Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Sawicki, A., Piotrowski, J., Lifshin U., Kretchner, M., Skowronski, J. J., Sedikides, C., Jonason, P. K., Adamovic, M., Agada, A. M. G., Ahmed, O., Al-Shawaf, L., Appiah, S. C. Y., Ardi, R., Azam, U., Babakr, Z. H., Baldursson, E. B., Bălțătescu, S., Bochaver, K., Bolatov, A., … Zand, S. (2024). Narcissism in the pandemic: Unfounded beliefs and behavioral reactions. *Scientific Reports*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1038/>s41598-024-67954-2

**Grandiose Narcissism in the Pandemic:**

**Unfounded Beliefs and Behavioral Reactions**

Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw, Poland

Artur Sawicki, University of Gdansk, Poland

Jarosław Piotrowski, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw, Poland

Uri Lifshin, Reichman University, Herzliya, Israel

Mabelle Kretchner, Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya, Israel

John Skowronski, Northern Illinois University, The United States of America

Constantine Sedikides, University of Southampton, The United Kingdom

Peter K. Jonason, Padova University, Italy, & Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw, Poland

Mladen Adamovic, King's College London, United Kingdom

Oli Ahmed, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh

Kokou A. Atitsogbe, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Laith Al-Shawaf, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, USA

Seth Christopher Yaw Appiah, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Kumasi, Ghana

Rahkman Ardi, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

Uzma Azam, Aligarh Muslim University, India

Zana Hasan Babakr, Soran University, Iraq

Einar Baldvin Baldursson, Aalborg University, Denmark

Sergiu Bălțătescu, University of Oradea, Oradea, Romania

Konstantin Bochaver, Independent Researcher, Russia

Aidos Bolatov, Astana Medical University, Astana, Kazakhstan

Mario Bonato, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

Harshalini Y. Bundhoo, University of Mauritius, Reduit, Moka, Mauritius

Trawin Chaleeraktrakoon, Thammasat University, Pathumthani, Thailand

Phatthanakit Chobthamkit, Thammasat University, Pathumthani, Thailand

Richard G. Cowden, Harvard University, Boston, MA, United States

Victor Counted, Regent University, VA, United States

Gisela de Clunie, Universidad Tecnológica de Panamá, Panama

Sonya Dragova-Koleva, New Bulgarian University, Sofya, Bulgaria

Carla Sofia Esteves, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Católica Lisbon School of Business & Economics, Católica Lisbon Research Unit in Business and Economics, Lisboa, Portugal

Valdiney V. Gouveia, Federal University of Paraiba, Paraiba, Brazil

Katherine Gundolf, University of Applied Sciences Upper Austria, Austria

Salima Hamouda, University of Biskra, Algeria

Carmen Haretche, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa, Uruguay

Evelyn Hye Kyung Jeong, University of Limerick, Ireland

Dzintra Iliško, Daugavpils University, Daugavpils, Latvia

Najma Iqbal Malik, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

John Jamir Benzon Aruta, De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines

Fanli Jia, Seton Hall University, NJ, USA

Veljko Jovanović, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia

Tomislav Jukić, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Croatia

Doroteja Pavan Jukić, University of Zagreb, School of Medicine, Croatia

Shanmukh V. Kamble, Karnatak University, Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Narine Khachatryan, Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia

Martina Klicperova-Baker, Czech Academy of Sciences, Praha, Czech Republic

Christoph Kogler, University of Tilburg, the Netherlands

Emil Knezović, International University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Metodi Koralov, New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria

Monika Kovacs, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

Walaa Labib M. Eldesoki, Department of Education and Psychology, faculty of Science and Arts in Qurayyat, Al Jouf University, Sakaka, Saudi Arabia & Department of Psychology, faculty of Arts, Menoufia University, Egypt

Aitor Larzabal Fernandez, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Leioa, Spain

Kadi Liik, Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia

Sadia Malik, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

John Maltby, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom

Karine Malysheva, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

Agim Mamuti, Mother Theresa University, Albania

Jasmina Mangafic, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia & Herzegovina

Chanki Moon, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK

Taciano Milfont, University of Waikato, New Zealand

Stephan Muehlbacher, Karl Landsteiner University of Health Sciences, Department of Psychology and Psychodynamics, Division of Work, Organizational, and Economic Psychology, Krems, Austria

Reza Najafi, University of Padova, Italy

Emrah Özsoy, Sakarya University, Turkey

Joonha Park, NUCB School, Nagoya, Japan

Pablo Pérez de León, Universidad Católica del Uruguay, Uruguay

Iva Polackova Solcova, Czech Academy of Sciences, Praha, Czech Republic

Jano Ramos-Diaz, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Privada del Norte, Lima, Perú

Goran Ridic, Cologne Business School (CBS) University of Mainz, Germany

Ognjen Riđić, International University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Adil Samekin, M. Narikbayev KAZGUU University, Astana, Kazakhstan

Andrea Spoto, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

Andrej Starc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Delia Stefenel, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

Kiều Thị Thanh Trà, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Vietnam

Habib Tiliouine, University of Oran, Algeria

Robert Tomšik, Research Institute for Child Psychology and Pathopsychology, Bratislava, Slovakia

Jorge Torres-Marín, Department of Research Methods in Behavioral Sciences, University of Granada, Spain

Charles S. Umeh, College of Medicine, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

Eduardo Wills-Herrera, Los Andes University, Colombia

Anna Wlodarczyk, Universidad Católica del Norte, Antofagasta, Chile

Zahir Vally, United Arab Emirates University, United Arab Emirates

Christin‐Melanie Vauclair, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), CIS-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal

Illia Yahiiaiev, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

Somayeh Zand, University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

**Author Note**

The work of Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska and Jarosław Piotrowski was supported by grant 2017/26/E/HS6/00282 from the National Science Centre, Poland. The work of Artur Sawicki was supported by grant number 0086/DIA/2017/46 financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education in Poland. The work of Peter K. Jonason was partially funded by the Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange (PPN/ULM/2019/1/00019/U/00001) and a grant from the National Science Centre of Poland (2019/35/B/HS6/00682). The work of Martina Klicperova-Baker and Iva Polackova Solcova was supported by the NPO "Systemic Risk Institute" no. LX22NPO5101, funded by European Union - Next Generation EU (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, NPO: EXCELES), IOCB, and Strategie AV21.The work of Narine Khachatryan was supported by the RA Science Committee, in the frames of the research project № 20TTSH-070. The authors declare, in accordance to national laws, that there was no direct collaboration between researchers from conflicting countries, where applicable. Corresponding author: Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw, Wóycickiego 1/3 01-938 Warsaw, email: [m.zemojtel-piotrowska@uksw.edu.pl](about:blank)

**Author Contributions Statement**

Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska: writing a first draft, conceptualization, funding, study design, supervision of the project

Artur Sawicki: statistical analysis, data curation, commenting, writing method and results section

Jarosław Piotrowski: co-supervising the project, study design, commenting

John Skowronski, Constantine Sedikides: co-writing and editing a draft, conceptualization, supervising

Uri Lifshin, Mabelle Kretchner, Peter Jonason: commenting, conceptualization, data collection

Remaining authors: data collection in their countries, preparing national versions of their surveys, commenting, co-funding (as indicated in the Authors note).

**Abstract**

A theoretical perspective on grandiose narcissism suggests four forms of it (sanctity, admiration, heroism, rivalry) and states that these forms conduce to different ways of thinking and acting. Guided by this perspective, we examined in a multinational and multicultural study (61 countries; *N* = 15,039) how narcissism forms are linked to cognitions and behaviors prompted by the COVID-19 pandemic. As expected, differences in cognitions and behaviors across narcissism forms emerged. For example, higher narcissistic rivalry predicted lower likelihood of enactment of COVID-19 prevention behaviors, but higher narcissistic sanctity predicted higher likelihood of enactment of COVID-19 prevention behaviors. Further, whereas the heroism, admiration, and rivalry narcissism forms acted in a typically antisocial manner, with high narcissism predicting greater endorsement of unfounded health beliefs, the sanctity form acted in a prosocial manner, with higher narcissism being linked to lower endorsement of unfounded COVID-19 health beliefs. Thus, the findings (a) support the idea of four narcissism forms acting differently, and (b) show that these differences reflect a double-edged sword, sometimes linking to an anti-social orientation, and sometimes linking to a pro-social orientation.

Research into the COVID-19 pandemic explored, in part, links between psychosocial functioning and responses to it2,10,34. One stream of this research focused on grandiose narcissism18,23,30, characterized by self-absorbing self-aggrandizement23,30, distinctly from vulnerable narcissism that is characterized by feelings of inadequacy and incompetence23,24,30. In the context of the pandemic, which required a socially coordinated and collective response to combat the crisis effectively, this focus makes sense. Given that (grandiose) narcissists are often seen as self-serving, ostentatious, and exploitative30,32, they might not be especially helpful in responding to collective crises like the pandemic. Indeed, the early narcissism literature in the context of the pandemic examined associations between grandiose narcissism and various anti-social variables, such as (a) failing to respect national restrictions, (b) selfish behavior (e.g., hoarding), and (c) the adoption of unfounded beliefs about the pandemic (e.g., Coronavirus was created to be a bioweapon).

The pertinent findings have been informative, but somewhat limited. First, grandiose narcissism was often treated as a primarily agentic construct9,18,23,38, although some research also addressed communal narcissism12,13. As suggested by recent theorizing, this view of narcissism may be too restrictive30. Second, the emphasis was on the association between narcissism and undesirable thoughts and behaviors, largely neglecting the potential link between narcissism and desirable thoughts and behaviors such as helping, with notable exceptions11,12,41. We aim to address these limitations by exploring the relation between grandiose narcissism and psychosocial functioning via (a) a fourfold model, and (b) assessments of both negative and positive elements of psychosocial functioning likely to be influenced by the pandemic. When we use the term “narcissism,” we imply grandiose narcissism.

**Forms of Grandiose Narcissism**

Grandiose narcissists strive to maintain an inflated self-view in domains central or important to them16,29. These domains can be agentic (involving such attributes as competition, achievement, and effectiveness) or communal (involving such attributes as cooperation, morality, and kindness1). Grandiose narcissism, then, can comprise two forms: agentic and communal14,15. Supporting this distinction are findings indicating that agentic narcissists and communal narcissists evince distinct beliefs and behaviors30. Specifically, communal (but not agentic) narcissists report that they are more prosocial16,38, more trustworthy21, and less likely to obey immoral authority41, while overestimating their knowledge on communal topics16.

However, each of these two forms of grandiose narcissism can be subdivided further based on the motive, self-enhancement or self-protection, driving the narcissism22,23. This motivational distinction leads to the proposal that there are two forms of *agentic* narcissism: admiration and rivalry4. Admirative narcissists are thought to be guided by the self-enhancement motive3,33 to gain an ego boost by seeing themselves as highly agentic or effective (e.g., that they are exceptionally mentally stable or a genius). In comparison, rivalrous narcissists are thought to be guided by the self-protection motive29,31 to gain an ego boost by denigrating others’ agency or effectiveness (asserting that others are especially mentally unstable or especially stupid). Further, this motivation distinction leads to the proposal that there are two forms of *communal* narcissism: sanctity and heroism43. Narcissistic sanctity produces an ego boost by thinking of oneself as especially moral or saintly, or by acting in these ways, and is thought to be driven by the self-enhancement motive. In comparison, narcissistic heroism produces an ego boost by inducing positive crisis-related thoughts (e.g., only I alone can save us) or actions (developing novel technology to fight climate change), and is thought to be driven by the self-protection motive.

This fourfold model is of interest because it potentially contradicts the standard view of narcissists as acting to the detriment of others. Instead, a communal narcissist can augment their perceived grandiosity via their helping-related actions and thoughts17,20,43. The fourfold model suggests that sometimes helping-related actions and thoughts18,20,37 are driven by self-enhancement (e.g., “all the people I helped worship me and say they love me and admire me - I’m great!”). However, there are other prosocial routes to boosting a narcissist’s ego. For example, sometimes a narcissist’s grandiosity might be augmented by the mere thought that only the heroic, self-protecting, narcissist has the power to eliminate a collective’s troubles (e.g., “We are all going to be doomed unless you let me fix this!”), and the narcissist may act accordingly.

**Fourfold Grandiose Narcissism and Variation in Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic**

The implication of the fourfold model of grandiose narcissism, then, is that there are different motives that underlie narcissism (self-enhancement vs. self-protection) and distinct domains in which narcissism can be expressed (agentic vs. communal). This view implies that forms of narcissists may think and behave differently, and for varying reasons. We sought evidence for these possibilities in the context of the pandemic.

We used existing instruments to measure the extent to which individuals evinced each of the four narcissism forms (admiration, rivalry, sanctity, heroism). In addition, to replicate and extend results from prior COVID-19 psychosocial research7,26, we assessed the extent to which individuals endorsed unfounded beliefs about the pandemic. Some of these were conspiracy beliefs (e.g., “Coronavirus was created to be a bioweapon”) and some were health beliefs (e.g., “Eating garlic cures the coronavirus”). We also pursued our replication and extension goal by building on COVID-19 psychosocial research that examined behaviors25. As in that research, we assessed the extent to which individuals engaged in three types of behavioral responses to the pandemic: prevention (e.g., “more frequent washing hands”), hoarding (e.g., “buying food products, like rice, flour, milk, canned goods, rice”), and helping (e.g., “provide emotional help those in need”).

We explored (a) the extent to which the narcissism forms independently predicted thoughts or behaviors, (b) whether these predictive effects varied across narcissism forms, and (c) whether any lack of independence reflected commonality either in underlying motive (self-enhancement vs. self-protection) or domain (agentic vs. communal). The fourfold model would be supported by results showing that (a) any of the four narcissism forms uniquely predict thoughts or behaviors, (b) the four narcissism forms predict thoughts and behaviors differently (e.g., one form might positively predict a thought/behavior, whereas another form might negatively predict the same thought/behavior), and (c) the observed patterns make sense in terms of the dimensions of the fourfold model (self-enhancement vs. self-protection, agentic vs. communal).

What result patterns would be consistent with the fourfold model? One such pattern might show that, though all forms of heightened narcissism are positively related to unfounded beliefs of COVID-19 being the consequence of conspiracy, this positive relation is stronger for narcissism’s self-protection (rivalry, heroism) than self-enhancement (admiration, sanctity) forms. This hypothesis relies on the idea that threat to the self prompts explanatory behavior deflecting the threat away from the self 29,31, but this tendency will be pronounced in narcissists who are particularly responsive to self-threat, regardless of domain. Another possible pattern of results might show that both narcissism forms in the communal domain (sanctity, heroism) positively predict the extent to which an individual provides emotional COVID-related support to others, but that narcissism forms in the agentic domain (admiration, rivalry) negatively predict such behavior. This hypothesis is grounded in the idea that a narcissist can be prosocial (e.g., help others) to boost the self via social approval for one’s prosocial-actions, regardless of whether those actions result from the motive to promote the self (e.g., appearing saintly) or protect the self (e.g., avoid appearing indifferent). We note that our hypotheses for the agentic domain derive from the notion that agentic narcissists get their ego boost from the extent to which they are perceived to be effective; as such, unless effectiveness information can be derived from a thought or behavior, agentic narcissists will be highly unlikely to engage in, or endorse, behaviors such as providing emotional support to others.

These findings, should they occur, will have implications for the literature on narcissism and responses to the pandemic. Specifically, the conclusions from that literature, which generally treated narcissism as a unitary construct, will need to be revised if the narcissism forms predict outcomes independently or differently. They will also need to be revised if narcissism sometimes promotes pro-social thoughts and behaviors.

**Method**

**Participants**

We used data collected, via convenience sampling, between 24 April and 20 November 2020. The data were collected as part of the international (and preregistered at OSF) project, “COVID-19, personality and quality of life: Self-enhancement in the time of pandemic.” Other studies have also relied on this dataset7,28,44.

The project obtained ethical approval from the Bioethics board of Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw [KEiB – 32/2020]. Each participant provided informed consent prior to participation. All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files] available on the project’s OSF page: [https://osf.io/pv2zy/?view\_only=f7e745f9133a4b978af1d26b73ae1963](about:blank).

Participants were invited to engage in the study via email or an announcement on Facebook forums devoted to COVID-related topics. These communications included a link to the project’s website. After accessing the website, participants reported their nationality and country of residence, and selected their preferred language version (out of 35 language options). [We distributed invitations and announcements in official languages. Most participants in each country (*M* = 96.17%, *SD* = 6.46%) selected the country’s official language (e.g., Italians selected Italian). Latvians were the exception: Only 64.90% of them selected Latvian]. We did not offer remuneration, except for participants from the Republic of South Africa and the United Kingdom (2GBP or ≈2.5USD). [We lacked funding for data collection, and so we did not pay participants in general. However, in these two countries, we encountered insurmountable difficulties with data collection. We managed to carry out the surveys after local collaborators secured funding from their home institutions].

For a country’s data to be included in the sample, the country needed to provide at least 40 usable participants44. After exclusions, the final sample included data from 61 countries. We report each country’s sample composition in Supplementary Information, Table S1.

With one exception, we deemed data usable if participants (a) were over the age of 18 years, (b) responded to all scales, and (c) passed all three randomly placed attention-check items (e.g., “This item aims to check your attention. Please mark 2”). The exception involved gender. We did not include in the analyses data from 90 (0.6%) non-binary individuals because gender was a predictor in our analyses, and we deemed the sample size of the non-binary individual group too small and too unbalanced across countries to yield trustworthy results.

The final sample comprised 15,093 participants (65.7% women, 34.3% men) aged between 18 and 87 years (*M* = 31.7, *SD* = 12.3). Of them, 0.80% had a primary education level, 30.53% a secondary education level, 38.97% a bachelor’s level, 23.32% a master’s level, and 6.39% a doctoral level or higher.

**Measures**

***Narcissism Predictors***

We assessed four forms of grandiose narcissism: admiration, rivalry, sanctity, heroism. We assessed admiration and rivalry using the 6-item shortened version of the Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire4. Three items pertain to admiration (e.g., “I deserve to be seen as a great personality”) and three to rivalry (e.g., “I want my rivals to fail”). We assessed sanctity and heroism with the 10-item Narcissistic Sanctity and Heroism Questionnaire43. Five items pertain to sanctity (e.g., “I can understand everyone in every situation”) and three to heroism (e.g., “There is no one except me who can deal with threats to my surroundings”). All response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

**Criterion Variables**

We were interested in the extent to which the measures of narcissism predicted both thoughts about COVID-19 and behaviors related to COVID-19. To replicate and extend prior research, we focused on unfounded beliefs about the coronavirus in our assessment of thoughts. We measured them with the Unfounded Beliefs of COVID-19 Misperceptions Scale7,26. Four items refer to conspiratorial beliefs (e.g., “A cure for the coronavirus has already been discovered but is being suppressed by people who want the pandemic to continue”) and four to health beliefs (e.g., “If one gargles with warm water and salt or vinegar it eliminates the coronavirus”). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Our interest in replication and extension also drove the behavior assessments that we used. In particular, we adapted previously used three types of behavioral responses to the pandemic25: prevention (e.g., “more frequent washing hands”), hoarding (e.g., “buying food products, like rice, flour, milk, canned goods, rice”), helping (e.g., “provide emotional help those in need”). We assessed each of them with three items. Participants indicated the extent (1 = *definitely not*, 4 = *definitely yes*) to which they enacted each behavior in the week preceding data collection.

All measures were translated by local teams using a standard back-translation procedure5. Each participant received (a) a version of the measures that matched their preferred language, and (b) the measures in a separate random. We report descriptive statistics for all measures in all countries in Supplementary Information, Table S2. With two exceptions, the scales’ internal consistency (Cronbach’s α) was adequate or better in all countries and for all variables. The exceptions were for the measures of rivalry and helping behaviors, which evinced an average Cronbach’s α of 0.57 in both cases. We report coefficients across countries in Supplementary Information, Table S3.

**Data-Analytic Strategy**

We conducted an initial wave of analyses that focused on describing the sample characteristics and calculated the simple correlations among variables. However, given the nested structure of the data, we recognized that we needed to go beyond such simple descriptors to test our hypotheses, especially the extent to which each of the four narcissism forms evinced predictive power that was independent of the other forms. In pursuit of this goal, we carried out a set of Multilevel Models (MLM), which simultaneously included all the forms of narcissism that we had studied.

Acknowledging that at least a metric level of measurement invariance is necessary for the predictiveness of the narcissism measures to be valid, we first assessed whether the responses to the narcissism assessments and to unfounded belief items were comparable across countries. We did not include the measures of behavioral responses in this analysis step because the behavior items were not part of a response scale with known psychometric properties and, thus, were not suited for our analytic approach.

To examine whether responses to the narcissism and belief measures provided structurally valid data across countries, we first conducted Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFAs) across all countries, when possible (*n* > 100, 50 countries). Second, we conducted Multigroup Confirmatory Factor Analyses, allowing for partial metric invariance, and excluded items in some cases (for details, see Supplementary Information, Factor Analyses of Used Instruments section). Third, we estimated latent variable scores for each participant using CFA on the whole sample (61 countries).

To test whether the four narcissism forms independently predicted unfounded COVID-19 beliefs and COVID-19 related behavior, we relied on a series of Multilevel Models (MLM). We report results from the models in Supplementary Information, Tables S5–S9. As depicted in those tables, the analyses proceeded hierarchically. We added sequentially each predictor or group of predictors to help highlight the shared effects of the predictors and the unique effects of each predictor. In the first step of each model and for each criterion variable, we entered control variables such as the age, gender, and economic status of participants. In the second step of each model, we included admiration and rivalry in one common analysis (2A) and sanctity and heroism in a second common analysis (2B) to control for their common effects and to examine their residual effects within each dimension of the fourfold model (i.e., agency vs. communion, self-enhancement vs. self-protection). Finally, in the third step, we entered all four narcissism forms as simultaneous predictors to examine their incremental predictive effects.

In all analyses, we used R software with the “dplyr” package for basic data analyses, the “lavaan” package for factor analyses, and the “lme4” package for MLM analyses. In the factor analyses, we used the Robust Maximum Likelihood (MLR) estimator to account for deviations from normality39 and relied on the following thresholds of fit: CFI > .90, RMSEA < .08, SRMR < .086,8. In the cross-national Multigroup Confirmatory Factor Analyses, we relied on the thresholds: ΔCFI < -.02, ΔRMSEA < .0327. To compare coefficients, we relied on 95% confidence intervals of standardized effects. We interpreted overlapping CIs as indicative of no significant difference between the compared coefficients.

**Results**

**Preliminary Analyses**

We provided the zero-order correlations among variables for the whole sample (i.e., ignoring the data’s nested structure) in Supplementary Information, Table S4. With one exception (rivalry did not predict prevention behavior), all narcissism forms significantly and positively predicted all criterion variables.

These significant correlations present a mixed picture with regard to whether narcissists can be pro-social or anti-social. The simple correlations suggest that narcissists are likely to endorse both unfounded conspiracy beliefs and unfounded health beliefs about COVID-19 and are more likely to engage in hoarding behavior. However, these correlations also suggest that narcissists are more likely to engage in COVID-19 prevention behavior and to provide COVID-19 related emotional support to others.

The initial suggestion that high narcissism may conduce to pro-sociality is controversial. However, these simple correlations may be misleading. For example, if the narcissism form predictors are correlated with each other (and they are: see Supplementary Information, Table S4), the correlation between any given narcissism form predictor and a criterion variable might be contaminated by the other narcissism forms. Consequently, we engaged in analyses that allow assessment of the extent to which a narcissism form predicts beliefs and behaviors in a manner that is uncontaminated by, or independent of, other narcissism forms. The Multilevel Modeling Analyses, summarized in the section that follows (and fully presented in Supplementary Information, Tables S5–S9), accomplish that goal. These analyses probe the extent to which the predictive effects of each narcissism form are independent, controlling for other potential confounds such as between-country effects (accounted for via the ICC term in the models) and participant characteristics (e.g., gender).

**Narcissism and Unfounded Beliefs About the Coronavirus**

***Unfounded Conspiracy Beliefs***

Results from the MLM analyses conducted on the unfounded conspiracy beliefs showed that all narcissism forms were positively related to conspiracy beliefs (for a summary, see Table 1; for full results, see Supplementary Information, Table S5). However, the results also indicated that the narcissism-unfounded belief endorsement association was significant and independent only for narcissism’s self-protection forms (i.e., rivalry, heroism) and not its self-enhancement ones (i.e., admiration, sanctity). The 95% CIs of the standardized coefficients were [.07, .12] for rivalry, [-.02, .04] for admiration, [.10, .16] for heroism, and [.00, .06] for sanctity.

These results point to several conclusions. First, not all narcissism forms are equal. Instead, they are differentially linked to the unfounded conspiracy belief criterion variable: some independently predict the endorsement of unfounded conspiracy beliefs but others do not. Second, narcissistic thoughts can be motivated by either self-enhancement or self-protection. In this case, it was only the self-protective narcissism forms (rivalry and heroism) that independently predicted the endorsement of unfounded conspiracy beliefs.

***Unfounded Health Beliefs***

Results from the MLM analyses conducted on the unfounded health beliefs showed that all narcissism forms were significantly related to unfounded health beliefs (for a summary, see Table 1; for full results, see Supplementary Information, Table S6). However, the direction of this relation differed across forms. Heroism (95% CI = [.13, .19]), admiration (95% CI = [01, .07]), and rivalry (95% CI = [.03, .08]) all positively and independently predicted endorsement of unfounded health beliefs, but sanctity [-.06, .00] negatively and independently predicted endorsement of such beliefs.

These results allude to the same two conclusions as above. Narcissism forms are differentially associated with the unfounded health belief. In this case, although the heroism, admiration, and rivalry forms act in a typically antisocial manner, with high narcissism predicting greater endorsement of unfounded health beliefs, the sanctity acts in a prosocial manner, with higher narcissism being linked to lower endorsement of unfounded COVID-19 health beliefs.

**Narcissism and Behavioral Responses to the Pandemic**

***Enactment of Prevention Behaviors***

Results from the MLM analyses conducted on the likelihood of an individual enacting COVID-19 prevention behaviors in the past week (for a summary, see Table 1; for full results, see Supplementary Information, Table S7) indicated that the criterion variable was predicted only by rivalry (95% CI = [ -.06, -.01]) and sanctity (95% CI = [.04, .10]), and not by heroism (95% CI = [.00, .06]) or admiration (95% CI = [-.02, .03]). Notably, the direction of the predictive relation differed for rivalry and sanctity: Higher narcissistic rivalry predicted a lower likelihood of enactment of COVID-19 prevention behaviors, but higher narcissistic sanctity predicted a higher likelihood of enactment of COVID-19 prevention behaviors.

Therefore, when narcissism does predict the enactment of prevention behaviors, the direction of that relation differs across forms. Whereas rivalrous narcissists behaved in the anti-social manner (i.e., higher narcissism predicted lower enactment likelihood), sanctimonious narcissists behaved in a prosocial manner (i.e., higher narcissism predicted greater enactment likelihood).

***Hoarding***

Results from the MLM analyses conducted on the extent to which an individual enacted COVID-19-related hoarding behaviors (for a summary, see Table 1; for full results, see Supplementary Information, Table S8) revealed that hoarding was significantly and independently predicted by only one form of narcissism: heroism (95% CI =[.06, .12]; for sanctity, 95% CI = [-.02, .05]; for admiration, 95% CI = [-.02, .04]; and for rivalry 95% CI = [.00, .05]).

***Helping via Provision of Emotional Support***

Results from the MLM analyses conducted on the extent to which an individual enacted COVID-19-related behaviors that involved providing emotional support to others (for a summary, see Table 1; for full results, see Supplementary Information, Table S9) revealed that all narcissism forms were significantly and independently linked to helping. However, these effects were not all in the same direction. The predictive effects were positive for sanctity (95% CI = [.10, .16]), heroism (95% CI = [.08, .14]), and admiration (95% CI = [.04, .10]), but negative for rivalry (95% CI = [-.11, -.05]). Perhaps surprisingly, three of these independent and significant effects indicate that high (sanctity, heroism, admiration) narcissism predicted greater rates of pro-social behavior. Only heightened rivalrous narcissism yielded the pattern that would be considered to be typical of narcissism, with high rivalrous narcissism predicting lower rates of emotional support behavior. Hence, across all analyses, we found that not all forms of narcissism are equal, as they are differentially related to the probablity of enacting COVID-related behaviors. This mirrors results found for COVID-related thoughts, supporting hypotheses derived from the fourfold model.

**Discussion**

We examined whether (a) each grandiose narcissism form (sanctity, heroism, admiration, rivalry) predicted unfounded beliefs about COVID-19 and some COVID-19-linked behaviors; (b) these predictive effects varied across forms; and (c) any lack of independence among the forms reflected commonality in either domain (agentic vs. communal) or underlying motive (self-enhancement vs. self-protection) linked to the four forms. We expected results showing that (a) forms uniquely predicted beliefs or actions, (b) forms predicted beliefs and behaviors differently, and (c) the patterns observed in the relations make sense in terms of the dimensions of the fourfold model (self-enhancement vs. self-protection, agentic vs. communal) thought to produce the four forms.

The results indicated that the fourfold model is valid in that it possesses predictive utility. In two cases (unfounded health beliefs and the provision of emotional support), all four narcissism forms independently predicted each criterion variable. In two other cases (endorsement of conspiracy beliefs and enactment of prevention behavior), two narcissism forms significantly and independently predicted each criterion variable. In the final case (enactment of hoarding behavior), only one form significantly and independently predicted the extent to which an individual engaged in hoarding behavior. These results suggest that the fourfold model is an improvement over simpler models, such as those that only made a distinction between agentic narcissism and communal narcissism16. Taking into account the motives (self-enhancement and self-protection) presumed to underlie narcissism contributes to the construct’s predictive power of thought and behavior42,43,44.

Also, we found that higher narcissism can prompt pro-social thought and behavior. Specifically, we observed that (a) increases in sanctity were independently linked to weaker endorsement of unfounded COVID-19 health beliefs, (b) increases in sanctity independently predicted higher enactment likelihood of COVID-19 prevention behaviors, and (c) high sanctity, high heroism, and high admiration independently predicted stronger rates of emotional support to others.

Hence, narcissists will not always act and think in an antisocial manner. Instead, narcissism can be a double-edged sword: sometimes it is linked to anti-social thoughts and actions, whereas other times it is linked to prosocial thoughts and actions. Whether the consequence is anti-social or pro-social depends on the joint action of the domain in which the narcissism exists (agentic vs. communal), the motives that underlie it (self-enhancement vs. self-protection), and the criterion variable that is being predicted by any of the four grandiose narcissism forms.

**Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research**

Our study is a foray into examining the diverse responses of narcissists to the COVID-19 pandemic. Our research has several strengths. For example, we: (a) tested a large sample; (b) obtained data from participants in many countries; (c) used varied instruments and methods; and (d) employed statistical techniques appropriate to the pertinent research questions. Importantly, our study was the first to draw a distinction between sanctity and heroism, indicating the validity of the fourfold model and its utility in predicting human thoughts and behaviors at least in the context of the pandemic. Relatedly, we provided initial evidence that communal narcissism can be understood in terms of self-enhancement and self-protection, similar to agentic narcissism in the NARC model4.

However, our research also has limitations that can be addressed in future research. To begin, we collected the data via convenience sampling and computer. These procedures may have led to less educated and less affluent people being underrepresented in the sample. Thus, despite our large and cross-cultural sample, the generalizability of our findings to the general population may be restricted. We focused solely on grandiose narcissism, albeit vulnerable narcissism might be relevant in explaining COVID-related thoughts and behaviors, as it is related to lower subjective well-being, poorer mental health, and stronger responses to stressful events24. Also, we assessed beliefs and behaviors via retrospection: we asked participants to remember what they did at an earlier time. Retrospections sometimes do not accurately reflect the thoughts that people had or the behaviors they enacted during an earlier time in their life35. Follow-up research will do well to use ecological momentary assessment. Third, the COVID-19 crisis may have unique features and characteristics that influenced our results. For example, the politics of the era may have caused the COVID-19 crisis to be viewed through a conservative versus liberal political lens, which might not be present in other crises. Additionally, our data could be re-analyzed to detect latent profiles that describe narcissistic individuals and their behaviors instead of forms of narcissism or motives. For instance, such profiling might identify rivalrous narcissists who are not grandiose. These individuals could be of interest to policymakers, as they are unlikely to follow medical recommendations in future crises. In the same vein, communal narcissists may be likely to help others assuming that their actions are noticed.12,15,36 Lastly, admirative narcissists might assist in practical matters (e.g., food provision, prevention of contagious diseases) assuming their actions are public and receive praise22.

**Coda**

We validated the fourfold model of grandiose narcissism, proposing four forms (admiration, rivalry, sanctity, heroism) based on distinctions between motives (self-enhancement vs. self-protection) and domains (agentic vs. communal). Further, we showed that these forms contribute to distinct thoughts and behaviors, at least during a societal crisis. Finally, we demonstrated that narcissism can be linked to pro-social thinking and behaving during such a crisis. Our research expands the narcissism literature and is generative.

**References**

1. Abele, A.E., & Wojciszke, B. (2007). Agency and communion from the perspective of self and others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* *93,* 751–763.
2. Ahorsu, D.K., Lin, C.Y., Imani, V., Saffari, M., Griffiths, M.D., & Pakpour, A.H. (2022). The fear of COVID-19 scale: Development and initial validation. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 20*, 1537–1545.
3. Alicke, M.D., & Sedikides, C. (2009). Self-enhancement and self-protection: What they are and what they do. *European Review of Social Psychology, 20*(1), 1–48.
4. Back, M.D., Küfner, A.C., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T.M., Rauthmann, J.F., & Denissen, J.J. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*, 1013–1037.
5. Brislin, R.W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1*(3), 185–216.
6. Brown, T.A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Press.
7. Brzóska, P. Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J. Nowak, B., Jonason, P.K., Sedikides, C. … & Yahiiaiev, I. (2023). Testing the underlying structure of unfounded beliefs about COVID-19 around the world. *Thinking & Reasoning*. [https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2023.2259539](about:blank)
8. Byrne, B.M. (1994). *Structural equation modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows*. Sage Publications.
9. Dinic, B., & Bodroza, B. (2021). COVID-19 protective behaviors are forms of prosocial and unselfish behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 647710.
10. Ernst, M., Niederer, D., Werner, A. M., Czaja, S. J., Mikton, C., Ong, A. D., Rosen, T., Brähler, E., & Beutel, M. E. (2022). Loneliness before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review with meta-analysis. American Psychologist, 77, 660–677.
11. Federico, C.M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Baran, T. (2021). Collective narcissism, in-group satisfaction, and solidarity in the face of COVID-19. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 12*, 1071–1081.
12. Freis, S.D., & Brunell, A.B. (2022). Narcissistic motivations to help during the COVID-19 quarantine. *Personality and Individual Differences, 194*, 111623.
13. Gąsiorowska, W., Sioch, M., & Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M. A. (2021). Narcissism, social support, and loneliness during the pandemic. Personality and Individual Differences, 181, Article 111002.
14. Gebauer, J.E., & Sedikides, C. (2018a). Communal narcissism: Theoretical and empirical support. In A.D. Hermann, A.B. Brunell, J.D. Foster (Eds.), *Handbook of trait narcissism* (pp. 69-77). Springer.
15. Gebauer, J.E., & Sedikides, C. (2018b). Agency and communion in grandiose narcissism. In A. E. Abele & B. Wojciszke (Eds.), *Agency and communion in social psychology* (pp. 90–102). Routledge Press.
16. Gebauer, J.E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G.R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*, 854–878.
17. Giacomin, M., & Jordan, C.H. (2015). Validating power makes communal narcissists less communal. *Self and Identity, 14*, 583–601.
18. Grapsas, S., Brummelman, E., Back, M.D., & Denissen, J.J. (2020). The “why” and “how” of narcissism: A process model of narcissistic status pursuit. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15,* 150-172.
19. Grubbs, J.B., James, A.S., Warmke, B, &, Tosi, J. (2022). Moral grandstanding, narcissism, and self-reported responses to the COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 97*, 104-187.
20. Konrath, S., Ho, M.H., & Zarins, S. (2016). The strategic helper: Narcissism and prosocial motives and behaviors. *Current Psychology, 35*, 182–194.
21. Kwiatkowska, M.M., Jułkowski, T., Rogoza, R., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., & Fatfouta, R. (2019). Narcissism and trust: Differential impact of agentic, antagonistic, and communal narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 137*, 139–143.
22. Mahadevan, N., Gregg, A. P., & Sedikides, C. (2019). Is self-regard a sociometer or a hierometer? Self-esteem tracks status and inclusion, narcissism tracks status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 116*(3), 444–466.
23. Miller, J.D., Back, M.D., Lynam, D.R., & Wright, A.G.C. (2021). Narcissism today: What we know and what we need to learn. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 30*, 519–525.
24. Miller, J.D., Lynam, D.R., Vize, C., Crowe, M., Sleep, C., Maples‐Keller, J.L., ... & Campbell, W.K. (2018). Vulnerable narcissism is (mostly) a disorder of neuroticism. *Journal of Personality, 86*, 186-199.
25. Nowak, B., Brzóska, P., Piotrowski, J., Sedikides, C., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., & Jonason P.K. (2020). Adaptive and maladaptive behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: The roles of Dark Triad traits, collective narcissism, and health beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 167*, 110232.
26. Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Bago, B., & Rand, D.G. (2022). Beliefs about COVID-19 in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States: A novel test of political polarization and motivated reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 48,* 750–765.
27. Rutkowski, L., & Svetina, D. (2014). Assessing the hypothesis of measurement invariance in the context of large-scale international surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 74*, 31–57.
28. Sawicki, A.J., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Balcerowska, J.M., Sawicka, M.J., Piotrowski, J., Sedikides, C., Jonason, P.K., Maltby, J., Adamovic, M., Agada, A.M.D., Ahmed, O., Al-Shawaf, L., Appiah, S.C.Y., Ardi, R., Babakr, Z.H., Bălţătescu, S., Bonato, M., Cowden, R.G., Chobthamkit, P., . . . Zand, S. (2022). The fear of COVID-19 scale: Its structure and measurement invariance across 48 countries. *Psychological Assessment, 34*, 294–310.
29. Sedikides, C. (2012). Self-protection. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 327–353). Guilford Press.
30. Sedikides, C. (2021a). In search of Narcissus. *Trends in Cognitive Science, 25*, 67-80.
31. Sedikides, C. (2021b). Self-construction, self-protection, and self-enhancement: A homeostatic model of identity protection. *Psychological Inquiry, 32*, 197–221.
32. Sedikides, C., & Campbell, W.K. (2017). Narcissistic force meets systemic resistance: The Energy Clash Model. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*, 400–421.
33. Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2008). Self-enhancement: Food for thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*(2), 102–116.
34. Thomaes, S., Brummelman, E., & Sedikides, C. (2018). Narcissism: A social-developmental perspective. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. K. Shackelford (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality and individual differences* (pp. 377–396). Sage Publications.
35. Unsworth, N., McMillan, B. D., Brewer, G. A., & Spillers, G. J. (2013). Individual differences in everyday retrospective memory failures. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2*(1), 7–13.
36. Van Bavel, J. J., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., Crockett, M. L., Crum, A. J., Douglas, K. M., Druckman, J. N., Drury, J., Dube, O., Ellemers, N., Finkelm E. J., Fowler, J. H., Gelfand, N., Han, S., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Kitayama, S., … Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour,* *4*, 460–471.
37. Van Lange, P. A. M., & Sedikides, C. (1998). Being more honest but not necessarily more intelligent than others: Generality and explanations for the Muhammad Ali effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 675–680.
38. Yang, Z., Sedikides, C., Gu, R., Luo, Y., Wang, Y., & Cai, H. (2018). Communal narcissism: Social decisions and neurophysiological reactions. *Journal of Research in Personality, 76*, 65–73.
39. Yuan, K.H., & Bentler, P.M. (2000). Three likelihood-based methods for mean and covariance structure analysis with nonnormal missing data. *Sociological Methodology, 30*, 165-200.
40. Zajenkowski, M., Jonason, P.K., Leniarska, M., & Kozakiewicz, Z. (2020). Who complies with the restrictions to reduce the spread of COVID-19? Personality and perceptions of the COVID-19 situation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 166,* 110199.
41. Zdunek, R.R., Czarna, A.Z, & Sedikides, C. (2022). Grandiose (communal and agentic) narcissism and predicted (dis)obedience in the Milgram paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences, 189,* 111514.
42. Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J., Sawicki, A., & Jonason, P.K. (2021). We will rescue Italy, but we dislike the European Union: Collective narcissism and the COVID-19 threat. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *25,* 892-901.
43. Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J., Sawicki, A., Sedikides, C., Skowronski, J. J., Cieciuch, J., Struss, W., & Jonason, P. K. (2023a). *Narcissism and social domain beliefs: Communal narcissists can perceive themselves to be either saints or superheroes*. Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Psychology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw.
44. Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Sawicki, A., Piotrowski, J., Lifshin, U., Kretchner., M., Jonason, P.K., ... & Zand, S. (2023b). *Threat or opportunity to support the ingroup? Collective narcissists’ motivation during the COVID-19 pandemic*. Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Psychology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw.

**Table 1**

*Standardized Coefficients of Multilevel Models – Unfounded Beliefs About COVID-19*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Unfounded Beliefs** | | **Behavioral Responses** | | |
|  | **Conspiracy** | **Health** | **Prevention** | **Hoarding** | **Prosocialness** |
| **Fixed Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Covariates*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sex (men) | -.03 | .00 | **-.19\*\*** | -.02 | **-.04\*** |
| Age | **-.03\*\*** | **.05\*\*** | **.02\*** | .01 | **.11\*\*** |
| Education level | **-.12\*\*** | **-.07\*\*** | **.03\*\*** | .00 | .02 |
| SES | **-.07\*\*** | **-.04\*\*** | **.02\*** | **.02\*\*** | .01 |
| GDP | **-.26\*\*** | **-.32\*\*** | **-.14\*** | **-.14\*\*** | **-.15\*\*** |
| ***Narcissism forms*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admiration | .01 | **.04\*** | .00 | .01 | **.07\*\*** |
| Rivalry | **.09\*\*** | **.06\*\*** | **-.04\*** | .02 | **-.08\*\*** |
| Sanctity | .03 | **-.03\*** | **.07\*\*** | .02 | **.13\*\*** |
| Heroism | **.13\*\*** | **.16\*\*** | .03 | **.09\*\*** | **.11\*\*** |
| **Random Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICC | .11 | .17 | .27 | .11 | .08 |
| Country: intercept | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.04 |
| Residual | 1.02 | 0.94 | 0.36 | 0.65 | 0.05 |
| Marginal *R*2 | .18 | .19 | .04 | .05 | .11 |
| Conditional *R*2 | .27 | .33 | .30 | .15 | .18 |

*Note*. *N* = 15,039; Number of countries = 61; SES = socioeconomical status; GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita. Significant links are bolded.

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**Grandiose Narcissism in the Pandemic:**


**Unfounded Beliefs and Behavioral Reactions**

**Scale Factor Analyses**

We conducted confirmatory factor analyses of all scales aiming to examine whether (a) the original scale structure replicates in each country, and, if not, (b) whether we could arrive at a modified, cross-country invariant version of the scale. In modifying the models, we assumed that all items are equally important for a given scale. Therefore, we relied only on factor analysis criteria in the modification process. We started with testing the original, full version each scale in each country. Then, following modification indices in countries with a poor fit, we examined whether some of those modifications improved overall fit. We did that iteratively, assessing fit after each change of the model. Then, using MGCFA, we tested whether those modified solutions were invariant across countries, excluding those countries where even the modified version of the scale was not well-fitted. Knowing the invariance level of the modified scales, we conducted a CFA on a general sample (i.e., without dividing it into country-based groups) for each of them. Then, we extracted the latent score of each construct for every participant. We subsequently used those latent scores in MLM analyses. We report all fit indices across countries in .xlsx files on the project’s OSF page: <https://osf.io/pv2zy/?view_only=f7e745f9133a4b978af1d26b73ae1963>. We also reported on this OSF page the database and full code.

**Figure S1**

*Simplified Flowchart of Invariant Latent Scores Estimation*



**Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry (NARQ).** We tested a 2-factor structure, with three items for each narcissism form. The model was not convergent in Bangladesh, Hungary, and Kazakhstan. Further, such a model did not adequately fit to the data in nine countries, so, following modification indices, we relaxed the constraint between residuals of item #3 (“I want my rivals to fail”) and item #6 (“Most people are somehow losers”), both measuring rivalry. Such a modification improved fit in several groups, yet the model still did not fit the data well in Brazil, United Arab Emirates, and Uruguay. Therefore, we did not include those countries in MGCFA, examining measurement invariance of NARQ in a total of 44 countries. We also excluded Italy, due to estimation problems of metric-invariant model. We conducted the final, reported analyses in 43 countries.

We found partial metric invariance in 43 countries after relaxing the group-equal constraint on factor loadings of item #6, which varied across countries substantially and were rather low (< .50 in most countries). However, as the scale was short and all items were necessary for assessing rivalry (Back et al., 2013), we did not exclude item #6.

**Narcissistic Sanctity and Heroism Scale (NSHS).** Similarly to NARQ, we tested a 2-factor structure of NSHS, with five items measuring sanctity and five items measuring heroism. The initial model was not well-fitted to the data in 26 countries and was non-convergent in two countries (Egypt, Pakistan). Our modifications were limited to (a) the exclusion of item #3 (“Lots of people admire me for what I do for them”; heroism) and item #9 (“I can understand everyone in every situation”; sanctity), and (b) relaxing the correlation between residuals of item #8 (“I am universally respected for my heroic and steadfast fight against evil”; heroism) and item #10 (“Thanks to me, the world is more just”; heroism). Such a modified model was adequately fitted and metric-invariant in 43 counties. The exceptions were Bangladesh, China, Croatia, Hungary, and United Arab Emirates.

**Conspiracy and Health Beliefs About COVID -19.** We used an 8-item version of the scale, which we did not shorten. However, we relaxed the constraint on two error terms: item #5 (“The coronavirus was created in a lab”) and item #6 (“Coronavirus was created to be a bio-weapon”). We tested the model in all countries except the United Arab Emirates, where it was not convergent. The model was well-fitted in all tested groups except Latvia. We observed metric invariance across 48 countries.

**Table S1**

*Sample Composition*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country |  |  | Age | | SES | | GDP |
| *N* | Proportion of men | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Total | 15093 | 34% | 31.7 | 12.3 | 4.3 | 1.2 | - |
| Algeria | 173 | 38% | 34.4 | 10.7 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 13914 |
| Armenia | 168 | 34% | 30.0 | 10.8 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 8788 |
| Australia | 150 | 44% | 46.2 | 17.9 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 44649 |
| Austria | 319 | 46% | 40.1 | 12.2 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 45437 |
| Bangladesh | 345 | 54% | 24.5 | 6.0 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 3524 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 407 | 40% | 28.6 | 11.7 | 4.9 | 1.1 | 11714 |
| Brazil | 342 | 24% | 35.0 | 12.7 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 14103 |
| Bulgaria | 271 | 30% | 36.3 | 9.9 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 18563 |
| Chile | 190 | 35% | 31.1 | 10.3 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 22767 |
| China | 215 | 33% | 28.9 | 11.4 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 15309 |
| Colombia | 121 | 60% | 21.4 | 9.5 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 13255 |
| Croatia | 450 | 40% | 37.3 | 14.4 | 5.0 | 1.1 | 22670 |
| Czech Republic | 428 | 17% | 35.0 | 12.7 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 32606 |
| Denmark | 53 | 30% | 37.5 | 17.0 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 46683 |
| Ecuador | 583 | 36% | 25.8 | 8.5 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 10582 |
| Egypt | 165 | 25% | 31.9 | 9.9 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 10550 |
| Estonia | 253 | 26% | 40.6 | 12.7 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 29481 |
| Germany | 152 | 45% | 35.3 | 13.3 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 45229 |
| Ghana | 90 | 78% | 32.0 | 6.5 | 4.1 | 1.2 | 4228 |
| Greece | 124 | 44% | 38.7 | 13.1 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 24574 |
| Hungary | 115 | 11% | 39.2 | 13.5 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 26778 |
| India | 285 | 47% | 29.6 | 8.7 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 6427 |
| Indonesia | 324 | 22% | 23.3 | 7.9 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 11189 |
| Iran | 194 | 51% | 26.9 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 19083 |
| Iraq | 192 | 63% | 29.9 | 7.6 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 15664 |
| Israel | 162 | 39% | 39.6 | 16.3 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 33132 |
| Italy | 115 | 23% | 38.8 | 16.7 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 35220 |
| Japan | 248 | 78% | 20.0 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 39002 |
| Kazakhstan | 217 | 42% | 26.7 | 9.3 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 24056 |
| Latvia | 231 | 32% | 34.5 | 13.3 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 25064 |
| Lebanon | 93 | 23% | 28.4 | 9.3 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 13368 |
| Malaysia | 243 | 18% | 25.1 | 7.3 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 26808 |
| Mauritius | 42 | 26% | 31.0 | 14.4 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 20293 |
| Netherlands | 41 | 44% | 27.5 | 9.1 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 48473 |
| New Zealand | 59 | 29% | 50.3 | 16.6 | 5.0 | 1.4 | 36086 |
| Nigeria | 146 | 47% | 35.5 | 10.0 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 5338 |
| North Macedonia | 82 | 46% | 29.5 | 11.3 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 13111 |
| Pakistan | 177 | 49% | 24.3 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 5035 |
| Palestine State | 91 | 16% | 25.5 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 4450 |
| Panama | 92 | 58% | 27.4 | 14.2 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 22267 |
| Peru | 117 | 32% | 29.3 | 11.5 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 12237 |
| Philippines | 202 | 34% | 34.8 | 12.9 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 7599 |
| Poland | 269 | 33% | 31.4 | 11.5 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 27216 |
| Portugal | 1079 | 2% | 31.6 | 8.2 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 27937 |
| Romania | 294 | 25% | 33.4 | 12.0 | 4.6 | 0.9 | 23313 |
| Russia | 315 | 19% | 34.1 | 12.5 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 24766 |
| Serbia | 768 | 57% | 25.1 | 9.7 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 14049 |
| Slovakia | 221 | 12% | 42.5 | 12.4 | 4.5 | 0.9 | 30155 |
| Slovenia | 390 | 18% | 36.0 | 11.2 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 31401 |
| South Africa | 702 | 43% | 34.0 | 12.4 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 12295 |
| South Korea | 67 | 82% | 30.7 | 9.1 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 35938 |
| Spain | 522 | 16% | 38.3 | 14.2 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 34272 |
| Thailand | 194 | 41% | 27.6 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 16278 |
| Togo | 134 | 59% | 32.4 | 6.4 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 1430 |
| Turkey | 378 | 28% | 25.2 | 7.3 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 25129 |
| Ukraine | 350 | 25% | 28.0 | 11.4 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 7894 |
| United Arab Emirates | 172 | 30% | 29.5 | 7.0 | 4.4 | 1.3 | 67293 |
| United Kingdom | 298 | 29% | 35.0 | 11.7 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 39753 |
| United States of America | 72 | 35% | 38.5 | 14.2 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 54225 |
| Uruguay | 144 | 44% | 44.2 | 15.4 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 20551 |
| Vietnam | 257 | 71% | 22.1 | 7.0 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 6172 |

*Notes.* SES = Self-reported economic status of family (ranged from 1 = significantly below average to 7 = significantly over average); GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita. Given the application of a filtering rule to the dataset used (i.e., we only included participants with full responses to all scales), sample sizes in the current article differ than those reported in a companion articles (Brzóska et al., 2023; Sawicki et al., 2022) that relied on the same dataset.

**Table S2**

*Means and Standard Deviations of All Studied Constructs Across Countries*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Sanctity | | Heroism | | Admiration | | Rivalry | | Conspiracy beliefs | | | Health beliefs | | | Hoarding behaviours | | | Preventive behaviours | | | Helping behaviours | | |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | | *SD* | *M* | | *SD* | *M* | | *SD* | *M* | | *SD* |
| Algeria | 4.4 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 3.8 | | 1.2 | 2.9 | | 0.7 | 3.3 | | 0.6 | 2.6 | | 0.8 |
| Armenia | 4.4 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 3.0 | | 1.2 | 2.8 | | 0.8 | 3.0 | | 0.7 | 2.1 | | 0.7 |
| Australia | 4.1 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 1.7 | | 1.0 | 2.4 | | 0.7 | 2.6 | | 0.6 | 2.1 | | 0.7 |
| Austria | 4.1 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.3 | | 0.7 | 2.4 | | 0.8 | 2.4 | | 0.8 | 1.9 | | 0.7 |
| Bangladesh | 4.6 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 3.8 | | 1.1 | 3.0 | | 1.0 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.5 | | 1.0 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 4.5 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 2.7 | | 1.2 | 2.6 | | 0.9 | 3.0 | | 0.7 | 2.3 | | 0.8 |
| Brazil | 4.0 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.9 | | 0.9 | 2.7 | | 0.9 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.4 | | 0.8 |
| Bulgaria | 4.2 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 2.5 | | 1.1 | 2.3 | | 0.8 | 2.8 | | 0.7 | 2.1 | | 0.7 |
| Chile | 4.2 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 2.2 | | 1.1 | 2.7 | | 0.8 | 3.6 | | 0.4 | 2.3 | | 0.7 |
| China | 4.0 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 2.3 | | 1.5 | 2.9 | | 0.9 | 3.3 | | 0.6 | 2.3 | | 0.8 |
| Colombia | 4.2 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.9 | | 0.9 | 3.1 | | 0.8 | 3.4 | | 0.5 | 2.2 | | 0.7 |
| Croatia | 4.3 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 2.4 | | 1.1 | 2.4 | | 0.9 | 2.9 | | 0.8 | 2.2 | | 0.8 |
| Czech Republic | 4.1 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.8 | | 0.8 | 2.1 | | 0.7 | 3.0 | | 0.7 | 2.1 | | 0.7 |
| Denmark | 4.1 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.5 | | 0.8 | 2.3 | | 0.8 | 2.5 | | 0.7 | 1.9 | | 0.7 |
| Ecuador | 4.2 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 3.0 | | 1.2 | 3.2 | | 0.8 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.5 | | 0.7 |
| Egypt | 4.5 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 4.2 | | 1.1 | 3.1 | | 0.7 | 3.3 | | 0.6 | 2.7 | | 0.8 |
| Estonia | 4.1 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | | 0.9 | 2.1 | | 0.7 | 2.6 | | 0.6 | 2.1 | | 0.7 |
| Germany | 4.2 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 2.0 | | 1.2 | 2.4 | | 0.8 | 2.7 | | 0.7 | 2.0 | | 0.7 |
| Ghana | 4.8 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 3.3 | | 1.3 | 3.3 | | 0.8 | 3.4 | | 0.5 | 2.7 | | 0.8 |
| Greece | 4.2 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | | 1.1 | 3.3 | | 0.8 | 3.1 | | 0.7 | 3.0 | | 0.8 |
| Hungary | 3.9 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 1.5 | | 0.7 | 2.4 | | 0.9 | 3.2 | | 0.6 | 2.2 | | 0.7 |
| India | 4.4 | 0.9 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 3.5 | | 1.3 | 3.1 | | 0.8 | 3.3 | | 0.5 | 2.7 | | 0.7 |
| Indonesia | 4.2 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.8 | | 1.1 | 2.9 | | 0.7 | 3.5 | | 0.4 | 2.5 | | 0.7 |
| Iran | 4.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 3.7 | | 1.1 | 2.9 | | 0.8 | 3.1 | | 0.6 | 2.4 | | 0.7 |
| Iraq | 4.3 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 3.4 | | 1.2 | 2.7 | | 0.8 | 2.9 | | 0.7 | 2.6 | | 0.7 |
| Israel | 4.3 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 1.9 | | 1.0 | 2.3 | | 0.9 | 2.6 | | 0.7 | 2.0 | | 0.7 |
| Italy | 4.1 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 1.8 | | 1.0 | 3.0 | | 0.8 | 3.2 | | 0.6 | 2.1 | | 0.8 |
| Japan | 3.3 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.4 | | 1.2 | 2.6 | | 0.9 | 3.4 | | 0.5 | 1.8 | | 0.7 |
| Kazakhstan | 4.2 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 2.8 | | 1.2 | 2.5 | | 0.9 | 3.1 | | 0.6 | 2.0 | | 0.7 |
| Latvia | 4.2 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 3.0 | | 1.1 | 2.4 | | 0.7 | 2.6 | | 0.6 | 2.3 | | 0.7 |
| Lebanon | 4.5 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.0 | | 1.0 | 2.7 | | 0.7 | 3.1 | | 0.6 | 2.1 | | 0.6 |
| Malaysia | 4.1 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 2.4 | | 1.2 | 3.0 | | 0.8 | 3.3 | | 0.4 | 2.4 | | 0.7 |
| Mauritius | 4.2 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 3.0 | | 1.4 | 2.8 | | 0.9 | 3.1 | | 0.7 | 2.3 | | 0.7 |
| Netherlands | 4.0 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.7 | | 0.9 | 2.2 | | 0.8 | 2.6 | | 0.6 | 1.7 | | 0.6 |
| New Zealand | 4.2 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 1.7 | | 0.8 | 2.3 | | 0.7 | 2.9 | | 0.5 | 2.4 | | 0.6 |
| Nigeria | 4.8 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 3.1 | | 1.2 | 3.1 | | 0.8 | 3.2 | | 0.6 | 2.7 | | 0.7 |
| North Macedonia | 4.5 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 3.3 | | 1.2 | 2.9 | | 0.7 | 3.2 | | 0.7 | 2.5 | | 0.7 |
| Pakistan | 4.1 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.4 | 4.1 | | 1.2 | 2.9 | | 0.9 | 3.1 | | 0.7 | 2.5 | | 0.9 |
| Palestine State | 4.3 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 4.2 | | 1.2 | 2.7 | | 0.9 | 2.6 | | 0.7 | 2.5 | | 0.7 |
| Panama | 4.3 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 2.6 | | 1.3 | 3.1 | | 0.8 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.2 | | 0.7 |
| Peru | 4.4 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 3.9 | 1.5 | 3.1 | | 1.2 | 3.1 | | 0.9 | 3.7 | | 0.4 | 2.3 | | 0.7 |
| Philippines | 4.4 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 3.1 | | 1.3 | 3.3 | | 0.9 | 3.7 | | 0.4 | 2.6 | | 0.8 |
| Poland | 3.8 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 1.5 | | 0.7 | 2.4 | | 0.8 | 3.3 | | 0.6 | 2.0 | | 0.7 |
| Portugal | 4.0 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.6 | | 0.8 | 3.0 | | 0.8 | 3.6 | | 0.4 | 1.9 | | 0.7 |
| Romania | 4.4 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 2.3 | | 1.2 | 2.5 | | 0.9 | 3.1 | | 0.7 | 2.2 | | 0.8 |
| Russia | 3.9 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 2.2 | | 1.0 | 2.3 | | 0.8 | 3.0 | | 0.8 | 2.0 | | 0.7 |
| Serbia | 4.4 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 1.7 | 2.3 | | 1.2 | 2.2 | | 0.8 | 2.7 | | 0.8 | 2.0 | | 0.8 |
| Slovakia | 4.4 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.2 | | 1.1 | 2.2 | | 0.7 | 1.7 | | 0.6 | 2.4 | | 0.6 |
| Slovenia | 4.5 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 3.9 | 1.6 | 2.3 | | 1.1 | 2.5 | | 0.6 | 2.8 | | 0.6 | 2.4 | | 0.6 |
| South Africa | 4.9 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 3.7 | | 1.4 | 3.3 | | 0.8 | 3.6 | | 0.5 | 2.8 | | 0.8 |
| South Korea | 3.8 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | | 1.1 | 2.3 | | 0.8 | 3.2 | | 0.6 | 1.6 | | 0.7 |
| Spain | 4.1 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 1.7 | | 0.9 | 2.7 | | 0.8 | 3.3 | | 0.6 | 2.2 | | 0.7 |
| Thailand | 4.1 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 2.5 | | 1.1 | 3.1 | | 0.8 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.7 | | 0.7 |
| Togo | 4.3 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 2.8 | | 1.1 | 2.9 | | 0.8 | 3.1 | | 0.6 | 2.2 | | 0.9 |
| Turkey | 4.5 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 2.9 | | 1.2 | 3.0 | | 0.8 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.5 | | 0.7 |
| Ukraine | 4.0 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 2.2 | | 1.0 | 2.5 | | 0.9 | 3.0 | | 0.8 | 1.7 | | 0.7 |
| United Arab Emirates | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.2 | | 0.7 | 2.9 | | 0.8 | 3.6 | | 0.3 | 1.9 | | 0.7 |
| United Kingdom | 4.1 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.6 | | 0.8 | 2.6 | | 0.7 | 3.0 | | 0.6 | 2.2 | | 0.7 |
| United States of America | 4.3 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 2.0 | | 1.3 | 2.6 | | 0.9 | 3.2 | | 0.7 | 2.2 | | 0.8 |
| Uruguay | 4.2 | 0.8 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 2.3 | | 1.1 | 2.7 | | 0.7 | 3.1 | | 0.6 | 2.3 | | 0.7 |
| Vietnam | 3.7 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.8 | | 1.1 | 2.9 | | 0.8 | 3.5 | | 0.5 | 2.5 | | 0.7 |

*Note.* C-19 = COVID-19

**Table S3**

*Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach’s Alphas) Across Countries*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sanctity | Heroism | Admiration | Rivalry | Conspiracy beliefs | Health beliefs | Hoarding behaviours | Preventive behaviours | Helping behaviours |
| Minimum | 0.36 | 0.59 | 0.63 | 0.19 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.35 |
| Maximum | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Median | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.58 | 0.83 | 0.79 | 0.69 | 0.65 | 0.57 |
| Average | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.57 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.69 | 0.64 | 0.57 |
| Country |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Algeria | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 0.55 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.71 | 0.72 |
| Armenia | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.69 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.72 | 0.68 | 0.59 |
| Australia | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 0.87 | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.56 |
| Austria | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.81 | 0.58 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 0.45 |
| Bangladesh | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.63 | 0.35 | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.69 | 0.44 | 0.52 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 0.72 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.75 | 0.69 |
| Brazil | 0.71 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.56 | 0.83 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.65 | 0.45 |
| Bulgaria | 0.68 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 0.62 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.61 | 0.77 | 0.53 |
| Chile | 0.72 | 0.65 | 0.77 | 0.54 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.48 | 0.44 |
| China | 0.71 | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.66 | 0.85 | 0.94 | 0.82 | 0.74 | 0.68 |
| Colombia | 0.52 | 0.66 | 0.72 | 0.63 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.83 | 0.47 | 0.58 |
| Croatia | 0.68 | 0.73 | 0.79 | 0.51 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.65 |
| (Czech Republic) | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.81 | 0.53 | 0.81 | 0.70 | 0.53 | 0.69 | 0.49 |
| Denmark | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 0.38 |
| Ecuador | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.57 |
| Egypt | 0.65 | 0.63 | 0.77 | 0.55 | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.67 | 0.74 | 0.69 |
| Estonia | 0.56 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.53 | 0.85 | 0.74 | 0.55 | 0.68 | 0.49 |
| Germany | 0.68 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.61 | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.61 | 0.62 | 0.54 |
| Ghana | 0.67 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.58 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.74 | 0.51 | 0.72 |
| Greece | 0.59 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.19 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.80 |
| Hungary | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.35 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.72 | 0.64 | 0.43 |
| India | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.61 | 0.55 |
| Indonesia | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.62 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.61 | 0.56 |
| Iran | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.45 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.60 | 0.50 |
| Iraq | 0.60 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.45 | 0.86 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.61 |
| Israel | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.46 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.68 | 0.59 | 0.52 |
| Italy | 0.69 | 0.70 | 0.85 | 0.22 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.72 |
| Japan | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.64 | 0.52 | 0.75 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.52 | 0.62 |
| Kazakhstan | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.57 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.69 |
| Latvia | 0.78 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.69 | 0.66 | 0.75 |
| Lebanon | 0.74 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.55 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.60 | 0.65 | 0.43 |
| Malaysia | 0.73 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.69 | 0.45 | 0.57 |
| Mauritius | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.51 |
| Netherlands | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.78 | 0.69 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.71 | 0.56 | 0.67 |
| New Zealand | 0.70 | 0.83 | 0.87 | 0.64 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.35 |
| Nigeria | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.66 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.72 | 0.64 | 0.59 |
| North Macedonia | 0.36 | 0.70 | 0.81 | 0.64 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.72 | 0.54 |
| Pakistan | 0.65 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 0.61 | 0.87 | 0.75 | 0.74 | 0.68 | 0.68 |
| Palestine State | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.42 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.70 |
| Panama | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.46 | 0.40 |
| Peru | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.73 | 0.69 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 0.59 | 0.58 |
| Philippines | 0.66 | 0.76 | 0.82 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.82 | 0.53 | 0.59 |
| Poland | 0.70 | 0.76 | 0.82 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.57 | 0.65 | 0.57 |
| Portugal | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.55 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 0.67 | 0.45 | 0.44 |
| Romania | 0.74 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.49 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.72 | 0.68 | 0.61 |
| Russia | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.57 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.65 | 0.71 | 0.45 |
| Serbia | 0.64 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.53 | 0.88 | 0.81 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.55 |
| Slovakia | 0.72 | 0.67 | 0.78 | 0.65 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.42 |
| Slovenia | 0.72 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.52 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.58 | 0.72 | 0.62 |
| South Africa | 0.71 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.69 | 0.58 | 0.60 |
| South Korea | 0.85 | 0.74 | 0.65 | 0.21 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 0.59 | 0.73 | 0.75 |
| Spain | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.77 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.73 | 0.68 | 0.56 | 0.50 |
| Thailand | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.72 | 0.57 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.70 | 0.63 | 0.54 |
| Togo | 0.73 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.51 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.61 | 0.73 |
| Turkey | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.86 | 0.52 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.68 | 0.53 |
| Ukraine | 0.68 | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.52 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.58 | 0.72 | 0.56 |
| United Arab Emirates | 0.79 | 0.87 | 0.73 | 0.58 | 0.75 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.40 | 0.41 |
| United Kingdom | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.58 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 0.43 | 0.54 | 0.43 |
| United States of America | 0.66 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.66 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 0.69 | 0.67 | 0.57 |
| Uruguay | 0.65 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.60 | 0.65 | 0.60 |
| Vietnam | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.68 | 0.51 | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 0.65 |

*Note.* C-19 = COVID-19

**Table S4**

*Correlation Matrix of Studied Variables – Whole Sample Combined*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1. Gender (male) |  |  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Age | -.03\*\* |  | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Education | -.05\*\* | .25\*\* | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. SES | .01 | .04\*\* | | | .20\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Sanctity | .01 | .03\*\* | | | -.02\* | .02\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Heroism | .04\*\* | -.01 | | | -.03\*\* | .00 | .88\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Admiration | .12\*\* | -.15\*\* | | | .00 | .01 | .40\*\* | .48\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Rivalry | .13\*\* | -.15\*\* | | | .02\* | -.01 | .22\*\* | .33\*\* | .83\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Unfounded Beliefs** | | | |
| 9. Conspiracy | .06\*\* | -.14\*\* | | | -.16\*\* | -.10\*\* | .27\*\* | .31\*\* | .23\*\* | .19\*\* |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Health | .09\*\* | -.08\*\* | | | -.07\*\* | -.10\*\* | .27\*\* | .34\*\* | .29\*\* | .24\*\* | .71\*\* |  |  |  |
| **Behavioral Responses** | | |
| 11. Prevention | -.10\*\* | -.07\*\* | | | -.02\* | -.05\*\* | .08\*\* | .08\*\* | .05\*\* | .01 | -.05\*\* | .02\* |  |  |
| 12. Hoarding | .00 | -.04\*\* | | | -.03\*\* | -.04\*\* | .14\*\* | .15\*\* | .14\*\* | .09\*\* | .10\*\* | .16\*\* | .41\*\* |  |
| 13. Helping | .01 | .09\*\* | | | .02\*\* | -.01 | .30\*\* | .30\*\* | .17\*\* | .08\*\* | .14\*\* | .22\*\* | .26\*\* | .32\*\* |

*Note.* C-19 = COVID-19; SES = Self-reported economic status of family.

\* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01.

**Table S5**

*Multilevel Model Predicting Unfounded Conspiracy Beliefs About COVID-19*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 0** | | | **Model 1** | | | **Model 2A** | | | **Model 2B** | | | **Model 3** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *P* |
| Intercept [country] | -0.04 | -0.04 | 0.583 | 1.59 | 0.01 | **<0.001** | 1.55 | 0.01 | **<0.001** | 1.56 | 0.01 | **<0.001** | 1.55 | 0.01 | **<0.001** |
| Gender [male] |  |  |  | -0.02 | -0.02 | 0.285 | -0.05 | -0.04 | **0.011** | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.512 | -0.03 | -0.03 | 0.076 |
| Age |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.03 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.01 | 0.072 | -0.00 | -0.04 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.03 | **<0.001** |
| Education level |  |  |  | -0.14 | -0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.15 | -0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.14 | -0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.14 | -0.12 | **<0.001** |
| SES |  |  |  | -0.06 | -0.06 | **<0.001** | -0.07 | -0.06 | **<0.001** | -0.07 | -0.07 | **<0.001** | -0.07 | -0.07 | **<0.001** |
| GDP |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.31 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.29 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.27 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.26 | **<0.001** |
| Admiration |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.12 | 0.11 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.566 |
| Rivalry |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.06 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.09 | **<0.001** |
| Sanctity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.487 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.058 |
| Heroism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.29 | 0.18 | **<0.001** | 0.21 | 0.13 | **<0.001** |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| σ2 | 1.10 | | | 1.07 | | | 1.05 | | | 1.03 | | | 1.02 | | |
| τ00 | 0.35 country\_living | | | 0.16 country\_living | | | 0.15 country\_living | | | 0.13 country\_living | | | 0.13 country\_living | | |
| ICC | 0.24 | | | 0.13 | | | 0.13 | | | 0.11 | | | 0.11 | | |
| N | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | |
| Observations | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | |
| Marginal R2 / Conditional R2 | 0.000 / 0.244 | | | 0.131 / 0.242 | | | 0.157 / 0.263 | | | 0.172 / 0.262 | | | 0.180 / 0.272 | | |

*Note.* SES = Self-reported economic status of family; GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita; the ICC term refers to between-country effects.

**Table S6**

*Multilevel Model Predicting Unfounded Health Beliefs About COVID-19*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 0** | | | **Model 1** | | | **Model 2A** | | | **Model 2B** | | | **Model 3** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *P* |
| Intercept [country] | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.819 | 1.19 | 0.05 | **<0.001** | 1.15 | 0.05 | **<0.001** | 1.16 | 0.05 | **<0.001** | 1.14 | 0.05 | **<0.001** |
| Gender [male] |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.376 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.632 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.235 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.887 |
| Age |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.05 | **<0.001** | 0.01 | 0.06 | **<0.001** | 0.00 | 0.04 | **<0.001** | 0.00 | 0.05 | **<0.001** |
| Education level |  |  |  | -0.09 | -0.07 | **<0.001** | -0.09 | -0.08 | **<0.001** | -0.09 | -0.07 | **<0.001** | -0.09 | -0.07 | **<0.001** |
| SES |  |  |  | -0.03 | -0.03 | **<0.001** | -0.04 | -0.04 | **<0.001** | -0.04 | -0.04 | **<0.001** | -0.04 | -0.04 | **<0.001** |
| GDP |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.37 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.35 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.33 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.32 | **<0.001** |
| Admiration |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.14 | 0.12 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | 0.05 | 0.04 | **0.003** |
| Rivalry |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | 0.04 | **0.006** |  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.06 | **<0.001** |
| Sanctity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.07 | -0.04 | **0.003** | -0.05 | -0.03 | **0.034** |
| Heroism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.35 | 0.21 | **<0.001** | 0.27 | 0.16 | **<0.001** |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| σ2 | 1.00 | | | 0.99 | | | 0.96 | | | 0.95 | | | 0.94 | | |
| τ00 | 0.47 country\_living | | | 0.23 country\_living | | | 0.21 country\_living | | | 0.20 country\_living | | | 0.19 country\_living | | |
| ICC | 0.32 | | | 0.19 | | | 0.18 | | | 0.17 | | | 0.17 | | |
| N | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | |
| Observations | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | |
| Marginal R2 / Conditional R2 | 0.000 / 0.322 | | | 0.143 / 0.306 | | | 0.170 / 0.317 | | | 0.180 / 0.320 | | | 0.188 / 0.325 | | |

*Note.* SES = Self-reported economic status of family; GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita; the ICC term refers to between-country effects.

**Table S7**

*Multilevel Model Predicting Preventive Behaviours During the COVID-19 Pandemic*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 0** | | | **Model 1** | | | **Model 2A** | | | **Model 2B** | | | **Model 3** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *P* |
| Intercept [country] | 3.12 | -0.06 | **<0.001** | 3.18 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 3.18 | 0.02 | **<0.001** | 3.17 | 0.02 | **<0.001** | 3.18 | 0.02 | **<0.001** |
| Gender [male] |  |  |  | -0.15 | -0.21 | **<0.001** | -0.15 | -0.20 | **<0.001** | -0.14 | -0.20 | **<0.001** | -0.14 | -0.19 | **<0.001** |
| Age |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.03 | **0.001** | 0.00 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 0.00 | 0.02 | **0.004** | 0.00 | 0.02 | **0.015** |
| Education level |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 0.02 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 0.02 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 0.02 | 0.03 | **<0.001** |
| SES |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.02 | **0.005** | 0.01 | 0.02 | **0.012** | 0.01 | 0.01 | **0.050** | 0.01 | 0.02 | **0.039** |
| GDP |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.15 | **0.007** | -0.00 | -0.15 | **0.009** | -0.00 | -0.13 | **0.021** | -0.00 | -0.14 | **0.020** |
| Admiration |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | 0.07 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.816 |
| Rivalry |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.06 | -0.07 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | -0.03 | -0.04 | **0.004** |
| Sanctity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | 0.07 | 0.07 | **<0.001** |
| Heroism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.451 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.072 |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| σ2 | 0.37 | | | 0.36 | | | 0.36 | | | 0.36 | | | 0.36 | | |
| τ00 | 0.14 country\_living | | | 0.13 country\_living | | | 0.13 country\_living | | | 0.14 country\_living | | | 0.14 country\_living | | |
| ICC | 0.27 | | | 0.27 | | | 0.27 | | | 0.27 | | | 0.27 | | |
| N | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | |
| Observations | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | |
| Marginal R2 / Conditional R2 | 0.000 / 0.274 | | | 0.031 / 0.291 | | | 0.033 / 0.291 | | | 0.039 / 0.301 | | | 0.040 / 0.303 | | |

*Note.* SES = Self-reported economic status of family; GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita; the ICC term refers to between-country effects.

**Table S8**

*Multilevel Model Predicting Hoarding Behaviours During the COVID-19 Pandemic*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 0** | | | **Model 1** | | | **Model 2A** | | | **Model 2B** | | | **Model 3** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *P* |
| Intercept [country] | 2.71 | -0.00 | **<0.001** | 2.84 | 0.02 | **<0.001** | 2.83 | 0.01 | **<0.001** | 2.83 | 0.01 | **<0.001** | 2.83 | 0.02 | **<0.001** |
| Gender [male] |  |  |  | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.412 | -0.02 | -0.02 | 0.169 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.570 | -0.01 | -0.02 | 0.370 |
| Age |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.116 | 0.00 | 0.02 | **0.013** | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.333 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.163 |
| Education level |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.601 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.813 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.551 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.616 |
| SES |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 0.02 | 0.03 | **0.001** | 0.02 | 0.02 | **0.002** | 0.02 | 0.02 | **0.003** |
| GDP |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.17 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.16 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.15 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.14 | **<0.001** |
| Admiration |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.07 | 0.08 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.500 |
| Rivalry |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.933 |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.106 |
| Sanctity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.476 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.313 |
| Heroism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.10 | **<0.001** | 0.11 | 0.09 | **<0.001** |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| σ2 | 0.66 | | | 0.66 | | | 0.66 | | | 0.65 | | | 0.65 | | |
| τ00 | 0.11 country\_living | | | 0.08 country\_living | | | 0.08 country\_living | | | 0.08 country\_living | | | 0.08 country\_living | | |
| ICC | 0.14 | | | 0.11 | | | 0.11 | | | 0.11 | | | 0.11 | | |
| N | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | |
| Observations | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | |
| Marginal R2 / Conditional R2 | 0.000 / 0.144 | | | 0.030 / 0.141 | | | 0.036 / 0.142 | | | 0.044 / 0.151 | | | 0.045 / 0.151 | | |

*Note.* SES = Self-reported economic status of family; GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita; the ICC term refers to between-country effects.

**Table S9**

*Multilevel Model Predicting Helping During the COVID-19 Pandemic*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 0** | | | **Model 1** | | | **Model 2A** | | | **Model 2B** | | | **Model 3** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* | *Estimates* | *std. Beta* | *p* |
| Intercept [country] | 2.27 | 0.01 | **<0.001** | 2.22 | 0.04 | **<0.001** | 2.20 | 0.03 | **<0.001** | 2.20 | 0.04 | **<0.001** | 2.20 | 0.03 | **<0.001** |
| Gender [male] |  |  |  | -0.05 | -0.06 | **<0.001** | -0.05 | -0.06 | **<0.001** | -0.04 | -0.05 | **0.004** | -0.03 | -0.04 | **0.011** |
| Age |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.01 | 0.13 | **<0.001** | 0.01 | 0.11 | **<0.001** | 0.01 | 0.11 | **<0.001** |
| Education level |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.086 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.225 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.053 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.066 |
| SES |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.03 | **0.001** | 0.01 | 0.02 | **0.042** | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.198 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.251 |
| GDP |  |  |  | -0.00 | -0.20 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.18 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.15 | **<0.001** | -0.00 | -0.15 | **<0.001** |
| Admiration |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.17 | 0.22 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | 0.05 | 0.07 | **<0.001** |
| Rivalry |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.13 | -0.14 | **<0.001** |  |  |  | -0.08 | -0.08 | **<0.001** |
| Sanctity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.15 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | 0.14 | 0.13 | **<0.001** |
| Heroism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | 0.10 | **<0.001** | 0.12 | 0.11 | **<0.001** |
| **Random Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| σ2 | 0.54 | | | 0.53 | | | 0.52 | | | 0.50 | | | 0.50 | | |
| τ00 | 0.08 country\_living | | | 0.05 country\_living | | | 0.05 country\_living | | | 0.04 country\_living | | | 0.04 country\_living | | |
| ICC | 0.13 | | | 0.09 | | | 0.08 | | | 0.08 | | | 0.08 | | |
| N | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | | 61 country\_living | | |
| Observations | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | | 15093 | | |
| Marginal R2 / Conditional R2 | 0.000 / 0.129 | | | 0.047 / 0.132 | | | 0.064 / 0.141 | | | 0.103 / 0.174 | | | 0.106 / 0.176 | | |

*Note.* SES = Self-reported economic status of family; GDP = Gross Domestic Product per capita; the ICC term refers to between-country effects.