This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

NARCISSISM AND SELF-PRESENTATION:
CONCEPTUALIZATION AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

presented by

EUNSOON LEE

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

M.A. degree in Communication

Major Professor's Signature

Oct. 16, 2004

Date

NARCISISSM AND SELF-PRESENTATION: CONCEPTUALIZATION AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

By

Eunsoon Lee

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication

2004

ABSTRACT

NARCISISSM AND SELF-PRESENTATION: CONCEPTUALIZATION AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

By

Eunsoon Lee

This study conceptually defines narcissism as having an inflated self-image and a feeling of entitlement over others through exhibitionistic behaviors resulting from a failure in regulating self-respect and other respect in social interaction. Empirically, the study examined the relationship between narcissism and self-presentation. Participants (N = 178) responded to questionnaires measuring narcissism, self-presentation tactics, dominance, perspective-taking, and self-esteem. Multiple measures of narcissism, self-presentation, and dominance were included. Narcissism had significantly positive associations with all Self Presentation Influence Tactics' (SPIT) Ratings– self-promotion, ingratiation, intimidation, and supplication. However, in the coded self-presentation responses, narcissism was positively related with the use of intimidation tactics and not the other tactics. Compared with the new narcissism scale, the shortened Margolis-Thomas Measure of Narcissism (MT) scale seems to show pathological aspect of narcissism with respect to association with self-esteem and perspective taking.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people deserve thanks for their assistance in the preparation of the thesis. I wish to thank Dr. Timothy Levine for his support, advice, and guidance throughout my master studies. I especially appreciate Tim's mentorship, his enthusiasm for intellectual inquiry and narcissism research, and his willingness to take a great deal of interest in my academic development and research activities.

I wish to thank Dr. Sandi Smith for her help throughout my graduate studies at MSU. Sandi's encouragement and warm guidance helped me a great deal to move on my next academic career. Her advice on conceptual and editorial issues of the thesis helped to improve the quality of organization and writing. I wish to thank Dr. Lawrence Messé for his insightful coursework which nurtured my knowledge on Narcissism. I sincerely wish for his quick recovery against illness. I wish to thank Dr. Pamela Witten for her willingness to join in my thesis project. Her comments helped to clarify a number of practical issues.

Much deserved thanks go to people who sacrificed their time and efforts helping me to go through difficult times: Jina, Alysa, Kate, Jeung-An, Mikeung, Jaemin, and our Absolute members. Thanks so much to my dear EunSeok, too

Finally, I want to thank my precious two parents, my American family - Barbara and Donald – and my home family – Mom and Dad - in South Korea, for being a constant source of strength, understandings, and for the endless help they provided throughout my master studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....v

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION..... 1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....3
Conceptualizing Narcissism.....3
Clinical Definition and Its Origin 3
Two Faces of Narcissism – Overt and Covert 6
The Core Features of Narcissism.....7
The Measurement of Narcissism.....10
NARCISSISM AND SELF-PRESENTATION.....17

CHAPTER 2
METHOD.....22
Overview.....22
Participants.....23
Procedures.....23
Measurement 24

CHAPTER 3
RESULTS.....29
Preliminary Analyses.....29
Initial Item Screening.....29
Confirmatory Factor Analyses.....30
Coding Reliability.....32
Linearity, Normal Distribution, and Outliers.....33
Hypotheses Testing.....34
Supplemental Analyses.....36

CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION.....37
Are Narcissists Impression Managers or Socially Mal-poised People? 38
The Narcissism Construct.....40
Limitations and Implications.....42
CONCLUSIONS.....46

FOOTNOTES.....48
REFERENCES.....50
APPENDICES.....57
TABLES 67

LIST OF TABLES

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for Eight Independent and Dependent Variables.....67

Bivariate Correlations among Independent Variables and Dependent Variables.....68

Summary of Bivariate Correlations for Hypotheses Testing.....69

Summary of Multiple Regression Separately Conducted for each Self-Presentation Tactic.....70

Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Self-Promotion Tactic.....71

Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Ingratiation Tactic.....72

Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Intimidation Tactic.....73

Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Supplication Tactic.....74

Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Cooperation Tactic.....75

Chapter1: Introduction

Individual differences in communication behaviors can affect interpersonal relationships, and narcissism may be among the most important of those individual differences. Narcissism has become an increasingly popular construct for studies of social, clinical and organizational psychology during the last three decades (Soyer, Rovenpor, Kopelman, Mullins, & Watson, 2001).[1] Catt argued that "to ignore narcissism is to ignore one of the most significant problems of our time" (1986, p.242). Vangelisti, Knapp, and Daly pointed out that "given society's continuing interest in narcissistic behavior, it is surprising how little attention scholars of social interaction pay the topic" (1990, p.252).

Interpersonal communication is a transactional process (Miller & Steinberg, 1975) and effective or competent communication requires some degree of perspective-taking (e.g., Davis, 1983; Stiff, Dillard, Somera, Kim, & Sleight, 1988), flexibility (Martin & Rubin, 1995), or other-centerness. Anything that systematically lowers perspective-taking, other-centerness, or flexibility should affect communication competence adversely. Narcissists are excessively self-focused to the exclusion of others. Therefore, narcissism should have important and detrimental effects on interpersonal communication.

Despite these prevalent and serious effects of narcissism in society and its importance to the study of communication, the current state of narcissism in theory and research is problematic for scholars interested in furthering empirical research on a normal population rather than on a clinical population, for at least two reasons. First, there is a theoretical expansiveness in defining narcissism as a distinct diagnostic entity (American Psychiatric Association., 1980, 1987, 1994) inasmuch as the construct of narcissism has been regarded as multiple sets of interpersonal characteristics. Second, the resulting theoretical "fussiness" has led to difficulties in empirical construct validation

studies (Morey & Jones, 1998; Mullins & Kopelman, 1988; Soyer et al., 2001). Many scholars have generated different types of self-report measures of narcissism, each reflecting different theoretical perspectives.

In the middle of this theoretical and empirical turmoil, narcissism can be regarded as a condition awaiting an integrated and comprehensive framework. As Beatty pointed out, "challenges to trait conceptualizations were briefly popular in psychology and a few personality communication scholars followed suit" (1998, p.309). The theory construction tradition in the communication field has also emphasized that theories can be evaluated according to parsimony and elegance, as well as their internal consistency, testability, predictive power, explanatory scope, empirical relevance (Miller & Nicholson, 1976). Many theorists seem to agree that "simple" theories are preferred to more complex ones, assuming that both predict and explain equally well (e.g., Chaffee & Berger, 1987). This rule of parsimony can be applicable in developing the construct of narcissism.

Therefore, based upon a literature review involving both clinical speculation and empirical research, one purpose of this paper is to reduce the current, multifaceted and complex concepts of narcissism into a smaller and more parsimonious set which encompasses the core of narcissism. To accomplish that goal, the first section of the literature review will focus on identifying those points of agreement among scholars who have published studies on narcissism. Consistent with this conceptualization, previous empirical research on narcissism will be scrutinized with regard to the narcissistic self-concept and the measurement validity controversy. Several aspects of narcissism such as cognitive, affective, and behavioral motivations will be provided in this theoretical framework.

The second part of this literature review will focus on behavioral aspects of

narcissism as they relate to self-presentation styles, and the need for greater understanding of those behaviors by scholars of social interaction. The relationship between narcissism and commonly used self-presentation styles will be tested empirically from the communication perspective

Literature Review

Conceptualizing Narcissism

Clinical Definition and Its Origin

The self has a long and controversial history in psychology (e.g., Pervin, 2002). In terms of narcissism, Millon declared that "given our dominant cultural orientation toward self-enhancement,[2] it is often difficult to determine which self-focused traits indicate a narcissistic disorder and which are merely adaptive styles that fit societal modes" (1998, p. 90). Thus, where to draw the line between self-confident, healthy self-esteem and an artificially inflated, empty sense of self-worth, has not been always an easy task (Millon, 1998).

The term "narcissism" was originally used in psychoanalysis to refer to a pathological state. That meaning has changed over time. Today, in its broadest sense, it refers to an interest in or concern with the self along a broad continuum (Cooper, 1998). *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-III; American Psychiatric Association, 1980) defined the narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) as "self-admiration that is characterized by tendencies toward grandiose ideas, fantasied talents, exhibitionism, and defensiveness in response to criticism; interpersonal relationships are characterized by feelings of entitlement, exploitativeness, and a lack of empathy." Later versions, issued as DSM-III-R (American Psychiatric Association, 1987) and DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). DSM-III-R modified the

definitional criteria from mixed polythetic / monothetic criteria to entirely polythetic criteria, subdividing "grandiosity" and "uniqueness" into separate criteria as well as adding "feelings of envy." The DSM-IV changed "exhibitionism" to "requires excessive admiration" and dropped "defensiveness in response to criticism", at the same time adding "arrogant, haughty behaviors or attitudes" from DSM-III-R. Therefore, DSM-IV specified diagnostic criteria of narcissistic personality disorder as "a pervasive pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy, beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by five (or more) of the following: has 1) a grandiose sense of self-importance, 2) fantacies of unlimited success, power, etc., 3) a feeling of their specialty, 4) need for admiration, 5) a sense of entitlement, 6) lack of empathy, 7) a feeling of envy, 8) interpersonal exploitativeness, and 9) arrogant and haughty attitudes."

In terms of the clinical tradition, the contemporary descriptions of the narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) incorporate elements from the writings of earlier theorists. Freud (1914) regarded narcissism as involving self-love, vulnerabilities concerning self-esteem and fear of failure, and feelings of entitlement involving the expectation of special privileges over others - including a tendency to be critical of others who are different from oneself. On the other hand, however, Freud used narcissism to describe "all human efforts," "man's most sublime aspirations," and even "the guiding motive of nature herself" (Ellis, 1927).

More recently, the works of Kohut and Kernberg have been hugely influential, not only among psychoanalysts but also among personality researchers and theorists interested in narcissism. Kohut (1971), a student of Freud, viewed narcissism as a natural and potentially healthy dimension of personality. All individuals possess the need to be

mirrored (usually by the mother) and the need to idealize (usually the father). Healthy narcissism assists during childhood in the formation of stable self-representation and the reliance on internal (e.g., self) rather than external (e.g., parent) resources to remain stable when subjected to external and possibly threatening information with regard to the actual self (Kohut, 1971). Conversely, pathological narcissism involves a grandiose reliance on approval from and idealization by powerful others to bolster and preserve the narcissist's fragile self-esteem. Therefore, pathological narcissism develops out of the parents' failure to meet one or both needs and is viewed as a disruption of the normal development of the self.

In contrast to Kohut's view, Kernberg's (1975) notion is that unacceptable or negative aspects of the self are "split off" from the main self, but nonetheless influence the functioning of the self. Thus, for Kernberg the narcissistic self is pathological. Cooper (1998) observed that Kernberg gave greater emphasis to the aggressive and denigrating aspects of narcissistic pathology and said the pathology as mainly a result of intrapsychic conflict.

Despite their differences in the etiology of narcissism, both Kernberg and Kohut agreed that one aspect of the narcissist is the intensely ambitious, self-absorbed, and overly dependent focus on acclaim. Another facet of the narcissist is characterized by a lack of empathy and interpersonal disturbances (Kernberg, 1975; Kohut, 1971; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995).

The intense ambitiousness and self-absorption of narcissists is believed to be the result of unresolved inner conflicts. People conceive both actual self and ideal self and sometimes experience a conflict between the two distinct concepts. In the maturation process of the self in normal people, there should be a realistic and integrated perception

of oneself with one's actual positive and negative aspects, which is in harmony with the wishful concept of oneself representing the ideal self (Kernberg, 1998). Pathological narcissism, however, fails in regulating harmony between actual and ideal self by excluding or ignoring negative aspects of the self.

In addition to an integrated self-concept, normal people have a quasi-realistic perception of others in their positive and negative qualities. Pathological narcissism, however, fails to perceive in others those integrated aspects, because of their inflated and grandiose self. According to Kernberg (1998), "regular sources of self-esteem that stem from interaction with others – first with parents and later with playmates and friends – are obstructed by the grandiose self for narcissists ...The grandiose self has to extrude negative aspect by projecting them onto others" (p. 105). In other words, one's own self becomes inflated and others become denigrated.

Two Faces of Narcissism - Overt and Covert

Before mentioning common symptoms of narcissists[3], two distinct faces of narcissism need to be addressed. One trend of research on narcissism has been focused on the distinction between overt narcissism and covert narcissism (Cooper, 1998; Wink, 1991). In clinical tradition, Cooper (1998) contended that NPD must be recognized in two different presentations, covert and overt. Further, he argued that DSM-IV quite adequately describes the overt type but it fails to give a description of covert narcissism. The popular conception of the narcissistic person as the loud, ostentatious, self-centered braggart is the version of the overt narcissism, while a group of shy, seemingly timid, and inhibited individuals are the covert narcissists. Individuals who have covert narcissism have the same defects in structure of the self-representation and self-esteem regulation and have similar fantasies of grandiosity. However, they have a different social self-

presentation, which substitutes inhibitions of assertion, exhibitionism, and grandiosity with apparent shyness, sensitivity, and empathic capacity.

In empirical research, Wink (1991) concluded that the findings are consistent with the view that there are two distinct overt and covert forms of narcissism. He described overt narcissism as the "grandiosity-exhibitionism" form and covert narcissism as the "vulnerability-sensitivity" form. Overt narcissists are marked as "grandiosity-exhibitionism," and exhibit self-assuredness, exhibitionism, self-indulgence and disrespect for the needs of others. In the case of overt narcissism, the difficulties are overconfidence, aggressiveness at the cost of others, and an excessive need for admiration from others. Covertly narcissistic people can be defensive, hypersensitive, anxious and timid, and insecure, but at the same time are marked by self-indulgence, conceit and arrogance, and an insistence on having their own way. In the case of covert narcissism, the most visible difficulties are anxiety, pessimism, lack of fulfillment, and vulnerability to life's traumas.

The Core Features of Narcissism

Both the overt and covert narcissists share exploitativeness, a sense of entitlement, excessive envy, a diminished capacity for empathy, and a lack of sustained enthusiasm for their activities or their relationships (Cooper, 1998; Wink 1991). Both types are incapable of maintaining enduring personal relationships, lack of concern for others, and hungry for acclaim. That is, the same defects in structure of the self-representation, self-esteem regulation, and fantasies of grandiosity lead to both covert and overt narcissistic symptoms. Consistent with this view, Cooper and Ronningstam (1992) mentioned that both overt and covert patients are equally involved in grandiose, exhibitionistic fantasy and equally unable to maintain deep ties to another person. Rhodewalt and Morf's (1995)

results showed that the adaptive and maladaptive aspects of narcissism co-occur. In other words, narcissism should be defined as a mental state of cohabitation between overt and covert aspects of narcissism. Robbins and Dupont (1992) also argued that both overt and covert aspects of narcissism relate to a fragile self-esteem and strategies to regulate self-esteem by means of others.

Inflated self-image is the core feature of narcissism which derives from the inability to regulate the actual self and the ideal self (Millon, 1998). It is also problematic because one's self-esteem becomes unstable and insecure. Thus, narcissists have a "fragile self." Worse still in pathological narcissism, others become non-valuable objects for the sake of enhancing the narcissistic grandiose self. Kernberg (1998) noted that, for narcissists, external objects are used and acknowledged only to confirm the individual's own grandiose self. Communication between narcissists and others is not grounded in reality, but rather in fantasies of inflated self-image. Their selves are enveloped in their ideal world. Due to this enveloped self, narcissists cannot functionally communicate with the outer world. In this sense, narcissism may be regarded as a *miscommunicated self*.[4]

As a result, the key narcissistic themes regardless of whether overt and covert, are conceit and arrogance, and the tendency to prioritize one's own needs while disregarding others. These narcissistic core features result from malfunctions in the regulation of self-esteem and others-respect.

This study, therefore, conceptualizes narcissism as a "tendency to inflate one's fragile self image at the cost of others." First, "inflated fragile-self concept" means that the narcissistic self has an extreme sense of grandiosity encompassing superiority, self-absorption, self-admiration and so on. On one hand, the inflated self may have a sense of authority and leadership by means of exhibitionism, which are subcategorized as

characteristics of overt narcissism. On the other hand, a person obsessed with one's inflated self image may respond hyper-sensitively to criticism, that is viewed as covert narcissism. The fragile self seems to lead to two types of narcissism because the fragile self appears insecure and unstable. Several factors of narcissism that have been differently titled by different scholars seem to stem from this one root: the inflated self. [5]

Second, reference to "at the cost of others" means that a narcissistic person is indifferent towards, or lacks empathy for, others and/or lacks respect to the point of exploitativeness. Among the factors, entitlement (i.e., unreasonable expectations of especially favorable treatment or automatic compliance with his or her own ends) seems be somewhere along the spectrum between inflated self for the person's own ego and excessive narcissism exhibited at the cost of others. A feeling of entitlement may result from one's self-view over others. Therefore, a narcissistic personality demonstrates an individual's failure to regulate self-respect Vis-à-Vis respect for another individual.

This paper argues that to define narcissism, these two concepts have to go hand in hand. If a person has a slightly inflated self-image without denigrating others, he or she might merely have self-confidence, high self-esteem or an extrovert personality, which can be regarded as socially appropriate especially in individualistic cultures. If a person has an exploitative or heartless characteristic without bearing an inflated fragile self, she or he may be classified as Machiavellian. However, if a person has the tendency to project and preserve an inflated self-image in keeping others down, or in using others for their own purpose, he or she has pathological symptoms such as excessive fantasies of own self and talent, exploitativeness and entitlement. As a consequence, he or she has difficulty in showing empathy to others.

The Measurement of Narcissism

This conceptual definition of narcissism - tendency to inflate one's fragile self image at the expense of others – aids in integrating pervious research results. In this section, several measurements of narcissism and their associations with other constructs will be presented in terms of self-regulation and relations with others. Buss and Chiodo's (1991) and Vangelisti et al.'s (1990) studies will be summarized from behavioral and communication perspectives.

Several attempts to construct measures of narcissism have been tried but the results have been mixed at best. Raskin and Hall (1979) constructed the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), a 54-item, forced-choice questionnaire assessing individual differences in narcissism as a personal trait. Subsequent studies on the NPI have reduced the scale to 40 items focusing on identifying its major components (e.g., Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Studies of the factor structure of the NPI have yielded four or seven components, depending upon the investigator. Emmons (1984, 1987), in two separate studies, found evidence for four principal factors: exploitativeness/entitlement, leadership/authority, superiority/arrogance, and self-absorption/self-admiration. In contrast, Raskin and Terry (1988) found evidence for seven components of the NPI: authority, self-sufficiency, exhibitionism, explotiativeness, vanity, entitlement, and superiority.

Although the NPI inventory is based on the DSM-III criteria, the assumption is that when exhibited in less extreme forms, these behaviors are reflective of narcissism as a "normal" personality trait (Emmons, 1987). There is a growing body of research that proposes that narcissism scales can help define a broad psychological continuum related to healthy self-esteem at one pole and maladjusted self-functioning at the other

(Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002; Watson, Little, Sawrie, & Biderman, 1992). That is, a continuum exists between normality and abnormality and narcissism is a personality trait possessed to varying degrees by normal persons.

Emmons (1984) labeled the leadership, superiority, and self-absorption subscales as indices of healthy narcissism and entitlement as an index of maladaptive narcissism. The exploitativeness/entitlement subscale of four factors correlated positively with the interpersonal styles labeled aggressive/sadistic and rebellious/distrustful (Emmons, 1984), as well as with measures of pathological narcissism (Emmons, 1987). It was found to correlate negatively with empathy and social desirability (Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984).

Soyer et al. (2001) reexamined the hypothesized continuum between more adjusted and more maladjusted narcissism. Zero-order and partial correlations of seven factors of the narcissism pathology inventory (NPI) were consistent with the continuum hypothesis. When the more adaptive factors such as authority and self-sufficiency were removed, people with higher scores displayed clearer associations with psychological dysfunction, so-called covert narcissism. They were positively associated with Machiavellianism and inversely related with life, job, and family satisfaction. Removing the more maladaptive factors such as the exploitativeness and entitlement factors, in contrast, eliminated the association with Machiavellianism, but the correlation with self-satisfaction was strengthened slightly.

Even though the NPI has been used the most widely by empirical scholars in psychology, the generalizability of the findings by the NPI has been questioned (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Soyer et al., 2001). Instead of the NPI, the Margolis-Thomas Measure of Narcissism (MT scale, Margolis & Thomas, 1980) is reported to show the

best validity with respect to association with other variables, such as Machiavellism (+), need for achievement (+), life/self/general job satisfaction (-) and no relationship with self-esteem (Mullins & Kopelman, 1988).

According to Pervin (2001), the self functions in three ways: Cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects. First, cognitive aspect of self would appear to represent an important part of the way a person construes the world. The cognitive self is related to the ability to differentiate ourselves from others and to reflect back upon ourselves. Second, in terms of affective aspects of the self-concept, individuals strive to behave and view their behavior in ways that are consistent with their self-image, which is usually defined as the ideal self. Third, the relationship of the self to behavior can be explained by the presentation of self in everyday life. We may behave in certain ways to create an impression on others as to what we are like according to social and cultural contexts.

Previous research on narcissism has mainly focused on the affective aspect of the self which is explained by self-esteem and real-ideal self incongruency. Even though narcissists are conceptually regarded as having fragile and inflated selves, capturing the"fragile" and "inflated" self empirically has not been easy task. Instead, a considerable amount of previous research has reported that narcissism is positively related to self-esteem in a nonclinical population (Emmons, 1984; Kernis & Sun, 1994; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Watson, Talyor, & Morris, 1987). Although the relations between narcissism and self-esteem are consistently positive, Rhodewalt and Morf (1995) concluded that they may be different constructs. As John and Robins (1994) pointed out, narcissism involves feeling superior to others, while self-esteem involves evaluating oneself positively. That is, "narcissism is more than high self-regard" (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995, p. 20).

Raskin et al. (1991) examined narcissistic self-esteem management based on clinical observation and theorizing that narcissistic persons are aggressive and domineering and have grandiose self-theories. The results showed that although hostility and self-esteem appeared to be uncorrelated, when grandiosity, dominance, and narcissism were taken into account, hostility and self-esteem exhibited significant negative covariation. That is, in the absence of grandiosity, dominance, and narcissism, people who express higher hostility also report lower self-esteem. The results also indicated that the indirect influence mediated by grandiosity, dominance, and narcissism of hostility on self-esteem was substantial and positive. This study indicates that narcissistic behaviors marking hostility toward the world may be one way that protects a sense of inflated self-image. This result also implied the possibility of the coexistence of grandiose fantasies with feeling of inferiority.

Several studies have tried to measure the inflated self using the degree of incongruency between real self and ideal self descriptions by the interpersonal check list (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988). But this type of diagnosis of narcissism is contaminated because narcissistic individuals are oriented to distort representations of themselves as inflated and grandiose. Measuring actual-ideal self discrepancy as well as the self-esteem of narcissist individuals has been widely reported to reflect the self defense mechanism of the narcissism construct itself (Mullins & Kopelman, 1988; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Wink, 1991). But it is important to note here that even though the total NPI was associated with self esteem and low actual-ideal self discrepancy, a series of studies indicated that E/E (exploitativeness/ entitlement) among the NPI subscales was uncorrelated with self-esteem and positively correlated with actual-ideal self discrepancy (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995).

In terms of cognitive aspects of narcissism, Westen (1990) provided further elaboration by defining a cognitive-affective preoccupation with self. These self-concepts are characterized by "fusion" or the failure to differentiate between real and ideal selves. Westen contends that the narcissists' inability to regulate self-concept would lead to low self-complexity. Self-complexity refers to the capacity to differentiate among aspects of the self, such as one's professional self, one's social self, and one's family self (Linville, 1987). Emmons (1987) also suggested that narcissists are low in self-complexity or the capacity to differentiate among multiple aspects of the self. More recently, Rhodewalt and Morf (1995) found that the NPI (Narcissistic Personality Inventory) is correlated with low self-complexity. Linville has found that greater self-complexity results in less extreme and variable moods and fewer fluctuations in self-appraisal (1987).

In summary, the entitlement / exploitativeness subtype of narcissism, as incorporated on the concept of "at the expense of others," is central to defining pathological narcissism. This provides a strong basis for defining narcissism as necessarily including relational defects with others. Concomitantly, a question arises that "without malfunctions of narcissism such as entitlement or exploitativeness, are normal or healthy narcissists "real" narcissists?" Going back to the Narcissus myth, Narcissus' chief problem, in addition to his excessive self-love, was his inability to love others.

As an alternative, instead of depending on scale approaches and focusing on the self-concept of narcissism, Buss and Chiodo (1991) and Vangelisti et al. (1990) approached narcissism from the layperson's view in everyday life and investigated behavior aspects of narcissism. Buss and Chiodo (1991) complemented previous research on narcissism using the act frequency approach to provide a more complete depiction of narcissistic behaviors in everyday life. Series of studies identified a large number of acts

in everyday life from direct observation by peers, family members, or clinicians, assessed the prototypical acts nominated by them, and identified which acts are most and least central to narcissism as well as which clinically relevant dispositions are most central to narcissism. Based on this result of narcissistic act performance in everyday life, Buss and Chiodo (1991) further tested the validity of the NPI scale and located narcissistic act performance within each of three major taxonomies of personality psychology: the Interpersonal Adjective Scales, the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, and the Big Five personality dimensions.

The most frequently performed narcissistic acts are condescension (e.g., insulting others' intelligence, refusing to go out with someone who was not "good enough," avoiding talking to people who were "low life," associating mainly with high-status people, pointing out the faults of others, etc.) and extreme attention to one's physical appearance (e.g., watching ones' biceps, looking in a mirror while talking to others, commenting on weight loss, walking around with one's chest out, frequent grooming, etc.) (Buss & Chiodo, 1991). Both the NPI and the narcissistic act composites correlated positively with ambitious-dominant, arrogant-calculating, and extraversion, but negatively with lazy-submissive, unassuming-ingenuous, and warm-agreeable. The NPI and the narcissistic act composites, however, did not have the same results with respect to several other psychological traits. Only narcissistic acts were positively correlated with neuroticism and negatively correlated with emotional stability, and component act summaries were largely uncorrelated with these indices of adjustment. The NPI is negatively associated with neuroticism and positively linked with emotional stability personality measures reflecting adjustment. This result implies that the NPI may not capture the conceptual definition of pathological narcissism.

First used by Derber (1979) , "Conversational narcissism" refers to the attention-getting psychology pervasive in individualistic cultures such as America. It was described as the "ways that American conversationalists act to turn the topics of ordinary conversations to themselves without showing sustained interest in other' topics" (Derber, 1979, p. 5). Further, based on laypersons' behavioral reference to the term conversational narcissism, Vangelisti et al. (1990) related conversational narcissism with acts such as boasting, refocusing the topic of the conversation on the self, exaggerating hand and body movements, using a loud tone of voice, overusing "I" statements and "glazing over" when others speak. Consistent with this, high scores on the NPI tend to use personal singular pronouns (e.g., I am ..., I did...) more frequently and use personal plural pronouns (e.g., we are...) less frequently than low scores (Raskin & Shaw, 1988).

People who enact narcissistic conversational behaviors are perceived as less socially attractive than others (Vangelisti et al., 1990). Interestingly, they noted four situations when conversational narcissism was considered appropriate. These include when one person wants to show his or her superior knowledge and the other wants or needs that expertise, situations where one person wants control of conversation, to carry the burden of the conversation, to entertain the other, or guide the other, and the other is willing to comply. All these acceptable narcissistic behaviors, however, are ruled by social norms and assume the other's benefits as well. In general, more narcissists typically displayed attempts to focus the conversation on himself or herself to the "exclusion of the other" whereas less narcissists combined their use of self-references with references to a variety of other persons, objects, and events.

In summary, whether or not research depends on narcissism measurement scales, a consensus seems to emerge on that a construct of narcissism has to be explained by two

main features: 1) excessive self-focus, and 2) making little or no positive reference to others except in service to self (such as exploitativeness). In addition, an argument between healthy or unhealthy encompassing overt or covert narcissism has been an interesting domain of previous researchers. The common perception of narcissism also has been related with exhibitionistic behaviors (Buss & Chiodo, 1991; Vangelisti et al., 1990). For this reason, exhibitionistic behaviors was included as the second feature of narcissism.

Narcissism and Self-Presentation

This study aims to investigate how narcissists present themselves to others differently from less narcissistic individuals. Over many years within the clinical and psychoanalytic tradition, a variety of narcissistic behaviors have been reported. However, the empirical tradition has been relatively short and most efforts seem to focus on construct validation or self-concept. In contrast, the purpose of this study is to find behavioral aspects of narcissism in self-presentation styles.

Goffman's (1959) original work provides a theoretical ground for behavior aspects of the presentation of self. According to Goffman (1955), just as the member of any group is expected to have self-respect, so also every person is expected to sustain a standard of considerateness. In other words, people are expected to communicate in such a way that they present themselves positively while at the same time protecting the feelings and the face of others. Attention to others' face is done willingly and spontaneously because of emotional identification with the others and with their feelings. Goffman noted that "this kind of mutual acceptance seems to be a basic structural feature of interaction, especially the interaction of face-to-face" (1955, p. 325). Specifically relating to conversation in social interaction, Pin (1985) notes that people must balance

conversational demands in order to "discover the identities of others" and to "make evident their own" (p. 173).

Narcissistic personality results from a failure to regulate self and other esteem. In Goffman's words, a narcissistic person may not be able to balance "self-respect" and "considerateness" properly in social interaction. In conversational narcissism, Vangelisti et al. (1990) noted a perceived "imbalance" of conversational participation. Taking little or no notice of the other's needs or variations in contextual demands across time and situations was perceived as dispositionally narcissistic.

As an extension of Goffman's interest in social interaction, a large body of studies in social science has focused on self-presentation (or impression management) as a means of interpersonal influence. Self-presentations are defined as "attempts to influence others to perceive the actor as having a particular identity" (Tedeschi & Norman, 1985, p. 293). This approach views self-presentation as a primary means of interpersonal influence. Jones and Pittman (1982) suggested that self-presentation serves to maintain or augment one's power in relationships with other people because the impressions that people make on others can be a primary determinant of their outcomes in life.

There are different approaches to how to categorize impression management tactics. This study focuses on four main self-presentation styles: ingratiation, self-promotion, intimidation, and supplication (Brehm, Miller, Perlman, & Campbell, 2002; Jones & Pittman, 1982). Ingratiation is used when we seek acceptance and liking from others. Ingratiation includes several kinds of behavior such as flattery, opinion conformity, and doing favors. The second tactic of impression management is self-promotion, which takes the form of more direct attempts to establish one's competence, intelligence, knowledge, skills or prowess. Both ingratiation and self-promotion tactics attempt to create socially

desirable impressions (Brehm et al., 2002), but the two tactics have different goals conceptually. The ingratiator wants to be liked while the self-promotor wants to be seen as competent (Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986; Jones & Pittman, 1982).

Intimidation is designed to induce fear in another and, in turn, to make attempts at social influence (Jones & Pittman, 1982). Although the effectiveness of intimidation may be quite restricted, there are subcultures where intimidation is a frequent tactic in gaining advantage over others.

The final tactic of self-presentation is supplication. The supplicant seeks to demonstrate his or her helplessness. The goal of the actor is to gain some interpersonal advantage by invoking, directly or indirectly, a norm of social responsibility over others. Intimidation and supplication are basically posited from distinct power gaps in social status, which may create undesirable images.

To understand narcissism in relation to self-presentation styles, it may be worthwhile to discuss the role of dominance and affiliation in social interaction. Many theorists argue that dominance and affiliation are the fundamental principal dimensions underlying social interaction (Dillard, Solomon, & Palmer, 1999; T. Leary, 1956; Ruiz, Smith, & Rhodewalt, 2001; Wiggins, 1979). Hogan (1983) argues that needs for status and social approval are primary themes in interpersonal behavior and are satisfied through competition and affiliation. Similarly Wolfe, Lennox, and Cuttler (1986) noted that self-presentational strategies tend to concern either "getting along" or "getting ahead." By definition, we cannot think of narcissists without dominance-oriented characteristic such as grandiosity, superiority, and entitlement over others. In a good deal of previous research, narcissism has been reported to have a positive association with dominance and need for power (e.g., Bannett, 1988; Biscardi & Schill, 1985; Buss & Chiodo, 1991;

Carroll, 1987; Emmons, 1984; Raskin et al., 1991; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Ruiz et al., 2001). Especially Ruiz et al. (2001) pointed out that higher composite NPI scores were associated with higher dominance and lower affiliation, and furthermore concluded dominance was the best predictor of higher scores on the NPI.

With regard to self-promotion tactics, previous research on narcissism has focused mainly on self-enhancement strategies, which is one form of self-promotion (Tedeschi & Norman, 1985). Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, and Elliot (2000), for example, found that narcissists are willing to use self-enhancement strategies at the expense of the partners. The results of their investigation, coupled with those of previous researchers (e.g., Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998), showed that although identifying narcissists from less narcissistic persons with self-enhancement is somewhat imprecise, narcissists express and maintain an elevated view of self in relation to others. In other words, if the negative behaviors such as exploitativeness are controlled, self-enhancement can be regard as an adjusted behavior.

This is consistent with self-enhancement theory (Paulhus & Reid, 1991; Taylor, 1989). People are motivated to maintain and enhance their self-esteem. For example, John and Robins (1994) said that general findings provide support for the basic premise of self-enhancement theory. Moreover, their study showed that even though people generally used self-enhancement strategies to make their performance look good, narcissists were considerably more biased to enhance their performance than people in general. Individuals high in narcissism showed substantial overestimation of their performance, compared to individuals low in narcissism (substantial underestimation) and the intermediate group (no bias). Thus, the relationship between self-enhancement bias and narcissism is pervasive and strong, whether the data are analyzed across all

subjects or separately within each group. Accordingly, the first hypothesis is advanced:

H1: Scores on narcissism will be associated positively with the self-promotion tactic.

In terms of ingratiation tactics, narcissism is reported to lack intimate bonds and empathy (e.g., Carroll, 1987; Ronningstam, Gunderson, & Lyons, 1995; Watson et al., 1984) and moreover involve contempt for and devaluation of others. This tactic is typified by such behaviors as flattery and doing favors for other. However, previous study on narcissism reported unfriendliness of individuals high in narcissism. Therefore, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H2: Scores on narcissism will be associated negatively with the ingratiation tactic.

The fact that narcissism is positively related to hostility (Emmons, 1984; Raskin et al., 1991; Raskin & Terry, 1988) will provide evidence that narcissists tend to engage in intimidation tactics more often. Baumeister, Smart and Boden (1996), for example, found that inflated and fragile self-esteem, central in most descriptions of narcissism, underlies aggressive responses to threatened egotism. Individuals high in narcissism appear to have higher levels of hostility, feelings of anger, and aggressive behavior in reaction to negative or ego threatening criticism (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). In sum, previous results indicated that when narcissists received negative feedback from others, their reactions more likely would be aggressive and hostile. Furthermore, by definition, narcissists conceive a hostile feeling toward others or an inclination of denigrating others because they do not have balanced regulating system considering others' respect as well as own self. Therefore, without any negative criticism, individuals high in narcissism may use more intimidation tactics because they intrinsically have a feeling of hostility, than those low in narcissism.

Additionally, there is another reason that it might be interesting to take a look at intimidation and supplication tactics. Intimidation and submissive tactics are related to power distance (Jones & Pittman, 1982). Even though there is no clear power gap between individuals high in narcissism and individuals low in narcissism, there is much evidence that narcissists tend to assume they are superior and dominant compared with others. Hence, the following hypotheses are advanced:

H3: Scores on narcissism will be associated positively with the intimidation tactic.

H4: Scores on narcissism will be associated negatively with the supplication tactic.

In sum, this study assumes that imbalanced self and other respect, which is the core root of narcissism, may affect behaviors of self-presentation in social interaction. Based on previous discussion, excessive self-respect may result in excessive self-promotion tactics, which is related to self-enhancement strategies. Lack of other-respect - e.g., empathy or considerateness – suggests a negative relationship with ingratiation tactics in the self-presentation process. Since narcissists tend to feel arrogant and assert entitlement over others, individuals high in narcissism can be expected to use intimidation tactics more often and use supplication tactics less seldom than individuals low in narcissism.

Chapter2: Method

Overview

This study views narcissism as a failure in regulating self-respect and other respect in social interaction. The general goal of this study is to examine the relationship between narcissism and self-presentation. Scores on narcissism are predicted to be systematically associated with self-presentation. Specifically, it was hypothesized that: individuals high in narcissism are expected to present more frequently self-promotion tactics tapping self-

enhancement strategies (H1) and intimidation tactics (H3) than individuals low in narcissism. Further, individuals high in narcissism are expected to less frequently show ingratiation tactics (H2) and supplication tactics (H4) than individuals low in narcissism. Additionally, although not included as part of the hypotheses, to further investigate the conceptual definition of narcissism, four additional variables deemed to be important in discussing the relationship between narcissism and self-presentation will be measured: perspective-taking, empathic concern, dominance and self-esteem.

Participants

Participants who enrolled in communication courses and a tourism course at a large Midwestern University participated in this study. Although 181 completed the questionnaire, three were eliminated due to no response to three scenarios. In the analyses, 178 participants were considered. There were 85 men (48%), and 93 women (52%) in the sample. On average, participants were 20 years old ($SD = 1.9$), and the range of age was 17 to 31. Participants consisted of 55 freshmen (31%), 35 sophomores (20%), 36 juniors (20%), 49 seniors (28%), and 3 graduates (2%). Most were recruited from communication courses (N = 147, 83%).

Procedures

Participants from communication courses were recruited for this study, which was labeled "Presenting Yourself," in an exchange of one hour of research credit and those from a tourism course were asked to participate in the survey after that regularly scheduled class and were given packages of snacks and candies after completing the survey. During the survey administration in the classroom, participants were told that their participation is entirely voluntary and that the information gathered would be kept confidential and anonymous. They were asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix A),

which was turned in separately from the rest of the survey materials. The data collection was IRB approved.

Self-report measures of self-presentation tactics were employed because individuals are likely to be knowledgeable about their own general behaviors (Honoree, 2000). Both open-ended and close-ended measures were employed. Participants were asked to read the Self-Presentation Scenarios first and fill in their likely behaviors in each blank space as an open-ended question. Then, they were asked to complete a packet of personality questionnaires. After the session, participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed about the purpose of the study.

Measurement

For the current study, the survey is composed of three different types of response formats. The first is a 5-point Likert style, anchored from "strongly agree" (score 5) to "strongly disagree" (score 1) for a new Narcissism scale, Need for Control, Perspective Taking, Empathic Concern, and Self-Esteem and anchored from "very often" (score 5) to "never" (score 1) for four Self-Presentation Influence Tactics. The second is a forced response style. MT Narcissism is a forced-choice and Dominance scale is a true-false choice. The last is an open-ended response format for three scenarios for self-presentation situations.

Narcissism. Although the NIP scale by Raskin and Hall (1979) has been used widely in previous research on narcissism, this study did not use the NPI, for several reasons. First, previous results involving the NPI have been questioned on the ground that relationships with other variables such as self-esteem, life satisfaction, and neuroticism are not consistent with construct validity (Buss & Chiodo, 1991; Kopelman & Mullins, 1992; Mullins & Kopelman, 1987, 1988; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Soyer et al., 2001).

Second, the results seemed to show the confounded and unstable structure of the NPI because four or seven factors were found to function differently in the literature (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988). This may lead to difficulties in making predictions or drawing reliable conclusions. Third, the factor structure is complex so the scale lacks parsimony.

As an alternative, this study used the MT scale by Margolis and Thomas (1980) and a new Narcissism scale currently being developed by Levine. The MT is reported to show the best validity with respect to association with other variables (Mullins & Kopelman, 1988). The MT Narcissism Scale initially was composed of 122 dyadic items. Each pair contained complementary statements, one representing a pathologically narcissistic orientation and the other reflecting a socially acceptable form of narcissism. All items were evaluated by a panel of experts in psychology and psychiatry to enhance construct validity. Mullins and Kopelman (1988) reduced the scale to 24 items, after eliminating those with poor discrimination (Margolis & Thomas, 1980). This shortened MT scale had clear internal reliability (and construct validity (Kopelman & Mullins, 1992; Mullins & Kopelman, 1988; Soyer et al., 2001). Unfortunately, the factor structure of the MT has not been clarified yet (See Appendix B).

A new scale developed by Levine (See Appendix C) was expected to shed light on narcissism that needs to be more focused on the core concept, since narcissism has been too multifaceted to research empirically. This scale aimed to provide a more parsimonious conception of narcissism consistent with the conceptual definition of this study. The scale added overt symptom of narcissism– inflated self and entitlement over others through exhibitionistic behaviors. Therefore, the new scale, composed of 7-item Entitlement, 6-item Exhibitionism, and 7-item Grandiosity, was expected to produce

three factors, consistent with the current conceptual definition of narcissism.

Dominance. Dominance was measured with Need for Control lastly developed by Levine (1992) based on the work of Marshall (1990) and Schutz (1958) . Original items from Marshall (1990) yield to five items - 5 point Likert type response dropping three items as results of item analysis and CFAs (Levine, 1992). The resulting alpha coefficient was .88. In addition, Dominance was assessed through a shortened version of the Dominance scale of the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1969). The validity of these measures, as well as their particular relevance for person perception processes, has been widely demonstrated in past work (e.g., Assor, Aronoff, & Messe, 1986) (see Appendix E).

Two dominance scales were distributed for this study because the different orientations of two scales might provide insight useful to understanding dominance in terms of narcissism as well as strengthened reliability. Need for Control aimed to capture behavioral tendency of participants, while Dominance of the CPI is oriented mainly to measure personal motives. For example, Need for Control items include " I try to take charge of things when I am with people" and "I try to have others do things I want done," while Dominance includes "I like to give orders an get things moving" and "I think I would enjoy having authority over other people." The 22 true – false Dominance scale included 24 screening items to minimize response bias.

Perspective-Taking and Empathic Concern. Measures of Perspective-Taking and Empathic Concern were modified from scales developed by Davis (1983). Perspective-Taking refers to the ability of an individual to adopt the viewpoint of another. Empathic concerns include two features: 1) a general concern and regard for the welfare of others and 2) the stipulation that the affect is not parallel to that of the target person. Davis

(1983) provides evidence of the construct validity and structural quality of two measurements for predicting prosocial behaviors motivated by concern for others. Nine items of Perspective-taking and six items of Empathic Concern were employed in this study (See Appendix F).

Self-Esteem. Self-esteem was measured with the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1965), which has been widely used for decades. (See Appendix D). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). In terms of validity, RSE scores have been linked negatively to depressive affect, anxiety, psychosomatic symptoms, and interpersonal insecurity.

Self –Presentation Influence Tactics (SPIT) Questionnaire. The Self-Presentation Influence Tactic questionnaire (SPIT) was developed for the purpose of this study (See Appendix G). These questions concerned the four self-presentation tactics- self-promotion, ingratiation, intimidation, and supplication - according to Brehm et al.'s (2002) categorization in interpersonal relationships. The original version of the SPIT consisted of six items for self-presentation, seven items for ingratiation, five items for intimidation, and five items for supplication. Self-promotion items, for example, include "To make a good impression on others, I try to let people know about my accomplishments" and "To make a good impression on others, I brag about my strengths." Ingratiation items include "I am nice to other people so that they will like me more," and Intimidation scale includes "To make a good impression on others, I act powerful and controlling." Lastly, Supplication items include "I practice self-deprecating humor."

The items were designed to measure impression management concerns in general circumstances rather than specific situations. Apart from Self-Presentation Scenarios,

participants were asked to indicate their response which best describes the degree to which the statement applies to their behavior or attitude.

The Self-Presentation Scenarios. Participants were asked to respond to the Self-Presentation Scenarios (SPSs) for three hypothetical situations as open-ended questions (See Appendix H). Answers to open-ended questions asking one's own behavioral and verbal reaction to each scenario were coded according to the four SPIT categories: self-promotion, ingratiation, intimidation, and supplication. Self-promotion category includes talking about own strengths, and bragging such as "I am a hard-working and good student," "I did my best for our project," etc. Ingratiation encompasses flattery, compliment, and support for others such as "I admire your group's reliability," "The project turned out to be great with your effort," etc. Intimidation category includes intimidating and blaming remarks such as "Why don't you find another group?", "I feel that you and the others only gave me a small part in the group," etc. Supplication includes apologizing or self-debasement remarks such as "I am really sorry that I missed a few meetings," "I was in a desperate situation," etc.

Two coders including the author rated ten samples of open-ended answers independently to validate coding schema, using the four categories with coded values of absence (0) and presence (1). Prior to their coding, a second coder participated in a training session provided by the author, and the second coder learned the same instructions for coding schema. Sentences were the unit of analysis in the coding In a process of solving confusing remarks[6], a new category was added called the Cooperation tactic. Examples included "If I can do anything to make up for that just let me know," "If it is the same as mine, let's decide who is going to ask that group in a fair manner," "I am willing to meet you to make up…," etc. The coders were allowed to categorize a remark

into more than one category, if it clearly showed dual meanings. For example, "We will be a great team" can count as both self-presentation and ingratiation. After training, an inter-coder check was performed to examine the extent to which different coders got equivalent results in coding self-presentation tactics, using the same instructions. Pre inter-coder reliability check was performed several times until two coders achieved satisfying results in agreement of coding.

The two coders independently assessed self presentation strategies in all three scenarios for all participants. After the first training session, the overall percentage agreement was 85%. Coding in supplication tactics (70%) lowered the overall agreement. After one more training session, the inter-coder agreement improved to 87%. Agreements on each tactic in each scenario will be provided with Cohen's Kappa in the following results section. All disagreements were resolved by discussion, and post resolution data were reported in the results.

Chapter3: Results

Preliminary analyses

There are four sections for preliminary analyses: Reliability of continuous variables, confirmatory factor analyses for continuous variables, inter-coder reliability for scenario coding, and checks for linearity and normality.

Initial item screening

First, initial item screening was conducted using internal reliability analyses. Three criteria were employed to decide which items would be retained or deleted. These included corrected item total correlation of .4 or greater, a positive contribution to scale reliability, and the appearance of an approximately flat positive inter-item correlation matrix. For the new Narcissism scale, the original seven Entitlement items were reduced

to four items with standardized item alpha .77. The five Exhibitionism items were reduced to three items with α= .77 and the seven Grandiosity items were reduced to five items with α=.83 (See Appendix C). Only one item was deleted for the original nine Perspective-Taking items (α=.83), but the reliability for the six Empathic Concern items were unacceptably low (α=.65). Consequently Empathic Concern has not been considered for further analyses (See Appendix F). Self-Esteem and Need for Control retained all ten and five items with α=.85 (See Appendix D)and α=.82 (See Appendix E), respectively. In terms of Self-Presentation Influence Tactics (SPIT), the six Self-Promotion items were reduced to four items (α=.79), the seven Ingratiation items were reduced to five items (α=.76), the five Intimidation items were reduced to four items (α=.79), and the five Supplication items were reduced to two items (α=.73) after deleting two items, two items, one items, and three items, respectively (See Appendix G).

Reliabilities for the MT narcissism scale and Dominance of the CPI were assessed with Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20) coefficients for dichotomous scales. After deleting two items, the reliability of MT became .74 (See Appendix B) and the original 22 Dominance scale was .83. MT and Dominance were each summed to yield a total score that ranged from 0 to 22. Higher scores indicate higher narcissism and dominance.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Second, confirmatory factor analyses (Hunter & Gerbing, 1982) were performed to test the dimensionality of all Likert-format multiple item scales after the initial screening. The remaining items were consistent with the anticipated ten-factor model based on internal consistency and parallelism. Root mean squared error for the entire model was .087.

Tests of the statistical significance of errors were determined by the standard of 95%

confidence intervals of the obtained values falling within the predicted values. The four Entitlement items showed 8% significant error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency theorem. Only one error was .20. The three Exhibitionism items showed 11 % error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency theorem. Two errors exceeded .20. The four Grandiosity items showed 7 % error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency theorem. Three errors above .20 were observed. The eight Perspective-Taking items showed 6 % significant error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency theorem. Five errors above .20 were evident. The ten Self-Esteem items showed 5.5 % significant error rate for parallelism, but internal consistency theorem was not met sufficiently with six significant errors (17% error rate) that ranged from -.16 to .30. Six of 28 errors were larger than .20. The five Need for Control items showed 5 % error rate for parallelism, while only one error was significant for the internal consistency test. Two errors exceeded .20. The four Self-promotion items showed 7 % significant error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency test. Four errors above .20 were observed. The five Ingratiation items showed 7 % significant error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency test. Four errors were larger than .20. The four Intimidation items showed 5 % error rate for parallelism, while no error was significant for internal consistency theorem. Only one error exceeded .20. Due to lack of items, the two Supplication items could be tested for parallelism only. With 4 % error rate for parallelism, no error above .20 was found.

Therefore, given that the test of parallelism theorem is more stringent and given the present sample size of 178, we can conclude that the data were generally consistent with

a ten-factor model. Some concern, however, is warranted about the self-esteem scale's internal consistency. The decision was made to retain the scale. After item screening, all scales were averaged to yield a mean score ranging from 1 to 5.

Coding Reliability

Third, in order to measure self-presentation patterns as dependent variables along with the SPIT scale, respondents were asked to provide an open-ended description of their communication with one group leader and one competitor in three situations. Their descriptions were coded into five categories by two independent coders: self-promotion, ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, and cooperation. All disagreements were dissolved through discussion by two coders and the post resolution data were used in subsequent analyses.

In the first scenario, one hundred six respondents (60%) were coded as using the self-promotion tactic. Raw agreement was 88% and inter-coder reliability of Cohen's Kappa equaled to .75. Seventy six respondents (43%) used ingratiation tactic (Kappa=.85) and there was 93% agreement between the coders. Only one person was coded as using the intimidation tactic. Raw agreement was 97%, but Kappa was not produced due to uneven distribution of coded values and low variation.[7] Eighty five respondents (48%) used supplication (86%-agreement, Kappa=.72). Fifty eight respondents (33%) used cooperation tactic (76%-agreement, Kappa=.35). For the entire scenario 1, overall percent agreement of inter-coder reliability was 88%.

In the second scenario, ten respondents (6%) used self-promotion tactic with 94 % inter-coder agreement and .47 Cohen's Kappa. Twenty one respondents (12%) used ingratiation tactic with 88% agreement (Kappa=.85). Twenty respondents used intimidation tactic with 88% agreement (Kappa=.43). Twenty nine respondents (16%)

used supplication (88%-agreement, Kappa=.53). Twenty four respondents (14%) used cooperation tactic (84%-agreement, Kappa=.09). For the entire scenario 2, percent agreement of inter-coder reliability was 88%.

In the third scenario, 86 respondents (48%) used self-promotion tactic with 83% inter-coder agreement and .61 of Cohen's Kappa. Twenty nine respondents (16%) used ingratiation tactic with 84% agreement (Kappa=.39). Fifteen respondents (8%) used intimidation tactic with 90% agreement (Kappa=.43). Sixty one respondents (34%) used supplication (76%-agreement, Kappa=.52). Twenty two respondents (12%) used cooperation tactic (92%-agreement, Kappa=.67). For the entire scenario 3, the percent agreement of inter-coder reliability was 85%.

To test hypotheses, a total score for each tactic individuals used across three scenarios was calculated with a range of 0 to 3. Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and reliabilities with them of other variables are reported in Table 1. The correlation matrix for all variables - eight independents and nine dependents – are reported in Table 2.

Linearity, normal distribution, and outliers

Fourth, in preparation for correlation and regression analyses, the data were screened for linearity, normal distribution, and outliers. Scatter plots of all independent-dependent variable relationships were observed visually for linearity. No evidence of nonlinearity was observed. Second, the shapes of the distributions of variables were inspected to see if they were normal. Entitlement, Self-Esteem and Dominance had non-normal negative skews whereas MT narcissism, Intimidation tactic, Supplication tactic, Total Ingratiation, Total Intimidation, and Total Cooperation had statistical non-normal positive skews. The reason the MT scale is extremely positively skewed may stem from

the fact that it was originally invented for a clinical population.

To identify outliers that can cause misleading results, the data were inspected with scatter plots and histograms. Two outliers in Entitlement and one outlier in Self-Esteem with z-scores greater than 3 were omitted from further analyses. Means and standard deviations excluding outliers are reported in Table 1. The variables that were non-normally distributed were investigated with nonparametric method for further analyses. Kendall's Tau-b was performed to calculate correlation coefficients for non-normality data. Tau-b correlation measures how rank orders are related. Tau-b correlations are reported along with the zero-order correlations in Table 2.

Hypotheses Testing

One primary goal of this study is to examine the relationships between narcissism and self-presentation. It was hypothesized that narcissism is expected to be positively associated with self-promotion tactics tapping self-enhancement strategies (H1) and intimidation tactics (H3). Narcissism is expected to be negatively associated with ingratiation tactics (H2) and supplication tactics (H4). Correlational analyses were used to examine primary relationships between narcissism and self-presentation.

First, three narcissism subscores and the MT score were positively associated with self-promotion tactics of the SPIT at the significance level of .01 [Entitlement, *Tau-b* (174) = .32, $p < .001$; Exhibitionism, r (176) = .30, $p < .001$; Grandiosity, r (176) = .26, $p < .001$; MT, r (176) = .15, $p < .01$]. However, none of the four narcissism scales were positively related with the total number of used self-promotion tactics in the three scenarios. Contrary to the prediction, the Exhibitionism score was negatively and significantly associated with Self-Promotion tactic in scenarios [r (176) = -.17, $p < .05$]. Other narcissism scores were not significantly related with Self-Promotion in three

scenarios. Therefore, the positive relationship between narcissism and self-promotion predicted by H1 was partially supported.

The second hypothesis predicted the negative association between narcissism and ingratiation tactics. Contrary to the expectation, however, the three narcissism subscores and the MT score were positively associated with the Ingratiation tactic of the SPIT at the significant level of .001 [Entitlement, *Tau-b* (174) = .34, $p < .001$; Exhibitionism, r (176) = .22, $p < .01$; Grandiosity, r (176) = .19, $p < .05$; MT, r (176) = .30, $p < .01$]. None of the four narcissism scales were significantly related with the total number of used Ingratiation tactic in three scenarios. Therefore, the negative relationship between narcissism and ingratiation predicted by H2 was not supported at all in this study.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that people who score higher in narcissism score would show more intimidation tactics than those lower in narcissism score. The result showed the positive relationship between narcissism and intimidation tactics. Three narcissism sub scores and the MT score were positively associated with Intimidation tactic of the SPIT [Entitlement, *Tau-b* (174) = .23, $p < .001$; Exhibitionism, *Tau-b* (176) = .30, $p < .001$; Grandiosity, T*au-b* (176) = .31, $p < .001$; MT, *Tau-b* (176) = .28, $p < .001$]. However, intimidation tactics used in three scenarios had mixed results with narcissism scores. The Entitlement subscale and Grandiosity subscale were positively associated with Intimidation tactic used in three scenarios [Entitlement *Tau-b* (174) = .15, $p < .05$; Grandiosity *Tau-b* (176) = .15, $p < .05$], while Exhibitionism subscale and MT were not significantly related [Exhibitionism, *Tau-b* (176) = -.09, ns; MT, *Tau-b* (176) = .12, p = .06]. Although a positive association between narcissism and intimidation predicted by hypothesis 3 was not entirely supported, it is noteworthy that this association was partially supported by three scenarios as well as the SPIT scales. Moreover the zero-order

correlation coefficient between MT and intimidation tactic used in scenarios was significant as r (178) = .15, $p < .05$ before it was treated as nonparametric data.

Fourth, it was expected that people who are more narcissistic would show less supplication tactics than people who are less narcissistic. The negative association between narcissism and supplication tactics was not found in this study. On the contrary, three narcissism sub scores and the MT score were positively associated with Supplication tactic of the SPIT [Entitlement, *Tau-b* (174) = .14, $p < .05$; Exhibitionism, *Tau-b* (176) = .14, $p < .05$; Grandiosity, *Tau-b* (176) = .18, $p < .01$; MT, *Tau-b* (176) = .38, $p < .001$]. None of the four narcissism scales were significantly related with the total number of used supplication tactics in three scenarios. Therefore, results did not support the negative relationship between narcissism and supplication predicted by the fourth hypothesis.

One additional tactic – Cooperation – used in three scenarios was analyzed with the correlation coefficient. None of the narcissism scores were positively or negatively related with the Cooperation tactic at a significant level. The results of hypotheses testing are summarized in Table 2.

Supplemental Analyses

Although not included as part of the hypotheses, to further investigate relative impact of narcissism and relevant variables on self-presentation tactics, multiple regression analysis was performed. The results indicated that when all independent variables (3 narcissism subscales, perspective taking, self esteem, MT scale, and dominance) were included to predict each SPIT tactic, each regression model significantly predicted each of the SPIT variables. Multiple regression models, however, were only significant for some of the coded SPIT. The only coded tactics yielding

significant results was intimidation. Summary of multiple regression analyses is reported in Table 4.

The analysis showed that Need for Control was a significant predictor for Self-Promotion tactic ($\beta = .34$, $t = 3.89$, $p < .001$). Entitlement ($\beta = .26$, $t = 3.44$, $p < .001$), Need for Control ($\beta = .25$, $t = 2.86$, $p < .01$), and MT ($\beta = .24$, $t = 2.8$, $p < .01$) were significant predictors for Ingratiation tactic. For Intimidation tactic, Need for Control ($\beta = .39$, $t = 5.30$, $p < .001$), MT ($\beta = .26$, $t = 3.55$, $p = .001$), and Dominance ($\beta = .14$, $t = 1.98$, $p = .05$) were significant predictors. For Supplication tactic, Grandiosity ($\beta = .20$, $t = 2.72$, $p < .01$), Perspective-Taking ($\beta = .22$, $t = 3.41$, $p = .001$), Self-Esteem ($\beta = -.348$, $t = -4.32$, $p < .001$), MT ($\beta = .19$, $t = 2.35$, $p < .05$), and Dominance ($\beta = -.18$, $t = -2.26$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors.

Among regression analyses for self-presentation tactics used in the three scenarios, only Intimidation tactic showed a significant result, $F(8, 169) = 3.86$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .11$. Exhibitionism ($\beta = -.18$, $t = -2.23$, $p < .05$), Grandiosity ($\beta = .22$, $t = 2.46$, $p < .05$), and Dominance ($\beta = -.24$, $t = -2.61$, $p = .01$) were significant predictors for intimidation tactics used in the three scenarios. It should be noted that Dominance scale showed contradictory results in this study. Dominance was a positively significant predictor of Intimidation tactic in rating scale, but a negative significant predictor of coded Intimidation tactic in scenarios. The detailed results of regression analyses for each dependent variable are reported in Table 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Chapter 4: Discussion

The major goal of the current study was to explore the self-presentation of narcissistic people. This study conceptually defined narcissism as having an inflated self-image and a feeling of entitlement over others through exhibitionistic behaviors resulting

from a failure in regulating self-respect and other respect in social interaction. Consequently, scores on narcissism were predicted to be systematically associated with self-presentation behaviors across situations. Specifically, this study hypothesized that individuals high in narcissism are expected to more frequently present self-promotion tactics tapping self-enhancement strategies (H1) and intimidation tactics (H3) than individuals low in narcissism. Individuals high in narcissism are expected to be negatively related with ingratiation tactics (H2) and supplication tactics (H4). Discussions of whether related hypotheses were supported are presented first, and several findings about the narcissism construct in relation to other variables follow. Finally, several limitations of this study and future suggestions are provided.

Are narcissists impression managers or socially mal-poised people?

The hypothesis that narcissists would tend to present themselves in a more positive way was supported by only rating reports of the Self Presentation Influence Tactics (SPIT) but not by the open answers in three hypothetical situations. The expectation that narcissists would be reluctant to present themselves by a means of supporting or complimenting others was not supported at all in this study. Rather narcissists rate themselves as likely to ingratiate more frequently when they are concerned about their impression despite not showing this trend in three hypothetical scenarios. The hypothesis that narcissists would tend to present themselves in a more controlling way was supported by both the SPIT ratings for the general impression management and open reactions to specific situations provided by this study. Although one subscale of new narcissism scale – exhibitionism – was not related with intimidation tactics used in three scenarios, the remainder of the narcissism scales showed significantly positive associations with intimidation. In this study, the relationship between narcissism and

intimidation was the only significant result for the coded responses to the three hypothetical scenarios. At the end, the expectation that narcissists would be reluctant to present themselves by a means of self put-downs or self-deprecation was not found at all in this study. Results showed that scores on narcissism are positively associated with the likelihood of use ratings of supplication. This reverse result, however, was not replicated in the open-ended data.

The present study showed divergent results for the rating data and the open-ended data. According to the rating responses, narcissism had positive associations with all Self Presentation Influence Tactics (SPIT), which tap concern for general impression management. In other words, in terms of the explicit goal of impression management, narcissists tended to engage in a variety of self-presentation tactics in their attempts. Even though the current study fails to predict the direction of ingratiation and supplication of narcissists, an alternative explanation is plausible. According to Leary (1995; M. R. Leary & Kowalski, 1990) and Leary and Kowalski (1990), one of the factors that motivate self-presentation involves the degree of discrepancy between the image one would like others to have of oneself (the desired image) and the image that others appear to hold (the actual image). According to Rhodewalt and Morf (1995), more narcissistic people experience discrepancies between the actual self and ideal self to a greater extent than less narcissistic people. If this is the case, then narcissists may be consciously aware of impression management issues because they suffer greater actual-ideal self discrepancies and they consequently need to disguise this discrepancy. Consequently, they may be obsessed with their image to others. Moreover, they may think that using all the possible strategies is an effective means to look good to others. According to the results of rating SPITs, the more narcissistic respondents were, the more they were willing to report using

all types of impression management strategies. This tendency, however, was not supported in the open ended data.

In the coded self-presentation responses, narcissism was only significantly associated with intimidation tactics. Different from the rating results, narcissists presented themselves conspicuously by means of aggressive expression in such situations as when they tried to fit in a team, when they competed, and when they had to excuse their own faults. This result is consistent with a broad range of previous literature on narcissism. Individuals high in narcissism appeared to have higher levels of hostility (Emmons, 1984; Raskin et al., 1991; Raskin & Terry, 1988), feelings of anger, and aggressive behavior in reaction to negative or ego threatening criticism (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). Bumeister et al. (1996) argued that these aggressive responses are struggles of narcissists to compensate for their threatened ego to cover inflated and fragile self-esteem, central in most descriptions of narcissism.

Nonetheless, with the mixed results, the generalizability of the present findings to the construct of narcissism and open-ended scenarios may be questioned. Next, several issues of the narcissism construct will be discussed.

The Narcissism Construct

For a goal of parsimony, narcissism was defined as an inflated fragile self at the cost of others at first and this definition was expanded to include exhibitionistic behavior. Therefore, this study conceptually defined narcissism as having an inflated self-image and a feeling of entitlement over others through exhibitionistic behaviors resulting from a failure in regulating self-respect and other respect in social interaction. Measures of three core concepts (grandiosity, entitlement, and exhibitionism) fit a three-factor model and provided good reliabilities. However, good reliability and a fit factor model do not

guarantee construct validity. Central to construct validity, an examination of the discriminant validity and the convergent validity were considered.

For discriminant validity, narcissism would be correlated negatively with perspective taking and self-esteem. The MT was significantly negatively related with perspective taking and the new narcissism scale was marginally negatively related with perspective taking. In terms of self-esteem, the MT showed a negative association, whereas the new narcissism scale revealed a positive association. This result is replicated MT findings in previous investigations by Mullin and Kopelman (1988; 1992) and Soyer et al. (2001). Given the fact that high self-esteem shows the psychological well-being of someone, and that narcissists are reliant on others as a source of self-esteem support, the MT findings seem more guaranteed to show unstable and low self-esteem.

Meanwhile, the results of the MT and the new narcissism scales are not easy to interpret considering a long history of self-esteem study in narcissism. A considerable amount of research using self-reported Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979) has shown that the narcissism construct has positive connection with self-esteem in a nonclinical population (Emmons, 1984; Kernis & Sun, 1994; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Raskin et al., 1991; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Watson et al., 1987). Knowing that narcissists suffer from their discrepancy between ideal self and actual self and inner conflicts beneath the surface, most psychological researchers excused this opposite and unpredicted result as high likelihood of concern for self-presentational issue itself among narcissists. That is the fact that the subject completes the questionnaire knowing that his or her answers will be seen by others and these ratings can be distorted in socially proper ways (Leary, 1995).

For the convergent validity, the MT and three narcissism subscales in this study

were moderately intercorrelated. However, two dominance scales – need for control and dominance of the CPI - showed disparate results, especially for the MT. Need for control was strongly positively related with the MT, but dominance of the CPI was negatively related with the MT, whereas the two dominance scales were positively related with the two subscales of new narcissism – exhibitionism and grandiosity. For further inquiry, two dominance scales were compared with self-esteem. Interestingly, even though the two scales are moderately interrelated, dominance of the CPI has the strongest positive connection with self-esteem, whereas need for control showed no relation with self-esteem. It may be that two dominance scales reveal the different orientations. Need for control is aimed to capture the behavioral tendency of participants in the behavioral aspects while dominance of the CPI is mainly oriented to measure personal motives. Dominance of the CPI may have a prosocial component of control based on the results of no relation with perspective taking and strong positive relation with self-esteem, while need for control may have a maladaptive component of control because it relates negatively with perspective taking and negative relation with self-esteem.

In summary, the two narcissism scales – the MT and the new narcissism scale – were intercorrelated. Compared with the new narcissism scale, the shortened MT scale seems to show pathological aspect of narcissism with respect to association with self-esteem and perspective taking.

Limitations and Implications

Self-reported narcissism is a complex phenomenon and, due to this complexity, the present study was ambitious to attempt an integrated concept of narcissism and its relationships with self-presentation in social settings. Several findings, nevertheless, were ambiguous to interpret due to multiple measures and mixed results. Several limitations of

this study will be addressed next.

First, the process of validation is inseparable from that of general theory development and testing (Fiske, 1971). The conceptual definition of narcissism has been drawn based on the core features of narcissism, and this study argued that the two concepts - inflated self-image (grandiosity) and at the cost of others (entitlement) to go hand in hand. To differentiate narcissists from machiavellians, it needs to be shown hat exploitative or entitled behaviors of narcissists stem from their chronically inflated and fragile self. Conceptually, machiavellians exploit others as means of accomplishing their tangible goals while narcissists use others to boost their fragile self image or to guise their unstable self concept. Entitlement, as a subscale of the new narcissism scale, can not, by its self, be used to make this distinction.

Moreover, although exhibitionism was added to examine overt characteristics of narcissism, it could not have been fully investigated with relevant constructs such as extroversion and agreeableness. In terms of the construct validity, future research is necessary. For an example of systematic approach, Cronbach and Meehl (1955) set forth the "logic of construct validation" (p.290), a logic of "nomologial network" of lawful relations with other constructs.

Meanwhile, this study assumes that the MT scale is an unidimensional construct encompassing general narcissistic behaviors whereas the new narcissism scale was tested as a three-factor model. According to the results, the MT showed similar patterns as the new narcissism scale with relations to self-presentation but different inner state such as low self-esteem. At this, Problems may reside in the fact that a factor model of the MT is still unknown and that a multifaceted construct is hard to interpret in empirical research. In clinical setting, the DSM-IV defines narcissistic disorder as having five (or more)

symptoms out of nine descriptions. In empirical setting, a multidimensional construct is difficult to verify the target construct because it produces each problem whether it is summed across subscales or treated as a distinct feature of each subscale all the time. If a multidimensional construct is summed, data can be misleading because a person who had one or two extremely high and low scores on specific subscales can be treated equally with a person who has stably high scores on all subscales. If every subscale is treated as one distinctive construct, then we can question "Is it really one construct?" For example, the new narcissism construct has three factors – entitlement, grandiosity, and exhibitionism. If we regard these subscales as unique, they are just entitlement, grandiosity, and exhibitionism, respectively. Empirically, there is no evidence that narcissism exists. In sum, the construct validation is a necessary and significant process of social science and should be precise to make claim for certain concept, but it still needs conceptual and statistical development.

Second, there is the validation problem in self-presentation tactics as well. The present study showed perplexing results according to response types. Sizable discrepancies between self-rating responses and open-ended responses are seriously problematic for interpreting results. Low correlation between rating Self Presentational Influence Tactics (SPIT) and coded SPIT cannot guarantee the generalizability of the findings. Low Cohen's kappa for coded variables showed a major problem. Krippendorff (2004) noted that when the four chance-corrected agreement coefficients for the data turn out to be near zero, it suggests the virtual absence of reliability. In this sense, low Cohen's kappa of this study resulting from low variation of occurrence in tactic usages does not guarantee reliable measurement of coded SPIT variable and its findings.

These low correlations and reliabilities may be caused by four potentials: weak

scenarios which might not draw a variety of responses from respondents, restriction in range inherent in strategy, problems of coding schemes, and inherent difficulties of self-reported measures. To remedy the first problem, future research on self-presentational issues may require more defined scenarios and broad pre-testing before the main study. For the reliable coding scheme of self-presentation, the Self Presentation Influence Tactics (SPIT) this study invented may need revision. Since self-presentation has been a blurred concept and over-expanded to many areas, a more focused approach such as one tactic by different methods or settings could be more fruitful than a typology approach.

Third, in addition to problems of the open-ended questionnaire, the social interaction setting itself matters. The present study assumes that narcissism is pathological across situations and investigates its effect in a formal setting with relatively new encounters that can occur in a classroom setting. However, a significant pathological narcissism was found, particularly in the areas of interpersonal relations and reactiveness. For example, Ronningstam et al. (1995) found that an important indicator for the more enduring forms of narcissistic personality disorder was the capacity to form commitments to others. Chronically, people who suffer from narcissistic personality disorder have difficulty in maintaining intimate relationships and deriving satisfaction from the relationship itself. Recent research found that narcissism was associated with a game-playing love style and narcissists' self-reports of game playing were confirmed by their partners in past and current relationships (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002) and narcissism was negatively related to commitment (Campbell & Foster, 2002). As such, narcissistic behaviors may cause detrimental effects in intimate relationships rather than in casual relationships.

Conclusions

Despite several drawbacks, the results confirmed that narcissism showed significant associations with using self-presentation tactics to influence others. This study overviews narcissistic association in self-presentation. Regarding general questions about their self-presentation tactics, it was found that narcissists are likely to perceive themselves as vivid impression managers. Given certain situations, narcissism was related to showing intimidating strategy to influence others. In general, the present findings do not support that narcissism is dramatically detrimental in social interaction with a lack of social skill.

Concerning the narcissism construct, the two narcissism scales were fruitful in predicting relationships with self-presentation in a same way. The MT contributes towards showing the negative psychological well-being of individuals, which is low self-esteem in accordance with what underlying narcissism mechanism predicts. Meanwhile the new narcissism scale with a valid factor model contributes to replicating previous common empirical findings in accordance with high self-esteem and dominance association. It is clear that the MT scale this study employed, instead of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), is a promising tool to study narcissism for the future. Advanced validation techniques may be needed to compare and contrast the many variables to refine the narcissism construct. Follow-up research should examine narcissism in more diverse situations.

Theory integration in research aids in the development of a more complex understanding of personality such as narcissism. This study tries to demonstrate the parsimonious construct of narcissism and corresponding measures of narcissism. Since narcissistic personality has been rarely studied in the communication field despite its

importance, this study advances our understanding in plausible connections between narcissistic personality and communication behavior. As one of the predictors of unique communication patterns, relationship formation and maintenance, narcissism may be a promising but challenging construct to delve into for the future.

Footnotes

[1] Soyer et al. (2001, p. 246) reported that PsyInfo database references to narcissism and to the narcissistic personality increased from 405 in the 10-year period of 1969-1978, to 1,322 during 1978-1988, and to 1,971 during 1989-1998.

[2] Some psychologists discuss positive self-enhancing or self-deception positivity as a general law of human behavior applicable to all normal, psychologically healthy individuals (Paulhus & Reid, 1991; Taylor, 1989).

[3] Parsimonious language leads us to talk about the narcissist or narcissistic individual. Such wording may create the impression that narcissism is a categorical and binary construct. Both conceptually and empirically, however, a narcissistic personality (as opposed to a clinic diagnosis) is a continuous variable where gradations surely exist. Thus, although the paper refers to the narcissistic person for easy of expression, the author realizes and advocates thinking about more or less narcissistic people.

[4] The self emerges through social interaction (Goffman, 1959; Mead, 1934). In terms of defining communication among social interaction, Coover and Murphy (2000) note that "the essence of communication is the formation and expression of an identity" (p. 125). Communication, then, is integral to the ongoing negotiation of self, and should be a process during which individuals are defined by others as they, in turn, define and redefine themselves (Coover & Murphy, 2000). The *communicated self* presents one's identity along many dimensions through social interaction, facilitating adaptation to different communication settings. For narcissists, however, once established as the grandiose self, narcissists not only are blind to their diverse aspects of own self but also try to use others and situations to serve their own grandiose self concept, which precludes effective communication.

[5] Raskin and Terry (1988) identified the seven Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) factors: Authority, Exhibitionism, Superiority, Vanity, Exploitativeness, Entitlement, and Self- Sufficiency. However, even though using the same NPI, Emmons's (1984) factor analysis showed four separate factors he labeled as Exploitativeness/Entitlement, Leaderships/Authority, Superiority/Arrogance, and Self-Absorption/Self-Admiration. For another example, Carroll, Hoenigmann-Stovall, and Whitehead III's (1996) results indicated that participants did not discriminate between the factors of entitlement and self-absorption.

[6] Some responses were difficult to code. Some examples of the difficulties encountered included; 1) Sometimes, reported intentions contradicted the reported behavior. In this case, the behavior was coded, 2) Remarks of "helping out," "extrahand,"etc. were coded as cooperation. For example "I will be a great **help** to the group, " as cooperation but other terms like "value," "member," etc. were coded as self-promotion, 3) "I would REALLY/GEATLY/VERY MUCH like to be in your group" were coded as ingratiation BUT just plain "I would like to be (or am interested) in your group" was nothing, 4) "**Allow** me, " "I REALLY **need** your permission, your help or a good grade," and "This class or grade is REALLY IMPORTANT to me" were coded as supplication because "allow" and "permission" assume power gap and "need" and "importance "expresses the other's assistance, 5) "I would REALLY appreciate it if you would do... " or "It would be a big help or favor if you would do..." were coded as supplication but plain "thank you" was nothing, 6) "I am really sorry or apologize that I missed a few meetings because....." was coded as supplication. But "....sorry (plain sorry) BUT I did my best" counts as self-promotion.

[7] Two coders agreed that intimidation tactic was rarely used in scenario 1 showing 97% of the raw percent agreement, but due to absence of cases caused it to be impossible to calculate Cohen's κ reliability which concerns the chance-corrected agreement. Coder A reported no presence of intimidation tactic and Coder B reported five cases out of 178 sample. According to Krippendorff (2004), when the four chance-corrected agreement coefficients for the data turn out to be near zero, it suggests the virtual absence of reliability. For this reason, coded intimidation tactic in scenario 1 could not yield any reliability index such as Cohen κ or Scott's π.

References

American Psychiatric Association (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychiatric Association (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders : DSM-III-R* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders : DSM-IV* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Assor, A., Aronoff, J., & Messe, L. A. (1986). An experimental test of defensive processes in impression formation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 50*(3), 644-650.

Bannett, J. B. (1988). Power and influence as distinct personality traits: Development and validation of a psychometric measure. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22*, 361-394.

Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatening egotism to viloence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review, 103*, 5-33.

Beatty, M. J. (1998). Future directions in communication: Trait theory and research. In M. James C, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 309-319). New Jersey: Hampton.

Biscardi, D., & Schill, T. (1985). Correlations of narcissistic traits with defensive style, machiavellianism, and empathy. *Psychological Reports, 57*(2), 354.

Brehm, S. S., Miller, R. S., Perlman, D., & Campbell, S. M. (2002). *Intimate relationships*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Buss, D. M., & Chiodo, L. M. (1991). Narcissistic acts in everyday life. *Journal of Personality, 59*, 179-215.

Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(4), 484-495.

Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 340-354.

Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and

comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*(3), 329-347.

Campbell, W. K., Rudich, E. A., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(3), 358-368.

Carroll, L. (1987). A study of narcissism, affiliation, intimacy, and power motives among students in business administration. *Psychological Reports, 61*, 355-358.

Carroll, L., Hoenigmann-Stovall, G. I., & Whitehead, G. I., III. (1996). The interpersonal impact of narcissism: A comparative study of entitlement and self-absorption factors. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 11*(3), 601-613.

Catt, I. E. (1986). Rhetoric and narcissism: A critique of ideological selfism. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50*(3), 242-253.

Chaffee, S. H., & Berger, C. R. (1987). What communication scientists do. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 99-122). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cooper, A. M. (1998). Further developments in the clinical diagnosis of narcissistic personaltiy disorder. In E. F. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of Narcissism: Diagnositc, Clinical, and Empirical Implications* (pp. 53-74). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Cooper, A. M., & Ronningstam, E. F. (1992). Narcissistic personality disorder. In A. Tasman & M. B. Riba (Eds.), *American psychiatric press review of psychiatry* (Vol. 11, pp. 80-97). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Coover, G. E., & Murphy, S. T. (2000). The communicated self: Exploring the interaction between self and social context. *Human Communication Research, 26*(1), 125-147.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 281-302.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 113-126.

Derber, C. (1979). *The pursuit of attention: Power and individualism in everyday life*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

Dillard, J. P., Solomon, D. H., & Palmer, M. T. (1999). Structuring the concept of relational communication. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 49-65.

Ellis, H. (1927). The concept of narcissism. *Psychoanalytic Review, 14*, 129-153.

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(3), 291-300.

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 52*(1), 11-17.

Fiske, D. W. (1971). *Measuring the concepts of personality*. Chicago: Aldine.

Freud, S. (1914). On narcissism: An introduction. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14 (1957), pp. 73-102). London: Hogarth Press.

Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 50*(1), 106-115.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry, 18*, 319-345.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Gough, H. G (1969). *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory* (rev. ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hogan, R. (1983). A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. M. Page (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Vol. 29, pp. 55-89). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Prss.

Honoree, A. L. (2000). Personality and impression management: An interactionist perspective. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 60*(12-A), 4506.

Hunter, J., & Gerbing, D. (1982). Unidimensional measurement, second order factor analysis, and causal models. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 4*, 267-320.

John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 66*(1), 206-219.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kernberg, O. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York:

Jason Aronson.

Kernberg, P. F. (1998). Developmental aspects of normal and pathological narcissism. In E. F. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of Narcissism: Diagnostic, clinical, and empirical implications* (pp. 103-120). Northvale, NJ: Aronson.

Kernis, M. H., & Sun, C. (1994). Narcissism and reactions to interpersonal feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*, 4-13.

Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self.* New York: International Universities Press.

Kopelman, R. E., & Mullins, L. S. (1992). Is narcissism inversely related to satisfaction? An example of data from two U.S. samples. *The Journal of Psychology, 126*, 121-130.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). Reliability in content analysis: Some common misconceptions and recommendations. *Human Communication Research, 30*, 411-433.

Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Madison: Brown &Benchmark.

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34-47.

Leary, T. (1956). *A manual for the use of the interpersonal system of personality*. Berkely, CA: Psychological Consultation Service.

Levine, T. R. (1992). *The effects of power and message factors upon success in gaining compliance.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Linville, P. W. (1987). Self-complexity as a cognitive buffer against stress-related illness and depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 663-676.

Margolis, H. D., & Thomas, V. (1980). *The measurement of narcissism in adolescents with and without behavioral and emotional disabilities.* United States International University, San Diego, CA.

Marshall, L. J. (1990). *The development of paper and pencil measures of need for affiliation and need for achievement.* Unpublished Preliminary Paper, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Martin, M. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1995). A new measure of cognitive flexibility. *Psychological Reports, 76*, 623-626.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, G. R., & Nicholson, H. E. (1976). *Communication inquiry : a perspective on a process*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Miller, G. R., & Steinberg, M. (1975). *Between People: A new analysis of interpersonal communication*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Millon, T. (1998). DSM narcissistic personality disorder: Historical reflections and future directions. In E. F. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of Narcissism: Diagnostic, clinical, and empirical implications* (pp. 75-101). Northvale, NJ: Aronson.

Morey, L. C., & Jones, J. K. (1998). Empirical studies of the construct validity of narcissistic personality. In E. F. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of Narcissism: Diagnostic, Clinical, and Empirical Implications* (pp. 351-372). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Explorations in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.

Mullins, L. S., & Kopelman, R. E. (1987). Narcissism as a moderator of the relationship between job characteristics and job reactions. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 1*(3), 264-275.

Mullins, L. S., & Kopelman, R. E. (1988). Toward an assessment of the construct validity of four measures of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(4), 610-625.

Paulhus, D. L., & Reid, D. B. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 307-317.

Pervin, L. A. (2002). *Current controversies and issues in personality* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Pin, E. J. (1985). *The pleasure of your company: A socio-psychological analysis of modern sociability*. New York: Praeger.

Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.

Raskin, R., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 60*(6), 911-918.

Raskin, R., & Shaw, R. (1988). Narcissism and the use of personal pronouns. *Journal of Personality, 56*(2), 393-404.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic

Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54*(5), 890-902.

Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1995). Self and interpersonal correlates of the narcissistic personality inventory: A review and new findings. *Journal of Research in Personality, 29*, 1-23.

Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74*(3), 672-685.

Robbins, S. B., & Dupont, P. (1992). Narcissistic needs of the self and perceptions of interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 462-467.

Ronningstam, E., Gunderson, J., & Lyons, M. (1995). Changes in pathological narcissism. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 152*(2), 253-257.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ruiz, J. M., Smith, T. W., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Distinguishing narcissism and hostility: Similarities and differences in interpersonal circumplex and five-factor correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 76*(3), 537-555.

Schutz, W. C. (1958). *FIRO: A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Soyer, R. B., Rovenpor, J. L., Kopelman, R. E., Mullins, L. S., & Watson, P. J. (2001). Further assessment of the construct validity of four measures of narcissism: Replication and extension. *Journal of Psychology, 135*(3), 245-258.

Stiff, J. B., Dillard, J. P., Somera, L., Kim, H., & Sleight, C. (1988). Empathy, communication, and prosocial behavior. *Communication Monographs, 55*, 198-213.

Taylor, S. E. (1989). *Positive illusions : creative self-deception and the healthy mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Norman, N. (1985). Social power, self-presentation, and the self. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 293-322). New York: McGrow-hill.

Vangelisti, A. L., Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. A. (1990). Conversational narcissism. *Communication Monographs, 57*, 251-274.

Watson, P. J., Grisham, S. O., Trotter, M. V., & Biderman, M. D. (1984). Narcissism and

empathy: Validity evidence for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(3), 301-305.

Watson, P. J., Little, T., Sawrie, S. M., & Biderman, M. D. (1992). Measures of the narcissistic personality: Complexity of relationships with self-esteem and empathy. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 6*, 434-449.

Watson, P. J., Talyor, D., & Morris, R. J. (1987). Narcissism, sex roles, and self-functioning. *Sex Roles, 16*, 335-350.

Westen, D. (1990). The relations among narcissism, egocentricism, self-concept, and self-esteem: Experimental, clinical, and theoretical considerations. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought, 13*, 183-239.

Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 37*, 39-412.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 61*(4), 590-597.

Wolfe, R. N., Lennox, R. D., & Cuttler, B. L. (1986). Getting along and getting ahead: Empirical support for a theory of protective and acquisitive self-presentation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 356-361.

Appendix A. Informed Consent Form

Title of Study: Communication Traits and Message Behaviors

Researcher: Dr. Timothy R. Levine, Eunsoon Lee
e-mail: levinet@msu.edu,leeeuns2 @msu.edu.
Department of Communication — Office: CAS 482
Michigan State University — Phone: 432-1124

Information

We are interested in people's communication traits and message behavior. You will be asked to fill out a questionnaire containing a couple of standardized scales, and three hypothetical situations that require open-ended responses. Finally, you will be asked to provide some basic demographic information. All answers are CONFIDENTIAL. **Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.** The total time necessary is about forty-five minutes. Following completion of the research task, you will be debriefed about the purpose of this research.

Participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time without penalty.

While this study is not expected to yield any immediate benefit to the individual participations, it will add to the general store of Communication knowledge. There are no anticipated risks associated with participation.

You will receive extra-credit in your class in exchange for your participation if your instructor has previously agreed to provide extra-credit. If you would receive extra-credit in exchange for your participation, you can get an equivalent amount of credit by doing an alternative should you choose not to participate in this study.

The final results of the study will be made available, probably by the end of Spring of 2003. To obtain the report, please contact Tim Levine at the above address or Eunsoon (Soony) Lee at (517) 927-0815.

For questions regarding your rights as a human subject of research, contact UCRIHS Chair: Ashir Kumar, M.D., 202 Olds Hall, Telephone: (517) 355-2180, Email: ucrihs@msu.edu

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

_____	_____	_____
Print your name	Your signature	Date

_____	_____
Your Instructor's name	Class and section you are receiving extra or research credit in

Appendix B. MT Narcissism Scale (Margolis-Thomas)

This section contains a series of statements on personality traits. Please choose the member of each pair that you believe is more descriptive of yourself and circle the corresponding letter of "A" or "B" that precedes that statement. For example:

A. I usually feel that life is worthwhile.
B. I rarely feel that life is worthwhile.

If you feel that the first statement is more like you, then circle "A." If you feel that the second statement is more like you, then circle "B." Select only one member of the pair of statements.

1. A. I am not concerned with looking good at all times.
   B. I am concerned with looking good at all times.*
2 A. I tend to exaggerate my achievement so others will accept and respect me.
   B. I try not to exaggerate my achievement, but sometimes my pride appears as bragging.
3 A. When I experience criticism and defeat, I learn about areas which need improvement.
   B. When I experience criticism and defeat, it reinforces my weakness and inadequacies.
4 A. When I give something my all but come up short, others still appreciate it.
   B. When I give something my all but come up short, others don't appreciate it.
5 A. I usually go out of my way to make sure that a person knows that I helped him or her.
   B. I like to help others even if they don't know that I did it.
6 A. Even when I am by myself, I rarely feel alone and uneasy.
   B. Even when I am in a group of friends, I often feel very alone and uneasy.
7 A. It would be nice to earn the attention and admiration of others.
   B. It is very important that others pay attention to and admire what I do.
8 A. When friends play a joke on me, I try to enjoy it with them.
   B. When friends play a joke on me, I wonder if they are laughing at me.
9 A. I foresee the day when life will be ideal.
   B. I foresee the day when life will be better for me.*
10 A. It is partially my responsibility to be aware of others' needs.
   B. It is my responsibility to meet my own needs and nobody else's.
11 A. My life seems to have a normal number of ups and downs.
   B. My life seems to have more than its share of downs.
12 A. I enjoy being with just a few select friends at parties.
   B. I enjoy being the center of everyone's attention at parties.
13 A. It is better to be yourself than to be popular.
   B. It is better to be popular than to be yourself.

14 A. Given the opportunity, I will take advantage without feeling guilty.
B. I find it difficult to take advantage of others.

15 A. I try to appreciate it when others have what I lack.
B. I resent others having what I lack.

16 A. I do not expect others to go out of their way for me.
B. I do expect others to go out of their way for me.

17 A. When I have been irresponsible, I try to lie my way out of it.
B. When I have been irresponsible, I am prepared to face the consequences.

18 A. How I appear to people is more important than how I feel.
B. How I appear to people is not as important as how I feel

19 A. Impressing others is important to get ahead.
B. Impressing others is okay only when it is truthful self-expression.

20 A. I do not deceive others in order to obtain something.
B. I may deceive others by being friendly when I really dislike them in order to obtain something.

21 A. I tend to become involved in relationships in which I alternately adore and despise my partner.
B. I tend to become involved in stable, long-lasting relationships.

22 A. I am bound by the principle of fairness only when it is to my benefit.
B. I am always bound by the principle of fairness.

23 A. Life has been fairly exciting, but I am still not satisfied with it.
B. Life has been fairly exciting, and I am content with it.

24 A. Defeat or disappointment usually make me try harder.
B. Defeat or disappointment usually shame or anger me, but I try not to show it.

Note. * Items deleted after initial screening.

Appendix C. Narcissism Scale by Levine

Please answer the following questions by using the scale below. Put the numberwhich best reflects your answer in the space provided next each statement.

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Not sure or Neutral
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

Entitlement

____1. I deserve praise and recognition from others.
____2. I feel I am entitled to favorable treatment from others.
____3. I am resentful when others don't treat me well.*
____4. I consider myself to be a deserving person.
____5. I have a sense of entitlement.
____6. I get uncomfortable when it seems I am getting special treatment .*
____7. I want to be treated just like everyone else .*

Exhibitionism

____1. I enjoy being the center of attention.
____2. I sometimes "show off" to other people.
____3. I like talking about myself.*
____4. I like people to pay attention to me.*
____5. I am a modest person.*
____6. I am uncomfortable being the center of attention.

Grandiosity

____1. Deep down, I think I am better than most other people.
____2. I am more successful than most of my friends.
____3. I often feel a sense of superiority over others.
____4. Other people often envy me.
____5. I am better than most other people.
____6. I am really kind of an average person.*
____7. I often daydream about doing great things.*

Note. * Items deleted after initial screening before CFA.

Appendix D. Self-Esteem

Please answer the following questions by using the scale below. Put the number which best reflects your answer in the space provided next each statement.

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Not sure or Neutral
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

____1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
____2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
____3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
____4. I am able to do things as well as most other people
____5. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.
____6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
____7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
____8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
____9. I certainly feel useless at times.
____10. At times I think I am no good at all.

Appendix E. Need for Control

Please answer the following questions by using the scale below. Put the number which best reflects your answer in the space provided next each statement.

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Not sure or Neutral
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

____1. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.
____2. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.
____3. I try to have others do things I want done.
____4. I try to influence other people's actions
____5. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.

Dominance Scale of CPI (California Psychological Inventory)

Read each one, decide how you feel about it. If you agree with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, indicate T (TRUE), if you disagree with a statement, or fell that it is not true about you, indicate F (FALSE). Be sure to answer either TRUE or FALSE for every statement, even if you have to guess at some!

T__F__1. I doubt whether I would make a good leader.
T__F__2. I think I would enjoy having authority over other people.
T__F__3. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.*
T__F__4. I have sometimes stayed away from another person because I feared doing or saying something that I might regret afterwards.*
T__F__5. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
T__F__6. School teachers complain a lot about their pay, but it seems to me that they get as much as they deserve.*
T__F__7. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.*
T__F__8. Every citizen should take the time to find out about national affairs, even if it means giving up some personal pleasures.*
T__F__9. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges. *
T__F__10. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
T__F__11. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things.
T__F__12. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.
T__F__13. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.*
T__F__14. I very much like hunting.*
T__F__15. A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself.*
T__F__16. I can honestly say that I do not really mind paying my taxes because I fell

that's one of the things I can do for what I get form the community.*

T__F__17. When prices are high you can't blame a person for getting all he can while the getting is good.*

T__F__18. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.

T__F__19. I am a better talker than a listener.*

T__F__20. I would be willing to give money myself in order to right a wrong, even though I was not mixed up in it in the first place.*

T__F__21. We should cut down on our use of oil, if necessary, so that they will be plenty left for the people fifty or a hundred years from now.*

T__F__22. When the community makes a decision, it is up to a person to help carry it out even if he had been against it.*

T__F__23. I would rather have people dislike me than look down on me.*

T__F__24. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand.*

T__F__25. People should not have to pay taxes for the schools if they do not have children.*

T__F__26. In a group, I usually take the responsibility for getting people introduced.

T__F__27. I would be willing to describe myself as a pretty "strong" personality.

T__F__28. There are times when I act like a coward.

T__F__29. I must admit I am a pretty fair talker.

T__F__30. I have strong political opinion.*

T__F__31. I think I am usually a leader in my group.

T__F__32. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do.

T__F__33. Disobedience to any government is never justified.*

T__F__34. I enjoy planning things, and deciding what each person should do.

T__F__35. I would rather not have very much responsibility for other people.

T__F__36. I usually have to stop and think before I act even in trifling matters.*

T__F__37. It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me.*

T__F__38. I have not lived the right kind of life.

T__F__39. I have a natural talent for influencing people.

T__F__40. I like to give orders and get things moving.

T__F__41. I am embarrassed with people I do not know well.

T__F__42. The one to whom I was most attached and whom I most admired as a child was a woman (mother, sister, aunt, or other woman).*

T__F__43. I'm not the type to be a political leader.

T__F__44. People seem naturally to turn to me when decisions have to be made.

T__F__45. I dislike to have to talk in front of a group of people.

T__F__46. I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.*

Note. * Items deleted for analysis.

Appendix F. Perspective Taking

Please answer the following questions by using the scale below. Put the number which best reflects your answer in the space provided next each statement.

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Not sure or Neutral
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

____1. Before I criticize somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel in their place.
____2. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.*
____3. I believe there are two sides to every question, and I try to look at both of them.
____4. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the other person's point of view.
____5. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.
____6. When I am upset at someone, I usually try to put myself in his or her "shoes" for a while.
____7. I usually try to see things from other people's point of view.
____8. When I'm talking to other people, I try to understand their point of view.
____9. I am good at taking other people's perspectives.

Empathic Concern
____10. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective toward them.*
____11. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel much pity for them.*
____12. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.*
____13. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.*
____14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.*
____15. I am often touched by the things that I see happen.*

Note. * Items deleted after initial screening before CFA.

Appendix G SPIT (Self-Presentation Influence Tactics)

The following questions address making impressions and how other people see you. Please rate each item regarding how often you do each of the following with the scale provided.

5 = Very often
4 = Somewhat often
3 = Once and a while
2 = Almost never
1 = Nevere

Self-promotion

____1. To make a good impression on others, I try to let people know about my accomplishments.
____2. To make a good impression on others, I brag about my strengths.
____3. To make a good impression, I try to make myself look good by focusing on my achievements.
____4. To make a good impression, I try to make myself look good by focusing on my good qualities.
____5. I practice self-promotion to make a good impression on others.*
____6. I try to create an image of competence by emphasizing my efforts.*

Ingratiation

____1. To make a good impression on others, I flatter the people I want to impress.
____2. I am nice to other people so that they will like me more.
____3. To make a good impression on others, I try to compliment others.
____4. I get people to like me by being nice to them.
____5. I practice ingratiation to make a good impression on others.*
____6. I try to be enthusiastic and supportive of others' efforts or accomplishments.*
____7. I am willing to do personal favors for others to make a good impression.

Intimidation

____1. To make a good impression on others, I act powerful and controlling.
____2. I act dominant and assertive to make an impression on others.
____3. I take charge to other's will respect me.
____4. I try to be a strong leader so others will look up to me.*
____5. I intimidate others to get my way.

Supplication

____1. I do self put-downs.
____2. I practice self-deprecating humor.
____3. I try to make others feel sorry for me.*
____4. I try to emphasize my dependence on other people for assistance, to make a proper impression on others.*
____5. I am quick to admit my weakness so I can make a proper impression.*

Note. * Items deleted after initial screening before CFA.

Appendix H. SPIT (Self-Presentation Influence Tactics)

Instruction: Imagine you are in each of the hypothetical situations described below. For each, describe in detail what you might say or do.

Scenario 1

Imagine that you are taking a class that has a group assignment. The class is in your major and it is important to you to get a good grade in this class. The group project is worth a big part of your final grade. Half of group grade is the same for all group members, and half of the grade is an individual grade assigned by the group leader.

You missed class on the day (for reasons beyond your control) other students in the class picked their groups. There is one particular group you really want to join. All the members seem smart, reliable, and nice, but you don't know them well. You think that if you become a member of that group, a good grade will be guaranteed.

The instructor says you can join that group if the group leader will allow you in. Otherwise, you will have to be a group of other people who missed class, and that would not be good. So, you need to e-mail the group leader and ask the group leader if you can join in the group.

Write an e-mail to the group leader below:

Scenario 2

Same situation as above. Imagine that you are taking a class that has a group assignment. The class is in your major and it is important to you to get a good grade in this class. The group project is worth a big part of your final grade. Half of group grade is the same for all group members, and half of the grade is an individual grade assigned by the group leader.

You missed class (for reasons beyond your control) on the day other students in the class picked their groups. There is one particular group you really want to join. All the members seem smart, reliable, and nice, but you don't know them well. You think that if you become a member of that group, a good grade will be guaranteed.

There is another student besides you that wants into the group, but there is only space in the group for one of you. After class you see the "competition" (the other person who wants in the group) in the hallway. What would you say to him/her?

Scenario 3

Now, move ahead in the future. Imagine now that your group project is done. You have become worried about your individual evaluation by the group leader because, while you did your best, you could not help missing some meetings from time to time because you had to work. Also, you took charge of a relatively small part of your group project.

Now, you want to have an opportunity to talk about your circumstance to the group leader before the semester ends. That opportunity presents itself when you run into your group leader in the library.

Describe in detail how you would communicate your concerns to the group leader below:

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for Eight Independent and Dependent Variables

Variable (N=178)	M	SD	α or %	Mean Range
Entitlement (N = 176)*	3.54 (3.56)*	.72 (.67)*	.77	1 ~ 5
Exhibitionism	3.25	1.00	.77	1 ~ 5
Grandiosity	2.71	.87	.83	1 ~ 5
Perspective-Taking	3.60	.64	.84	1 ~ 5
Self-Esteem (N = 177)*	3.98 (3.99)*	.63 (.60)*	.85	1 ~ 5
Need for Control	2.92	.85	.83	1 ~ 5
Sum of MT	5.09	3.51	.74	0 ~ 22
Sum of Dominance	15.60	4.54	.83	0 ~ 22
Self-Promotion (SP)	2.77	.77	.79	1 ~ 5
Ingratiation (ING)	3.45	.72	.76	1 ~ 5
Intimidation (INT)	2.26	.80	.79	1 ~ 5
Supplication (SUP)	2.21	.95	.73	1 ~ 5
Total_SP	1.13	.76	89%	0 ~ 3
Total_ING	.71	.72	88%	0 ~ 3
Total_INT	.20	.50	92%	0 ~ 3
Total_SUP	1.25	.79	83%	0 ~ 3
Total_Cooperation	.58	.73	84%	0 ~ 3

Note. ( )* when excluding outliers

Table 2

Bivariate Correlations among Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.ENT	—	.20**	.38***	-.18*	.15*	.40***	.32***	.39***	.33***	.17*	.29***	.06	.02	.09	.17*	.08	-.04
2.EXH	.20**	—	.16*	-.10	.01	.37***	.30***	.22**	.39***	.16**	.34***	.22**	-.17*	.38	-.12	.13	-.09
3.GRAND	.36***		—	-.19*	.22**	.50***	.26***	.19*	.45***	.20**	.30***	.19*	-.06	-.08	.26**	-.01	-.12
4.PT	-.13			—	.10***	-.25**	-.19*	-.07	-.22**	.04	-.30***	.07	-.05	-.08	-.05	-.05	-.03
5.SE	.16**	.01	.15**	.08	—	.08	.08	-.08	.14	-.43***	-.36***	.55***	-.03	.08	.03	-.04	.02
6.NC	.39***				.08	—	.47***	.37***	.63***	.19**	.38***	.25**	-.04	-.00	.13	.07	-.02
7.SP	.32***				.05		—	.32***	.43***	.16*	.27***	.14	.05	-.01	.07	.17*	-.04
8.ING	.34***				-.02			—	.37***	.33***	.39***	-.08	.06	.05	.04	.05	.13
9.INT	.23***	.30***	.31***	-.14**	.10	.47***	.35***	.30***	—	.24**	.42***	.28***	-.14	-.02	.13	.09	-.00
10.SUP	.14*	.14*	.18***	.04	.25***	.17**	.14*	.27***	.23***	—	.43***	-.31***	.02	-.03	.11	.12	-.02
11.MT	.21***	.23***	.22***	-.20***	-.22***	.27***	.15**	.30***	.28***	.38***	—	-.21**	-.08	-.11	.15*	.12	-.04
12.DO	.06	.15**	.13*	.08	.41***	.39***	.19**	.07	-.02	-.19**	-.13*	—	-.10	.01	-.16*	.04	-.06
13.T_SP	.04				-.03				-.14*	-.00	-.08	-.06	—	.00	.24**	-.02	.09
14.T_ING	.10	.05	-.06	-.03	.08	-.01	.01	.04	-.04	-.05	-.11	.01	-.02	—	-.16*	.12	.09
15.T_INT	.15*	-.09	.15*	-.08	.02	.09	.06	.01	.06	.08	.12	-.12	.23**	-.12	—	-.17*	-.11
16.T_SUP	.08				-.03				.08	.12	.06	.04				—	.04
17.T_CO	-.05	-.06	-.12	-.05	.06	-.03	-.04	.11	-.01	-.04	-.03	-.02	.08	.08	-.09	.02	—

Note. The uppers show *Pearson r* correlation coefficients conducted by the initial analysis. The lowers show *Tau-b* correlation coefficients after deleting outliers for the nonnormaly data. N=176 for ENT, n=177 for SE, and n=178 for the rest. ENT = Entitlement, EXH = Exhibitionism, GRAND = Grandiosity, PT = Perspective-Taking, SE = Self-Esteem, NC = Need for Control, SP = Self-Promotion, ING = Ingratiation, INT = Intimidation, SUP = Supplication, MT = MT Narcissism scale, DO = Dominance, T_SP = Total Self-Promotion, T_ING = Total Ingratiation, T_INT = Total Intimidation, T_SUP = Total Supplication, T_CO = Total Cooperation.
*$p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3
Summary of Bivariate Correlations for Hypotheses Testing

	Narcissism			
Tactics	Entitlement	Exhibitionism	Grandiosity	MT
Scales				
Self-Promotion	.32*** (T)	.30***	.26***	.27***
Ingratiation	.34***(T)	.22**	.19*	.39***
Intimidation	.23***(T)	.30***(T)	.31***(T)	.28***(T)
Supplication	.14*(T)	.14*(T)	.18**(T)	.38***(T)
Coded				
Self-Promotion	.04(T)	-.17*	-.06	-.08
Ingratiation	.10(T)	.05(T)	-.06(T)	.01(T)
Intimidation	.15*(T)	-.09(T)	.15*(T)	.12(T)
Supplication	.08(T)	.13	-.01	.12
Cooperation	-.05(T)	-.06(T)	-.12(T)	-.03(T)

Note. (T) indicates an estimated of *Tau-b* correlation. No marking indicates an estimate of *Pearson r* correlation. N = 176 for the column of Entitlement, and n = 178 for the rest.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4

Summary of Multiple Regression Separately Conducted for each Self-Presentation Tactic

Dependent Variables	Df1	Df2	F	Adjusted R^2
Scale				
Self-Promotion (SP)	8	169	7.74	.23***
Ingratiation (ING)	8	169	8.27	.25***
Intimidation (INT)	8	169	21.16	.48***
Supplication (SUP)	8	169	12.78	.35***
Coded				
Total_SP	8	169	1.09	.004
Total_ING	8	169	1.40	.02
Total_INT	8	169	3.86	.11***
Total_SUP	8	169	.73	-.01
Total_Cooperation	8	169	.76	-.01

Note. Predictors are all entered as Entitlement, Exhibitionism, Grandiosity, Perspective-Taking, Self-Esteem, Need for Control, MT, and Dominance

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

Table 5
Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Self-Promotion Tactic

	β	t	F (Df1, Df2)	Adjusted R^2
DV: Scale SP				
Entitlement	.12	1.62		
Exhibitionism	.12	1.56		
Grandiosity	-.02	-.29		
MT	.08	.96	7.74 (8, 169)	.23***
Perspective-Taking	-.06	-.80		
Self-Esteem	.07	.84		
Need for control	.34***	3.89		
Dominance	.00	.04		
DV: Coded SP				
Entitlement	.07	.769		
Exhibitionism	-.15	-1.793		
Grandiosity	-.06	-.642		
MT	-.09	-.92	1.09 (8,169)	.004
Perspective-Taking	-.07	-.89		
Self-Esteem	-.01	-.05		
Need for Control	.06	.59		
Dominance	-.09	-.89		

Note. DV = Dependent Variable. SP = Self-promotion.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 6
Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Ingratiation Tactic

Predictors	β	T	F (Df1, Df2)	Adjusted R^2
DV: Scale ING				
Entitlement	.26**	3.44		
Exhibitionism	.04	.51		
Grandiosity	-.07	-.87		
MT	.24**	2.82	8.27 (8,169)	.25***
Perspective-Taking	.11	1.59		
Self-Esteem	.01	.17		
Need for control	.25**	2.86		
Dominance	-.11	-1.35		
DV: Coded ING				
Entitlement	.14	1.62		
Exhibitionism	.08	1.00		
Grandiosity	-.13	-1.37		
MT	-.18	-1.85	1.40 (8,169)	.02
Perspective-Taking	-.13	-1.57		
Self-Esteem	.07	.67		
Need for Control	.02	.24		
Dominance	-.07	-.67		

Note. DV = Dependent variable. ING = Ingratiation.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 7
Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Intimidation Tactic

Predictors	β	t	F (Df1, Df2)	Adjusted R^2
DV: Scale INT				
Entitlement	.02	.28		
Exhibitionism	.10	1.62		
Grandiosity	.11	1.60		
MT	.26**	3.55	21.16 (8,169)	.48 ***
Perspective-Taking	-.04	-.61		
Self-Esteem	.10	1.44		
Need for control	.38***	5.30		
Dominance	.14*	1.98		
DV: Coded INT				
Entitlement	.06	.73		
Exhibitionism	-.18*	-2.23		
Grandiosity	.22*	2.46		
MT	.11	1.12	3.86 (8,169)	.11***
Perspective-Taking	.04	.52		
Self-Esteem	.13	1.42		
Need for Control	.08	.86		
Dominance	-.24*	-2.61		

Note. DV= Dependent variable. INT = Intimidation.
*$p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 8
Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Supplication Tactic

Predictors	β	T	F (Df1, Df2)	Adjusted R^2
DV: Scale SUP				
Entitlement	.09	1.29		
Exhibitionism	.08	1.10		
Grandiosity	.20**	2.72		
MT	.19*	2.35	12.78 (8,169)	.35 ***
Perspective-Taking	.22**	3.41		
Self-Esteem	-.35***	-4.32		
Need for control	.08	1.03		
Dominance	-.18*	-2.26		
DV: Coded SUP				
Entitlement	.07	.83		
Exhibitionism	.07	.84		
Grandiosity	-.09	-.92		
MT	.10	.99	.73 (8,169)	-.01
Perspective-Taking	-.02	-.19		
Self-Esteem	-.04	-.39		
Need for Control	-.00	-.04		
Dominance	.08	.82		

Note. DV = Dependent variable. SUP= Supplication.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 9
Multiple Regression of All Predictors for Cooperation Tactic

Predictors	β	t	F (Df1, Df2)	Adjusted R^2
DV: Coded COO				
Entitlement	-.03	-.30		
Exhibitionism	-.08	-.97		
Grandiosity	-.17	-1.79		
MT	.01	-.09	.76 (8,169)	-.01
Perspective-Taking	-.05	-.57		
Self-Esteem	.11	1.05		
Need for Control	.11	1.06		
Dominance	-.09	-.88		

Note. DV = Dependent variable. COO = Cooperation.
*$p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.