al., 2021), we further explored the role of self-uncertainty as an additional motive for identification that is not considered in the MICT (e.g., Hogg., 2000, 2007, 2012). We conducted an exploratory cross-sectional study to explore a) whether and how identity motives (i.e., self-esteem, meaning, distinctiveness, continuity, belonging, efficacy, and uncertainty) are associated with collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction; and b) how the two forms of ingroup positivity are then associated with different intergroup outcomes, such as outgroup hostility and solidarity during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Considering the lack of previous empirical evidence regarding the relation of identity motives and different forms of ingroup positivity, and the consequent exploratory nature of the study we refrained from establishing directional hypotheses for each identity motive specifically. Nonetheless, previous research examined the link between self-esteem and collective narcissism, showing that low self-esteem is related with increased collective narcissism and indirectly to outgroup hostility, whereas ingroup satisfaction was related with higher self-esteem (see Golec de Zavala, 2019a; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). Thus, although in the current study self-esteem is conceptualized as a motive (i.e., the motivation to construct identities that allow individuals to see themselves in a positive way) and not as in Golec and collaborators (2009; 2019b), we expect that the self-esteem motive may be associated with collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction in opposing ways.

Moreover, we expect that the distinctiveness motive will be associated with both collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction, as recent research showed lack of distinctiveness from a relevant outgroup was positively related to both forms of ingroup positivity (Guerra et al., 2020). Additionally, Vignoles and Moncaster (2007) showed that individual differences on the motives of distinctiveness and belonging predicted national ingroup favoritism. Thus, we also can expect that in addition to distinctiveness motive, the belonging motive will be also associated with both collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction. Regarding the continuity motive, Smeekes & Verkuyten (2015) suggested that the need for collective self-continuity can foster a motivational basis for national group identification. In line with this reasoning, Smeekes & Verkuyten (2013), have found that existential threats to one's national identity, enhance feelings of collective self-continuity, when controlling for the motives of collective self-esteem and collective belonging. Collective self-continuity in turn, resulted in increased attempts to defend the ingroup culture and identity through outgroup opposition and rejection of European integration. Threats to self-continuity motive seem to be related with outgroup hostility, thus we expect a similar pattern of results in the current this study.

Due to the lack of research regarding the remaining motives (meaning and efficacy) we will explore if and how they relate with collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction.

Similarly, research on self-uncertainty and different modes of ingroup positivity is scarce, and to the best of our knowledge no previous study examined the specific impact of self-uncertainty on collective narcissism. Nevertheless, we suggest that self-uncertainty may be positively related to collective narcissism, since high levels of self-uncertainty have been shown to motivate individuals to identify with extreme groups, which are associated with negative outcomes, such as populist ideology, outgroup hostility and violence (Hogg, 2007, 2012, 2020).

Finally, we examined if the different identity motives were indirectly related to intergroup outcomes, via collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction. We focused on two social relevant outcomes: outgroup hostility, as the current pandemic impacted intergroup relations, exacerbating prejudice and discrimination (Krings et al., 2021); and solidarity during the covid-19 pandemic. Previous research showed that collective narcissism, but not ingroup satisfaction, is consistently related with outgroup hostility (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a; Golec de Zavala, 2009; Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020), and recently it has also been associated with decreased solidarity during the pandemic, whereas ingroup satisfaction predicted greater solidarity (Federico et al., 2020). We therefore expect a similar pattern in the present study.

CHAPTER 2

Method

2.1 Participants

Participants were required to be older than 18 years old and to have Portuguese citizenship. Overall, 344 participants were recruited. From these, 117 participants were excluded, because they did not answer the survey and were considered dropouts. Most of these participants opened the questionnaire but did not answer to any question. Others filled in less than 50% of the survey, stopping their participations after the first block of questions. The final sample included 227 participants.

Age of participants ranged from 18 to 68 years old ($M = 35.3$, $SD = 12.7$). 61.2% of participants identified as female. 66.2% had a higher educational degree (bachelor or postgraduation), 21.3% finished high school and 6.7% did a professional course, only 5.7% reported not having complete the mandatory school years. Most participants were employed (66.1%), 18.3% were students and 10.7% were unemployed. The majority of the participants was born in Portugal (88.7%) and identified as Portuguese (99,6%). Regarding the political orientation, the sample presented a rather central political view ($M = 3.82$; $SD = 1.66$, range:1-7).

2.2 Procedure

Participants were recruited for an online questionnaire through social media (Facebook and Instagram). The study was approved by the ISCTE ethical commission on 7th May 2021. The questionnaire was divided in four main blocks assessing the variables of interest (predictor variables, mediators, outcome variables and sociodemographics), and took approximately seven minutes for completion. Informed consent was obtained at the beginning of the questionnaire, informing that the study was voluntary, confidential, and anonymous. After this, all measures were presented in the following order: identity motives, self-uncertainty, national ingroup satisfaction, national collective narcissism, outgroup hostility, covid-19 solidarity, and finally sociodemographic variables¹. All items of all scales were presented in a randomized order and all measures used a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 7 (“Strongly agree”),

¹ Additional measures were collected considering the exploratory nature of the study: attitudes towards immigrants (General Evaluation Scale: Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997), vote for the Portuguese presidential election, and ingroup identification sub-dimensions (centrality, solidarity, self-stereotyping and ingroup homogeneity)

unless said otherwise. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were debriefed and had the opportunity to participate on a lottery to win a voucher from FNAC (50 €). Participants who chose to participate in the lottery were redirected to another link to provide the necessary information.

2.3 Measures

Identity Motives were assessed with six items adapted from Easterbrook & Vignoles, (2012). Each item measured one of the six identity motives: Belonging: “How much does being Portuguese give you a sense that you “belong”—that you are included among or accepted by people that.”; Meaning: “How much does being Portuguese give you a sense that your life is meaningful?”; Self-esteem: “How much does being Portuguese make you see yourself positively?”; Continuity: “How much does being Portuguese make you feel that your past, present, and future are connected?”; Distinctiveness: “How much do you feel that being Portuguese distinguishes you—in any sense—from other people?”; Efficacy: “How much does being Portuguese make you feel competent and capable?”. Participants indicated their answers using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (“Not at all”) to 7 (“Very much”).

Self -Uncertainty was measured using five items adapted from Rast, et al. (2012), (e.g., “I am uncertain about myself, $\alpha = .88$). Items were aggregated in a single index, where higher values indicated higher levels of self-uncertainty.

National Collective Narcissism was assessed using the five-item Portuguese version of the Collective Narcissism scale (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009). (e.g., “I will never be satisfied until Portugal gets the recognition it deserves”, $\alpha = .85$). Items were aggregated in a single index, where higher values indicated higher levels of national collective narcissism.

Ingroup satisfaction was assessed with four items of the Portuguese version of the Multi-dimensional Scale of Identification (Ramos & Alves, 2011), (e.g., “I’m glad to be Portuguese.”, $\alpha = .89$). The four items were aggregated in a single index, where higher values indicated higher levels of ingroup satisfaction.

Outgroup Hostility was assessed with ten items adapted from Mackie, Devos & Smith (2000). Participants indicated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (“Not at all”) to 7 (“Very much”), to what extent they want to move against or away from immigrants: “confront them”, “oppose them”, “attack them”, “offend them”, “hurt them”, “intimidate them”, “humiliate them”,

“avoid them”, and “ignore them” “have nothing to do with them” ($\alpha = .82$). Items were aggregated in a single index, where higher values indicated a higher level of hostility towards immigrants.

Solidarity during covid-19, was assessed using six items adapted from Federico, et al. (2020). Sample item: “We should be united because we all can be infected by coronavirus”. The scale shown an adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .79$). Items were aggregated in a single index, where higher values indicated higher levels of solidarity during the covid-19 pandemic.

Political Orientation was measured using one item from the European Social Survey (round 7th, 2014). Higher values indicate a right-wing political orientation and lower scores a left-wing one.

Results

3.1 Descriptive and correlations

The analyses were conducted with the statistics-software IBM SPSS 27. Descriptives and zero-order correlations are presented in Table 3.1. Overall, identity motives were positively related to both collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction (see Table 3.1), whereas self-uncertainty was only negatively related with ingroup satisfaction. Regarding the outcome variables, outgroup hostility was only positively related with collective narcissism whereas solidarity during COVID-19 was not related with neither collective narcissism nor ingroup satisfaction. To examine how the different identity motives are related to collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction we conducted a hierarchical regression separately for each form of ingroup positivity. To examine the indirect effects of identity motives on the outcome variables (outgroup hostility and solidarity during covid-19) we used PROCESS macro (Model 4).

3.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

We conducted two hierarchical regressions, one for collective narcissism and one for ingroup satisfaction. Each step included one identity motive (self-esteem, meaning, distinctiveness, belonging and efficacy), and self-uncertainty was introduced in the last step. The variables were added in this order, to understand which identity motives better predicted collective narcissism (see table 3.2) and in-group satisfaction (see table 3.3). Collinearity effects were tested (tolerance and VIF) prior to analysis, and no significant multicollinearity ($Tol < 0.1$; $VIF > 10$) was found (Hair et al., 1998).

Table 3.2 shows the results of the hierarchical multiple regression for collective narcissism. The analysis revealed that at step one, self-esteem contributed significantly to the regression model ($F(1, 221) = 54.731$, $p < .001$), being positively related to collective narcissism and accounted for 20% of its explained variance. On the second step, the results of the regression indicated that introducing the meaning motive increased the explained variance of collective narcissism (30%, $F(2, 220) = 48.138$, $p < .001$), significantly improving the model ($\Delta F(1, 220) = 33.497$, $p < .001$). In this step self-esteem did not remain significant, while meaning positively relate to collective narcissism. Adding distinctiveness motive to the regression model explained

an additional 5% of the variation on collective narcissism ($R^2 = .345$, $F(3, 219) = 38.462$, $p < .001$), and this significantly improved the model ($\Delta F(1, 219) = 13.497$, $p < .001$). Meaning and distinctiveness were positively related to collective narcissism. Introducing continuity motive to the regression did not affect the explained variance ($R^2 = .346$, $F(4, 218) = 28.855$, $p < .001$), since there was no significant change of F ($\Delta F(1, 218) = .367$, $p = .545$). Indeed, continuity motive was not significantly associated with collective narcissism. Similarly, the inclusion of belonging also did not increase explained variance ($R^2 = .348$, $F(5, 217) = 27.197$, $p < .001$), since there was no significant change of F ($\Delta F(1, 217) = .702$, $p = .403$). The next step included the efficacy motive, and this resulted in a significant increase in explained variance (38%, $R^2 = .377$, $F(6, 216) = 21.794$, $p < .001$) ($\Delta F(1, 216) = 9.995$, $p = .002$). Over and above, the significant effects of meaning and distinctiveness, efficacy was positively related to collective narcissism. Finally, in the last step we included self-uncertainty, but this did not result in a significant increase in explained variance (38%, $R^2 = .378$, $F(7, 215) = 18.679$, $p < .001$) ($\Delta F(1, 215) = .369$, $p = .544$), and self-uncertainty was not significantly related to collective narcissism.

Overall, these results showed that only the motives for meaning, distinctiveness and efficacy were positively related to collective narcissism.

Table 3.1*Pearson Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations of the variables*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Self-esteem	4.21	2.05										
2. Meaning	3.78	2.17	.832**									
3. Distinctiveness	4.16	2.11	.492**	.541**								
4. Continuity	4.23	2.09	.634**	.697*	.533**							
5. Belonging	4.19	2.07	.785**	.758**	.554**	.593**						
6. Efficacy	3.94	2.15	.676**	.767**	.666**	.619**	.683**					
7. Self-Uncertainty	4.32	1.49	-.210*	-.235*	-.084	-.159*	-.084	-.231**				
8. Collective Narcissism	3.72	1.32	.446**	.551**	.465**	.395**	.414**	.571**	-0.119			
9. Ingroup Satisfaction	5.51	1.11	.608**	.584**	.356**	.441**	.437**	.484**	-.232**	.428**		
10. Outgroup Hostility	1.29	0.56	.157*	.212*	.266**	.026	.139*	.175**	.059	.306**	.110	
11. Solidarity	6.23	0.72	-.076	-.067	-.067	.092	-.067	-.059	.004	-.050	.102	-.311**

Note. **. $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

Table 3.2*Hierarchical Regression Coefficients: Predictors of Collective Narcissism*

Model	Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>
1	(Constant)	2.505	.182		13.745
	Self-esteem	.288	.039	.446**	7.398
2	(Constant)	2.478	.170		14.556
	Self-esteem	-.027	.066	-.042	-.417
	Meaning	.359	.062	.586**	5.778
3	(Constant)	2.176	.185		11.776
	Self-esteem	-.048	.064	-.075	-.757
	Meaning	.296	.063	.483**	4.719
	Distinctiveness	.151	.041	.241**	3.687
4	(Constant)	2.208	.192		11.469
	Self-esteem	-.044	.065	-.068	-.678
	Meaning	.309	.067	0.505**	4.643
	Distinctiveness	.158	.042	.251**	3.717
	Continuity	-.031	.051	-.048	-.606
5	(Constant)	2.232	.195		11.459
	Self-esteem	-.019	.071	-.030	-.270
	Meaning	.322	.068	.526**	4.711
	Distinctiveness	.166	.044	.265**	3.807
	Continuity	-.029	.051	-.046	-.581
	Belonging	-.052	.062	-.080	-.838
6	(Constant)	2.217	.191		11.61
	Self-esteem	-.021	.070	-.033	-.304
	Meaning	.236	.072	.386**	3.276
	Distinctiveness	.106	.047	.168*	2.251
	Continuity	-.039	.050	-.062	-.788
	Belonging	-.075	.061	-.117	-1.231
	Efficacy	.187	.059	.303*	3.162
7	(Constant)	2.069	.309		6.702
	Self-esteem	-.170	.070	-.026	-.241
	Meaning	.240	.073	.393**	3.311
	Distinctiveness	.104	.047	.165*	2.200
	Continuity	-.039	.050	-.062	-.787
	Belonging	-.082	.062	-.127	-1.321
	Efficacy	.192	.060	.311*	3.211
	Self- Uncertainty	.031	.050	.035	.607

Note. **. $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

Table 3.3 shows the results of the hierarchical regression for ingroup satisfaction. The first step included the identity motive self-esteem, that was positively related to ingroup satisfaction, accounting for 37% of its explained variation ($F(1, 221) = 129.371, p < .001$). Adding the meaning motive to the model, slightly improved the explained variance to 39% ($F(2, 220) = 70.066, p < .001$), presenting a significant change in F ($\Delta F(1, 220) = 7.157, p = .008$). Like self-esteem, meaning was positively related to ingroup satisfaction. Including the distinctiveness motive in the regression model did not increase the explained variance ($R^2 = .390, F(3, 219) = 70.066, p < .001$), ($\Delta F(1, 219) = .280, p = .598$). Indeed, distinctiveness was not significantly related to ingroup satisfaction. Similar, adding the continuity motive did not significantly increase explained variance ($R^2 = .390, F(4, 218) = 34.849, p < .001$) ($\Delta F(1, 218) = .048, p = .826$), and continuity was not associated with ingroup satisfaction. The inclusion of the belonging motive significantly increased the explained variance ($R^2 = .405, F(5, 217) = 29.565, p < .001$), ($\Delta F(1, 217) = 5.532, p = .020$). Belonging was negatively related with ingroup satisfaction, suggesting that the less motivation to belong the higher ingroup satisfaction. Including efficacy motive in the model did not significantly increase explained variance (41%, $R^2 = .407, F(6, 216) = 24.666, p < .001$) ($\Delta F(1, 216) = .506, p = .478$), and efficacy was not associated with ingroup satisfaction. Finally, in the last step we included self-uncertainty, and this did not significantly improve the model (41%, $R^2 = .411, F(7, 215) = 21.391, p < .001$) ($\Delta F(1, 215) = 1.442, p = .231$).

Overall, ingroup satisfaction was positively associated with self-esteem and meaning and negatively to the belonging motive.

Table 3.3*Hierarchical Regression Coefficients: Predictors of Ingroup-Satisfaction*

Model	Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>
1	(Constant)	4.118	.135		30.447
	Self-esteem	.329	.029	.608**	11.374
2	(Constant)	4.108	.133		30.783
	Self-esteem	.215	.051	.396**	4.174
	Meaning	.130	.049	.254**	2.675
3	(Constant)	4.073	0.149		27.306
	Self-esteem	.212	.052	.392**	4.103
	Meaning	.123	.051	.240**	2.425
	Distinctiveness	.018	.033	.033	.529
4	(Constant)	4.063	.156		26.128
	Self-esteem	.211	.052	.389**	4.039
	Meaning	.119	.054	.232*	2.207
	Distinctiveness	.016	.034	.030	.456
	Continuity	.009	.041	.017	.220
5	(Constant)	4.118	.156		26.455
	Self-esteem	.266	.057	.491**	4.689
	Meaning	.147	.055	.287**	2.689
	Distinctiveness	.035	.035	.066	1.001
	Continuity	.012	.040	.022	.292
	Belonging	-.116	.049	-.216*	-2.352
6	(Constant)	4.115	.156		26.398
	Self-esteem	.266	.057	.491**	4.677
	Meaning	.131	.059	.256*	2.225
	Distinctiveness	.024	.038	.045	.621
	Continuity	.010	.041	.019	.247
	Belonging	-.120	.050	-.223*	-2.418
	Efficacy	.034	.048	.067	.711
7	(Constant)	4.352	.251		17.307
	Self-esteem	.259	.057	.478**	2.689
	Meaning	.125	.059	.244*	2.114
	Distinctiveness	.027	.038	.051	.704
	Continuity	.010	.040	.019	.247
	Belonging	-.109	.050	-.202*	-2.154
	Efficacy	.026	.049	.051	.536
	Self- Uncertainty	-.049	.041	-.066	-1.201

Note. **. $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

3.3 Indirect effects of identity motives

To examine the indirect effects of identity motives on outgroup hostility and solidarity, via collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction, we conducted parallel mediation analysis using SPSS PROCESS macro (Model 4) (Hayes, 2018). We used bootstrap with 5000 samples and 95% confidence intervals to assess indirect effects. Since self-uncertainty and continuity were not related to neither of the two modes of ingroup positivity, they were excluded from the mediation analysis. The motives self-esteem, meaning, distinctiveness, belonging and efficacy were entered as predictors and collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction were entered as parallel mediators. We run two separated analyses for each outcome variable (outgroup hostility and solidarity during COVID-19).

As previously found with the hierarchical regression analyses, the motives meaning, distinctiveness and efficacy were positively related with collective narcissism. Collective narcissism was positively related to outgroup hostility, and the indirect effects showed that the motives meaning and efficacy, positively predicted outgroup hostility via collective narcissism, whereas the distinctiveness motive indirect effect was not significant (see Table 3.4). Regarding, ingroup satisfaction, as previously shown in the regression analyses, the motives self-esteem and meaning significantly were positively related to ingroup satisfaction, whereas belonging was negatively related to ingroup satisfaction. Ingroup satisfaction, contrary to collective narcissism, was not significantly related to outgroup hostility, and none of the indirect effects of identity motives via ingroup satisfaction were also significant.

Finally, regarding solidarity during COVID-19, results shows that only ingroup satisfaction was positively related to this outcome once collective narcissism was partialled out, whereas collective narcissism was not (see Table 3.5). The motives meaning and self-esteem were indirectly related to increased solidarity during COVID-19 via ingroup satisfaction, whereas the belonging motive was indirectly related to less solidarity during covid-19 via decreased ingroup satisfaction.

Table 3.4*Path analysis: Identity Motives, Collective Narcissism, Ingroup Satisfaction and Outgroup Hostility*

Mediator Model	M1 (CN)			M2(IS)			Y(Hostility)		
	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	2.177	.184	.000	4.13	.141	.000			
Self-esteem	-.026	.069	.704	.267	.056	.000			
Meaning	.221	.061	.002	.135	.057	.018			
Distinctiveness	.091	.046	.033	.026	.038	.496			
Belonging	-.076	.061	.213	-.112	.050	.016			
Efficacy	.184	.059	.002	.035	.048	.466			
Outcome Model							<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
(Constant)							.896	.203	.000
M (CN)							.113	.035	.001
M (IS)							-.034	.043	.425
Self-esteem							.004	.037	.924
Meaning							.046	.036	.208
Distinctiveness							.064	.024	.007
Belonging							-.025	.031	.424
Efficacy							-.049	.031	.113
Indirect Effects							<i>b</i>	SE	95%CI
Self-esteem via CN							-.003	.009	[-.021, .015]
Self-esteem via IS							-.009	.010	[-.030, .010]
Meaning via CN							.025	.015	[.004, .059]
Meaning via IS							-.005	.006	[-.019, .004]
Distinctiveness via CN							.011	.008	[-.00, .030]
Distinctiveness via IS							-.001	.002	[-.006, .003]
Belonging via CN							-.009	.008	[-.026, .004]
Belonging via IS							.004	.005	[-.044, .016]
Efficacy via CN							.021	.009	[.005, .038]
Efficacy via IS							-.001	.003	[-.009, .005]
Total Effects							<i>b</i>	SE	95%CI
Self-esteem							-.012	.013	[-.038, .013]
Meaning							.021	.017	[-.007, .058]
Distinctiveness							.010	.008	[-.002, .029]
Belonging							-.005	.009	[-.025, .013]
Efficacy							-.001	.003	[-.009, .005]
R2 = .375			R2 = .406			R2 = .132			
F(5,217) = 26.074, p < .001			F(5,216) = 29.715, p < .001			F(7,161) = 4.663, p < .001			

Table 3.5*Path analysis: Identity Motives, Collective Narcissism, Ingroup Satisfaction and Solidarity during covid19*

Mediator Model	M1 (CN)			M2(IS)			Y(Solidarity)		
	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	2.166	.186	.00	4.12	.152	.00			
Self-esteem	-.025	.069	.717	.267	.057	.00			
Meaning	.220	.070	.002	.135	.057	.018			
Distinctiveness	.010	.046	.032	.026	.038	.497			
Belonging	-.075	.061	.217	-.117	.041	.017			
Efficacy	.184	.059	.002	.035	.048	.467			
Outcome Model							<i>b</i>	SE	<i>p</i>
(Constant)							5.718	.271	.00
M (CN)							-.029	.046	.532
M (IS)							.174	.057	.003
Self-esteem							-.068	.049	.168
Meaning							-.018	.048	.710
Distinctiveness							-.017	.032	.584
Belonging							.017	.042	.684
Efficacy							.005	.041	.904
Indirect Effects							<i>b</i>	SE	95%CI
Self-esteem via CN							.001	.005	[-.009, .013]
Self-esteem via IS							.046	.019	[.014, .090]
Meaning via CN							-.006	.014	[-.037, .020]
Meaning via IS							.024	.011	[.004, .049]
Distinctiveness via CN							-.003	.007	[-.019, .009]
Distinctiveness via IS							.005	.007	[-.007, .020]
Belonging via CN							.002	.006	[-.001, .015]
Belonging via IS							-.021	.010	[-.044, -.005]
Efficacy via CN							-.005	.012	[-.027, .021]
Efficacy via IS							.061	.010	[-.0120, .030]
Total Effects							<i>b</i>	SE	95%CI
Self-esteem							.047	.020	[.013, .093]
Meaning							.017	.016	[-.018, .047]
Distinctiveness							.002	.009	[-.016, .020]
Belonging							-.019	.011	[-.043, -.00]
Efficacy							.001	.016	[-.026, .037]
R2 = .375			R2 = .404			R2 = .314			
F(5,216) = 25.9141, p < .001			F(5,216) = 19.3105, p < .001			F(5,161) = 14.720, p < .001			

Discussion

The current study aimed at extending previous research examining the predictors of collective narcissism. Specifically, it was, to the best of our knowledge, the first to explore whether and how different motives involved in identity construction are related with different forms of ingroup positivity. Overall, the results suggested that different identity motives are related with different forms of ingroup positivity. The motives meaning, distinctiveness and efficacy were positively associated with collective narcissism, and indirectly with outgroup hostility (except for distinctiveness). The motives self-esteem and meaning were positively related to ingroup satisfaction, whereas belonging was negatively related to ingroup satisfaction. These three motives were indirectly related with solidarity during COVID-19 via ingroup satisfaction.

Together these findings showed that different identity motives satisfy different forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction) and that different forms of ingroup positivity are associated with different outcomes, as shown in previous research (Golec de Zavala & Lantos, 2020; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a).

4.1 Collective Narcissism

The results showed that a narcissistic form of ingroup positivity was related with the satisfaction of the motives for meaning, distinctiveness and efficacy. The identity motive meaning refers to one's purpose and meaning in life (Vignoles, 2011). Indeed, scholars have suggested the importance of experiencing one's life as meaningful (Hicks & Routledge, 2013) and literature has also suggested that the search for meaning is a strong motivator for social identification (Hogg, 2007). On the literature of individual narcissism, research also shows a positive link between narcissism and meaning in life (Womich et al., 2019a), and that individuals high in trait narcissism attained higher meaning in life in extrinsic goals of wealth and fame, but not on intrinsic goals of relationship and community (Abeyta et al., 2017). Moreover, research also shows that the endorsement of right-wing authoritarianism promotes feelings of personal significance (Womich et al., 2019b).

Our results found that the motive of meaning positively related with collective narcissism, what can suggest that in the case of collective narcissism the group also appeared to satisfy the need for meaning. Collective narcissist individuals require constant external validation and

entailment (Golec de Zavala et al, 2019a), the group membership might affirm their grandiosity and in turn promote the satisfaction of their need for meaning. Yet, our results also found that meaning motive was associated with outgroup hostility, via collective narcissism. This is in line with previous findings that collective narcissism is linked with negative intergroup consequences (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a; Golec de Zavala & Lantos., 2020).

The identity motive distinctiveness also showed to be positively correlated with collective narcissism. The results suggest that a narcissistic ingroup positivity satisfies the motivations for being distinguishable from others, what is particularly relevant for collective narcissism, since it asserts the ingroup's uniqueness and superiority (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a). Our results are in line with previous findings showing that distinctiveness threat was positively related with collective narcissism (Guerra et al., 2020). However, in the current study distinctiveness motive did not indirectly relate to outgroup hostility. Previous research by Guerra and colleagues (2020) showed that collective narcissism mediated the relation between distinctiveness threat and outgroup hostility.

Individuals endorsing collective narcissistic beliefs are more sensible to ingroup image threats, which in turn results in increased outgroup hostility, as a mean of protecting and exacerbating ingroup's greatness (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a; Golec de Zavala et al., 2016). Previous studies suggested that intergroup threats can enhance positive identification with the threatened ingroup, hence intergroup threat plays a central role in fostering prejudice (Schmid et al., 2009). Thus, threat might influence in how the identity motives relate with collective narcissism. Nonetheless, this study was focused on exploring how different identity motives were associated with collective narcissism, rather than explore how different identity threats relate to it. Future research is needed to better understand the dynamics of identity motives, threat, and collective narcissism, exploring for example if inhibiting the satisfaction of distinctiveness motive is a source of threat that triggers outgroup hostility.

Additionally, our results showed that the efficacy motive positively predicted collective narcissism. The efficacy motive relates to the feelings of being competent and in control of one's life and surroundings (Vignoles, 2011). Previous research showed that collective narcissism is related with feelings of lower personal control (i.e., assumption that oneself can have an impact on the own's life) (Cichocka et al., 2018). Our findings suggest that high efficacy motive, which, in the present study, was conceptualized as feelings of competence linked to ingroup membership, predicted collective narcissism. Hence, ingroup membership

enhanced feelings of competency and may serve as a mean to suppress individual lower personal control. Additionally, the efficacy motive showed also to be indirectly related with outgroup hostility via collective narcissism. These findings suggest that some identity motives (e.g., efficacy) and not others (e.g., belonging), are indirectly related with negative intergroup consequences (e.g., outgroup hostility), depending on which form of ingroup positivity they relate.

Finally, the motives self-esteem, continuity and belonging were not related with collective narcissism. Previous research on collective narcissism found that self-esteem was positively linked to ingroup satisfaction, while collective narcissism was negatively linked with self-esteem. Collective narcissism also mediated the link between low self-esteem and outgroup derogation, when ingroup satisfaction was partialled out (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b). We did not find the same pattern of results in this study since self-esteem did not show to significantly relate to collective narcissism. However, in the current study, self-esteem was conceptualized as a motive (i.e., the motivation to construct identities that allow individuals to see themselves in a positive way) and not as individual self-esteem. In Collective narcissism the group is used as a vehicle to satisfy undermined personal self-esteem, thus collective narcissism explains the link between low self-esteem and intergroup hostility (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a). On the other hand, high valued ingroups increased and stabilize self-esteem, since collective self-esteem mediates the link between personal self-esteem and collective narcissism (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b). In our study we measured self-esteem related to national membership. Thus, the findings indicate that collective narcissism do not satisfy the need of group self-esteem.

Moreover, the belonging motive did not show to be significantly related with collective narcissism. Recent research found that collective narcissists are more prone to be disloyal towards their ingroup for personal gain (Marchlewska et al., 2020) and to treat their ingroup members instrumentally (Cichocka, et al., 2021). Collective narcissism is a form of ingroup positivity that primary serves the self, posing fewer emotional investment in their ingroup (Golec de Zavala., 2019a; Golec de Zavala et al., 2011). This may explain why collective narcissism did not satisfy the need for belonging, since one's membership is a form of exacerbating self-entitlement.

Finally, since the continuity motive was not significantly related to neither collective narcissism nor ingroup satisfaction we discuss these findings further after presenting the main findings for ingroup satisfaction.

4.2 Ingroup satisfaction

The results showed that a non-narcissistic form of ingroup positivity was related with the satisfaction of the different identity motives, which in turn, related to solidarity during COVID-19 via ingroup satisfaction.

Similar to the findings reported for collective narcissism, ingroup satisfaction was also positively related with the meaning motive, that is, to one's purpose and meaning in life (Vignoles, 2011). However, whereas collective narcissism mediated the relation of meaning with outgroup hostility ingroup satisfaction mediated the relation of meaning with solidarity during COVID-19. As previous suggested in Hogg (2007), these results suggest that people strive to have a meaningful life, and group membership may serve this need. However, the impact of meaning on intergroup relations seems to differ depending on what form of ingroup positivity is endorsed. Whereas meaning indirectly increased hostility via collective narcissism, it indirectly related to increased solidarity during the COVID-19 pandemic via ingroup satisfaction. Future studies could explore how both forms of ingroup positivity may satisfy the meaning motive, especially if different sources of satisfying this need relate to different forms of ingroup positivity.

Regarding the self-esteem motive, our results showed that the self-esteem motive was positively related with ingroup satisfaction. Ingroup satisfaction mediated the relation between self-esteem and solidarity during COVID-19. These results support previous findings that self-esteem is positively related with ingroup satisfaction (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009; Golec de Zavala et al., 2019b) and also that ingroup satisfaction is related with increased of solidarity actions during the Covid pandemic (Federico et al., 2020). People with high self-esteem tend to project their positive self-evaluation onto the groups they belong to, enhancing a positive ingroup evaluation (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019a; Amiot & Aubin, 2013). Hence, ingroup satisfaction appears to satisfy the motive of self-esteem, which in turn enhances intentions to act in solidarity towards others during the pandemic of COVID-19.

The results concerning the belonging motive showed that the belonging motive was negatively related with ingroup satisfaction, contradicting our expectation that the group membership would satisfy the motive for belonging. However, the belonging motive was positively correlated with ingroup satisfaction on the correlation analysis and the relation became negative on the hierarchical regression analysis when other identity motives were entered as simultaneous predictors. This may suggest a multicollinearity problem and will be further discussed in the limitations section. Considering this unexpected finding future research

is needed to further examine how the motive to belong relates to different forms of ingroup positivity.

Our results showed that the motives distinctiveness, efficacy and continuity were not significantly related with ingroup satisfaction. Regarding the distinctiveness motive, Guerra and colleagues (2020), found that distinctiveness threat was significantly related to ingroup satisfaction. In our studies we did not find the same pattern of results, what may be related with the fact that the threat component was not present, thus did not salience out the need for satisfaction of this motive.

Interestingly, our results suggested that whereas belonging was related with ingroup satisfaction, distinctiveness was related with collective narcissism. Vignoles and Moncaster (2007) have found that the motives belonging, and distinctiveness were related with ingroup favoritism. Particularly distinctiveness was related with negative outgroup evaluation and belonging with positive ingroup evaluation. The Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (ODT, Brewer, 1991; Hornsey & Jetten, 2004) proposes that individuals desire to satisfy two opposing motives, the need to belong to a certain group (belonging motive) and the need to be distinct from others (distinctiveness motive). These opposing motives shape evaluations of the ingroup and the outgroup. Thus, ODT specifies that the need for distinctiveness can be met through intergroup differentiation, while the need for belonging can be achieved through ingroup inclusivity (Hornsey & Jetten, 2004). Our results suggest, that both motives relate to different forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction), as well as to different intergroup outcomes (i.e., outgroup hostility and solidarity during COVID-19). Recent research found that when national ingroup identity was salient, the belonging motive predicted positive evaluations of the outgroup. This study suggests that a higher sense of belonging to one's ingroup relates to more positive attitudes towards the outgroup, however the authors did not find significant results for the distinctiveness motive (Adam-Troian et al., 2020). Yet, we know that distinctiveness is related with negative intergroup relations via collective narcissism (Guerra et al., 2020). Thus, future research could investigate further the relation between the belonging and distinctiveness motives and different forms of ingroup positivity, as well as their impact on intergroup relations.

When it came to the efficacy motive, it did not show to be significantly related with ingroup satisfaction. Efficacy is related with one's feelings of competency (Vignoles, 2011). Therefore, a possible explanation could be that ingroup satisfaction is not instrumentalized to increase one's feelings of efficacy, contrary to collective narcissism. However, future research is necessary to further investigate this notion.

Finally, our results showed that the continuity motive was not related to collective narcissism neither to ingroup satisfaction. Previous research found that collective continuity was an important motive for national identification (Smeeky & Verkuyten, 2014). However, this relation was stronger when existential threats was present. That is, existential threats increased the self-continuity motive, which subsequently enhanced ingroup-defense behaviors (Smeeky & Verkuyten, 2013). Thus, these findings suggested that threat can enhance self-continuity and influence intergroup relations (Smeeky & Verkuyten, 2015). Our results were not in line with these findings and showed that the continuity motive was not related to neither form of ingroup positivity. Nonetheless, this could be related to the absence of threat to one's identity. Thus, further research could use experimental designs to understand which motives relate to collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction when different threats are present, thereby disentangling the role of motive satisfaction, with and without the presence of threat.

In sum, this study evidenced that different identity motives are related with different forms of ingroup positivity. The results also suggest that some identity motives indirectly relate to positive intergroup consequences (solidarity during COVID-19) or to negative ones (outgroup hostility), depending on which form of ingroup positivity is endorsed.

4.3 Self- uncertainty

Finally, we expected that self-uncertainty would be related with both forms of ingroup positivity, since group identification is effective in reducing feelings of self-uncertainty (Hogg, 2012, 2007). Contrary to this expectation, self-uncertainty was not related to collective narcissism neither to ingroup satisfaction. Indeed, previous studies already demonstrated that direct measures of self-uncertainty showed relatively small effects with identification (Choi & Hogg, 2020), which is in line with our findings that self-uncertainty did not relate neither to collective narcissism nor to ingroup satisfaction. Nevertheless, it is important to note, that this study did not focus on measuring all sub-components of group identification (satisfaction, centrality, solidarity, self-stereotyping and ingroup homogeneity; Leach et al., 2008). But rather focused only two forms of ingroup positivity (i.e., ingroup satisfaction and collective narcissism). Thus, it is important that future research also assesses other dimensions of group identification (e.g., ingroup homogeneity) to further clarify if self-uncertainty relates to some but not other aspects of group identification. Finally, another possible explanation can be found in the relation of self-uncertainty and the meaning motive. Hogg (2007) argues that having a distinctive and meaningful sense of identity can work as a buffer to uncertainty, thus self-

uncertainty reduction relates to the pursuit of a meaningful and true sense of self. In other words, feelings of certainty relate with a sense of meaning. When people make sense of their environment and self, they achieve a sense of meaningfulness in life. Even though self-uncertainty showed not to be related to collective narcissism or ingroup satisfaction, correlation analysis showed a significant negative correlation between the meaning motive and self-uncertainty. Yet, more research is needed to further explore the relation between meaning and self-uncertainty.

4.4 Limitations

Even though this study contributed to the limited research on collective narcissism and identity motives, it entailed some limitations. Firstly, it is cross-sectional, enabling us to determinate directionality and causality. Future research could test the influence of different identity motives on collective narcissism experimentally and longitudinally, in order to draw more solid conclusions on the causal directions of the proposed effects.

This study also encompassed limitations with regards to the measurements used. Specifically, the measure used to assess the identity motives was composed by single items (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2012). Single items scales may present problems of reliability and validity since it increases the difficulty of differentiation of theoretical dimensions of a certain complex construct (Sauro, 2018). Indeed, in the current study the identity motives were highly correlated with each other, indicating a possible collinearity problem, even though no significant multicollinearity was found according to tolerance and VIF tests (Hair et al., 1998). Also, we suggested that multicollinearity may have been responsible for the changing of the direction of the relation between the belonging motive and ingroup satisfaction. Zero-order correlations showed that the belonging motive was positively correlated with both collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction. However, when other identity motives were entered as simultaneous predictors in the regression analysis, the beta coefficient changed to negative. Future studies on identity motives could use multiple item scales to assess each motive, as done in previous studies (Calandri et al., 2020; Smeekes & Verkuyten, 2013).

4.5 Conclusion

To date, most research has focused on the detrimental consequences of collective narcissism, whereas less studies have focused on understanding what can trigger this form of ingroup positivity. This research suggested new insights to better understand the predictors collective narcissism by showing that different forms of ingroup positivity are associated with the satisfaction of different identity motives. Specifically, collective narcissism is associated with the motives of meaning, distinctiveness, and efficacy and ingroup satisfaction is associated with the motives of self-esteem, belonging, and meaning. Ultimately by knowing what triggers extreme forms of ingroup identification, like collective narcissism, may help tackle its well-known detrimental consequences. This may be particularly important in the wake of the unprecedented crisis triggered in the COVID-19 pandemic, that exacerbated and increased social inequalities and political polarizations.

References

- Abeyta, A. A., Routledge, C., & Sedikides, C. (2017). Material meaning: Narcissists gain existential benefits from extrinsic goals. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(2), 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616667618>
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 317-334. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420180403.
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2010). Social identity and self-categorization. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.). *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination*. Sage. 179–193.
- Abrams, D., Lalot, F. & Hogg, MA. (2021). Intergroup and intragroup dimensions of COVID-19: A social identity perspective on social fragmentation and unity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(2), 201-209. doi:10.1177/1368430220983440
- Adam-Troian, J., Çelebi, E., Bonetto, E., Taşdemir, N. & Yurtbakan, T. (2020). Together we stand. Belonging motive moderates the effect of national ingroup salience on attitudes towards ethnic minorities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 77, 95-109, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.05.002>
- Amiot, C. E. & Aubin, R. M. (2013). Why and how are you attached to your social group? Investigating different forms of social identification. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52(3), 563–586. doi:0.1111/bjso.12004
- Amiot, C. E. & Sansfaçon, S. (2011). Motivations to identify with social groups: A look at their positive and negative consequences. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15(2), 105–127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023158>
- Bartos, V., Bauer, M., Cahlíková, J. & Chytilová, J. (2020). *COVID-19 Crisis Fuels Hostility against Foreigner* (report no13250). Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497–529.

- Becker, M., Vignoles, V. L., Owe, E., Brown, R., Smith, P. B., Herman, G., et al. (2010). *The motive for distinctiveness in 21 cultures*. Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Melbourne, Australia.
- Bonotti M., Zech S.T. (2021). The Human, Economic, Social, and Political Costs of COVID-19. *Recovering Civility during COVID-19*. Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1007/978-981-33-6706-7_1.
- Breakwell, G. M. (1987). Identity. In H. Beloff & A. Coleman (Eds.), *Psychology Survey* (Vol. 6, pp. 94–114). Leicester: British Psychological Society.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 475–482. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167291175001>
- Calandril, E., Graziano, F., Borghi, M., Bonino, S. & Cattelino, E. (2020). The Role of Identity Motives on Quality of Life and Depressive Symptoms: A Comparison Between Young Adults with Multiple Sclerosis and Healthy Peers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.589815>
- Choi, E & Hogg, M. (2020). Self-uncertainty and group identification: A meta-analysis. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 23(4). 483–501. doi:10.1177%2F1368430219846990
- Cichocka, A. (2016). Understanding defensive and secure in-group positivity: The role of collective narcissism. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 27, 283-317. doi: 10463283
- Cichocka, A., Cislak, A., Gronfeldt, B., & Wojcik, A. D. (2021). Can ingroup love harm the ingroup? Collective narcissism and objectification of ingroup members. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211038058>
- Cichocka, A., Golec de Zavala, A. G., Marchlewska, M., Bilewicz, M., Jaworska, M., & Olechowski, M. (2018). Personal control decreases narcissistic but increases non-narcissistic in-group positivity. *Journal of Personality*, 86(3), 465–480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12328>
- Dyduch-Hazar, K., Mrozinski, B., & Golec de Zavala, A. (2019). Collective narcissism and ingroup satisfaction predict different attitudes towards refugees via attribution of hostility. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01901>

- Easterbrook, M., & Vignoles, V. L. (2012). Different groups, different motives: Identity motives underlying changes in identification with novel groups. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1066-1080. doi:10.1177/0146167212444614
- Esses, V. & Hamilton, L. (2021). Xenophobia and anti-immigrant attitudes in the time of COVID-19. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(2), 253–259. doi: 10.1177/1368430220983470.
- Federico, C. M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Baran, T. (2020). Collective narcissism, in-group satisfaction, and solidarity in the face of COVID-19. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620963655>
- Forgas, J. P. & Lantos, D. (2019). Understanding Populism: Collective Narcissism and the Collapse of Democracy in Hungary. In: J. P. Forgas, K. Fiedler & W. Crano (Eds.), *Applications of Social Psychology* (pp. 267-291). New York: Psychology Press.
- Golec de Zavala, A. (2011). Collective narcissism and intergroup hostility: The dark side of “in-group love.” *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(6), 309-320
- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2013). The paradox of in-group love: Differentiating collective narcissism advances understanding of the relationship between in-group love and out-group attitudes. *Journal of Personality*, 81, 16-28, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00779>
- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., Eidelson, R., & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism and its social consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 1074-1096, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016904>
- Golec de Zavala, A., Dyduch-Hazar, K., & Lantos, D. (2019a). Collective Narcissism: Political Consequences of Investigating Self-worth in the Ingroup’s Image. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 40(1), 37- 74. doi: 10.1111/pops.12569
- Golec de Zavala, A., & Federico, C. M. (2018). Collective narcissism and the growth of conspiratorial thinking over the course of the 2016 United States presidential election: A longitudinal analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2496>
- Golec de Zavala, A., Federico, Ch. M., Sedikides, C., Guerra, R., Lantos, D., Mrozinski, B., Cyprianska, M., & Baran, T. (2019b). Low self-esteem is linked to out-group derogation via

collective narcissism but this relationship is obscured by in-group satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 741-764. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000260>

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

Golec de Zavala, A., & Lantos, D. (2020). Collective narcissism and its social consequences: The bad and the ugly. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29, 273–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420917703>

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

Górska, P, Stefaniak, A, Malinowska, K, et al. (2020). Too great to act in solidarity: The negative relationship between collective narcissism and solidarity-based collective action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 561– 578. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2638>

Guerra, R., Bierwiazzonek, K., Golec de Zavala, A., Ferreira, M., Abakoumkin, G., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2020). An intergroup approach to collective narcissism: Intergroup threats and hostility in four European Union countries. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1368430220972178>

Hair Jr., J. F. et al. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications, New York..2016.1252530

Hicks, J., & Routledge, C. (Eds.). (2013). *The experience of meaning in life: Classical perspectives, emerging themes, and controversies*. New York, NY: Springer Press

Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorization: A motivational theory of social identity processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 11, 223–255, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792772043000040>

Hogg, M. (2020): Uncertain Self in a Changing World: A Foundation for Radicalization, Populism, and Autocratic Leadership. *European Review of Social Psychology*, doi: 10.1080/10463283.2020.1827628

- Hogg, M. A. (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 69–126. doi:10.1016/s0065-2601(06)39002-8.
- Hogg, M. A. (2012). Uncertainty-identity theory. In P. A. M. van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.). *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 2, 62–80). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Hogg, M. A., Meehan, C., & Farquharson, J. (2010). The solace of radicalism: Self-uncertainty and group identification in the face of threat. *Journal Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1061–1066. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.005>
- Hogg, M., Sherman, D., Dierselhuis, J., Maitner., A., & Moffitt, G. (2007). Uncertainty, entitativity, and group identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(1), 135-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.008>.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Jetten, J. (2004). The Individual Within the Group: Balancing the Need to Belong With the Need to Be Different. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 248– 264. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_2
- Jetten, J., Bentley, S.V., Crimston, C.R., Selvanathan, H.P. & Haslam, S.A. (2021). COVID-19 and social psychological research: A silver lining. *Asian Journal Social Psychology*, 24, 34- 36. doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12465
- John Hopkins University’s Coronavirus Resource Centre (n.d). Retrieved from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>.
- Krings, V. C., Steeden, B., Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2021). Social attitudes and behavior in the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence and prospects from research on group processes and intergroup relations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(2), 195–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220986673>
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144>
- Mackie, D.M., Devos, T., & Smith, E.R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616.

- Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Jaworska, M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2020). Superficial in-group love? Collective narcissism predicts ingroup image defense, outgroup prejudice and lower in-group loyalty. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12367>
- Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Panayiotou, O., Castellanos, K., & Batayneh, J. (2018). Populism as identity politics: Perceived in-group disadvantage, collective narcissism, and support for populism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(2), 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617732393>
- ONU news (1, April 2020). *Chefe da ONU diz que pandemia é maior desafio que mundo enfrenta desde Segunda Guerra Mundial*. Retrived from: <https://news.un.org/pt/story/2020/04/1708982>
- Ramos, M. & Alves, H. (2011). Adaptação de uma Escala Multidimensional de Identificação para Português. *Psicologia*, 2(15). Lisboa: Edições Colibri.
- Rast, D. E., Gaffney, A., Hogg, M. A., & Crisp, R.J. (2012). Leadership under uncertainty: When leaders who are non-prototypical group members can gain support. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 646-653. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2012.718864>
- Rosenfeld, D. et al. (2021). Psychological Science in the Wake of COVID-19: Social, Methodological, and Metascientific Considerations. *Association for Psychological Science*, 1-26. Doi:10.1177/1745691621999374.
- Sauro, J. (14, March 2018). *Is a Single Item Enough to Measure a Construct?* MeasuringU. Retrieved from: <https://measuringu.com/single-multi-items/>.
- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Cairns, E., & Hughes, J. (2009). Antecedents and consequences of social identity complexity: Intergroup contact, distinctiveness threat, and outgroup attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 1085–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209337037>
- Smeekes, A., & Verkuyten, M. (2013). Collective self-continuity, group identification and in-group defense. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 984–994. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.06.004>
- Smeekes, A., & Verkuyten, M. (2014). Perceived group continuity, collective self-continuity and ingroup identification. *Self and Identity*, 13, 663–680. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.898685>

- Smeekes, A. & Verkuyten, M. (2015). The presence of the past: Identity continuity and group dynamics. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 162-202, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2015.1112653>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Vignoles, V. L. (2011). Identity motives. In K. Luycke, S. J. Schwartz, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 403-432). New York, NY: Springer.
- Vignoles, V. L., Chrysoschoou, X., & Breakwell, G. M. (2000). The distinctiveness principle: Identity, meaning, and the bounds of cultural relativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 337–354. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957PSPR0404_4
- Vignoles, V. L., Chrysoschoou, X., & Breakwell, G. M. (2002). Evaluating models of identity motivation: Self-esteem is not the whole story. *Self and Identity*, 1, 201–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/152988602760124847>
- Vignoles, V. L., Manzi, C., Regalia, C., Jemmolo, S., & Scabini, E. (2008). Identity motives underlying desired and feared possible future selves. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1165-1200. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00518.x
- Vignoles, V. L., & Moncaster, N. (2007). Identity motives and in-group favouritism: A new approach to individual differences in intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 91–113. doi:10.1348/014466605X85951
- Vignoles, V. L., Regalia, C., Manzi, C., Gollidge, J., & Scabini, E. (2006). Beyond self-esteem: Influence of multiple motives on identity construction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 308-333. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.2.308
- Womick, J., Foltz, R., & King, L. (2019a). “Releasing the beast within”? Authenticity, well-being, and the Dark Tetrad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 137(15), 115-125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.08.022>
- Womick, J., Ward, S.J., Heintzelman, S.J, Woody, B., & King, LA (2019b). The existential function of right-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Personality*. 2019; 87: 1056– 1073. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12457>

Appendix A -Questionnaire

Q1.1

O presente estudo surge no âmbito de um projeto de investigação a decorrer no ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa. O estudo tem por objetivo conhecer a opinião do público em geral relativamente ao contexto de incerteza que se vive em Portugal, devido à pandemia do covid-19.

O estudo é realizado por Raquel Carvalheiro (raquelcarvalheiro98@gmail.com), que poderá contactar caso pretenda esclarecer uma dúvida ou partilhar algum comentário. A sua participação no estudo, que será muito valorizada pois irá contribuir para o avanço do conhecimento neste domínio da ciência, consiste em responder a um questionário online com duração média de 7 minutos. Não existem riscos significativos expectáveis associados à participação no estudo.

A participação no estudo é estritamente voluntária: pode escolher livremente participar ou não participar. Se tiver escolhido participar, pode interromper a participação em qualquer momento sem ter de prestar qualquer justificação. Para além de voluntária, a participação é também anónima e confidencial. Os dados obtidos destinam-se apenas a tratamento estatístico e nenhuma resposta será analisada ou reportada individualmente. Em nenhum momento do estudo precisa de se identificar.

Ao participar neste estudo, ficará habilitado(a) ao sorteio de um Voucher FNAC com o valor de 50 euros. Se estiver interessado(a) em habilitar-se a este sorteio, deverá indicar o seu e-mail no final do questionário (esta informação não ficará registada com as suas respostas e não poderá ser associada às mesmas).

Declaro ter compreendido os objetivos propostos e explicados pelo/a investigador(a), ter-me sido dada oportunidade de fazer todas as perguntas sobre o presente estudo e para todas elas ter obtido resposta esclarecedora, pelo que aceito nele participar.

- Aceito participar
- Não aceito participar

Q2.1 Quanto classifica com cada uma das seguintes questões?

Nada		Inter-mé- dio			Muito	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Quanto é que ser português lhe dá sensação de pertença, que é incluído ou aceite por pessoas que são importantes para si?						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Quanto é que ser português lhe dá a sensação que a sua vida tem significado?						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Quanto é que ser português faz com que se veja a si mesmo/a de forma positiva?						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Quanto é que ser português o/a faz sentir que o seu passado, presente e futuro estão ligados?						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Quanto é que sente que ser português o/a distingue, de alguma forma, das outras pessoas?						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Quanto é que ser português o/a faz sentir-se competente e capaz?						1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Q2.2 Quanto concorda com cada uma das seguintes afirmações?

Discordo forte- mente	Discordo	Discordo em parte	Não con- cordo nem dis- cordo	Concordo em parte	Concordo	Concordo forte- mente
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tenho dúvidas acerca de mim mesmo/a.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Tenho dúvidas sobre o meu futuro.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Estou preocupado/a com o meu futuro.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Tenho dúvidas sobre o meu lugar no mundo.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Estou preocupado/a com o meu lugar no mundo.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Q3.1 Quanto concorda com cada uma das seguintes afirmações?

Discordo fortemente	Discordo	Discordo em parte	Não concordo nem discordo	Concordo em parte	Concordo	Concordo fortemente					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Os portugueses merecem um tratamento especial.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Nunca estarei satisfeito/a até que os portugueses recebam o reconhecimento que merecem.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fico realmente zangado/a quando os outros criticam os portugueses.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Se os portugueses tivessem “uma voz importante” no mundo, o mundo seria um lugar muito melhor.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Poucas pessoas parecem compreender plenamente a importância dos portugueses.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q3.2 Quanto concorda com cada uma das seguintes afirmações?

Discordo fortemente	Discordo	Discordo em parte	Não concordo nem discordo	Concordo em parte	Concordo	Concordo fortemente					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Eu penso que os portugueses têm muito de que se orgulhar.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
É agradável ser português					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ser português dá-me uma sensação agradável.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Eu estou contente por ser português.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Eu penso muitas vezes no facto de que sou português					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
O facto de que sou português é uma parte importante da minha identidade.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ser português é uma parte importante de como eu me vejo a mim mesmo					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Eu sinto uma ligação com os portugueses.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Eu sinto solidariedade para com os portugueses.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Eu sinto dedicação para com os portugueses.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Eu tenho muito em comum com o habitual português					1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Eu sou parecido com o habitual português	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Os portugueses têm muitos pontos em comum entre si.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Os portugueses são muito parecidos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q4.1 Por favor responda utilizando a escala abaixo.

Nada							Muito
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7
Quando pensa em interagir com imigrantes em Portugal, até que ponto tem vontade de...							
Confrontá-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Opor-se	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Feri-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ofendê-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Magoá-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intimidá-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Humilhá-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Evitá-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ignorá-los	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Não ter nada a ver com eles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q4.2 Por favor, indique como se sente em relação aos imigrantes em Portugal, em geral?

Negativo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positivo
Frios	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Calorosos
Hostis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Amigáveis
Suspeitos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Confiáveis
Desrespeitoso	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Respeitosos
Repulsa	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Admiração

Q5.1 Em política é costume falar-se de esquerda e direita.

Como é se posicionaria nesta escala, em que 1 representa a posição mais à esquerda e 7 a posição mais à direita?

Esquerda						Direita	Não sei
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	77

Q5.2 Em que candidato votou nas Eleições Presenciais 2021?

Q5.3 Quanto concorda com cada uma das seguintes afirmações?

Discordo fortemente	Dis- cordo	Discordo em parte	Não con- cordo nem discordo	Concordo em parte	Concordo	Concordo fortemente					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Sinto-me solidário com aqueles que podem estar infetados pelo coronavírus					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Devemos estar unidos porque todos nós podemos ser infetados pelo coronavirus					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Devemos unir-nos face à pandemia.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cada um de nós pode desempenhar um papel positivo na luta contra a propagação do coronavírus.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
É nossa responsabilidade comum combater a propagação do vírus					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sinto-me ligado a outras pessoas na luta contra a propagação do vírus					1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q5.4 Que idade tem? (utilize números para indicar anos)

_____ anos

Q5.5 Qual o nível de escolaridade mais elevado que completou?

1º Ciclo do Ensino Básico (1º ao 4º ano)

2º Ciclo do Ensino Básico (5º ao 6º ano)

3º Ciclo do Ensino Básico (7º ao 9º ano)

Ensino Secundário (10º ao 12º ano)

Cursos de especialização tecnológica

Bacharelato

Licenciatura

Pós-graduação/ Grau Avançado (Mestrado, Doutoramento, Pós-Doutoramento)

Não sei

Q5.6 Qual a sua situação laboral actual?

Estudante

Desempregado/a

Empregado (Se está empregado, por favor indique a sua profissão)

Reformado/a

Outra

Q5.7 Sexo

Masculino

Feminino

Outro _____

Prefiro não responder

Q5.8 Tem nacionalidade portuguesa?

Sim

Não

Q5.9 Nasceu em Portugal?

Sim

Não (Por favor, indique o país onde nasceu)

Q5.10 A sua mãe nasceu em Portugal?

Sim

Não (Por favor, indique o país onde a sua mãe nasceu)

Q5.11 O seu pai nasceu em Portugal?

Sim

Não (Por favor, indique o país onde o seu pai nasceu)

Q5.12 Por favor indique o grupo étnico com que mais se identifica.

Resposta aberta

Q5.13 Quanto é que se identifica com este grupo?

Nada (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) Muito

Q5.14 Por favor indique o grupo nacional com que mais se identifica.

Resposta aberta

Q5.15 Quanto é que se identifica com este grupo?

Nada (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) Muito

Muito obrigado por ter participado neste estudo. Conforme adiantado no início da sua participação, o estudo pretende analisar opiniões relacionadas com o país no contexto de incerteza que vivemos devido à pandemia do covid-19. Mais especificamente, analisar as formas como a identidade nacional pode ser construída e a sua influência nas relações intergrupais.

Reforçamos os dados de contacto que pode utilizar caso deseje colocar uma dúvida, partilhar algum comentário, ou assinalar a sua intenção de receber informação sobre os principais resultados e conclusões do estudo: Raquel Carvalheiro (raquelcarvalheiro98mail.com).

Mais uma vez, obrigado pela sua participação.