

# Loving Yourself Abundantly: Relationship of the Narcissistic Personality to Self- and Other Perceptions of Workplace Deviance, Leadership, and Task and Contextual Performance

Timothy A. Judge, Jeffery A. LePine, and Bruce L. Rich  
University of Florida

The authors report results from 2 studies assessing the extent to which narcissism is related to self- and other ratings of leadership, workplace deviance, and task and contextual performance. Study 1 results revealed that narcissism was related to enhanced self-ratings of leadership, even when controlling for the Big Five traits. Study 2 results also revealed that narcissism was related to enhanced leadership self-perceptions; indeed, whereas narcissism was significantly positively correlated with self-ratings of leadership, it was significantly negatively related to other ratings of leadership. Study 2 also revealed that narcissism was related to more favorable self-ratings of workplace deviance and contextual performance compared to other (supervisor) ratings. Finally, as hypothesized, narcissism was more strongly negatively related to contextual performance than to task performance.

*All that is lovely in himself he loves,  
and in his witless way he wants himself;  
he who approves is equally approved;  
he seeks, is sought, he burns and he is burnt.  
But why, O foolish boy,  
so vainly catching at this flitting form?  
The cheat that you are seeking has no place.  
Avert your gaze and you will lose your love,  
for this that holds your eyes is nothing save  
the image of yourself reflected back to you.  
It comes and waits with you; it has no life  
it will depart if you will only go.*  
– Publius Ovidius Naso (“Ovid”) (B. More [trans.])

The Greek myth of Narcissus tells the story of a man so vain and proud that he fell in love with his own image. In the field of psychology, Freud (1914/1991) used the term narcissism to describe the relationship between libido and the ego. Freud considered narcissism to result from a perturbed childhood transition from subject-directed to other-directed libido, and was manifested in tendencies to prefer fantasy to reality. Since Freud’s libidinal-based treatment of the concept, psychologists considered narcissism to lie within the domain of clinical psychology, though in a manner somewhat different from Freud’s treatment. According to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV*; American Psychiatric Association, 2000), narcissism is, broadly, a grandiose sense of self-importance. According to the *DSM-IV*, narcissists are preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, believe they are special and unique, require excessive admiration, have a sense of entitlement, are interpersonally exploitive, lack empathy, and

are arrogant and haughty. Within the realm of normal psychology, narcissism came under serious study in the late 1970s and has since intensified. Some writers have argued that society as a whole has become more narcissistic (Lasch, 1979), while others have argued that individuals differ in their narcissist tendencies and such differences could be measured in the normal population (Raskin & Hall, 1981).

In personality/social psychology, research has focused on topics such as whether narcissism predicts aggression (e.g., Bushman, Bonacci, van Dijk, & Baumeister, 2003), how narcissists view and are viewed by others (e.g., Taylor, Lerner, Sherman, Sage, & McDowell, 2003), and the role of narcissism in self-enhancement (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002) and in interpersonal relationships (e.g., Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002). Researchers have distinguished narcissism from related concepts such as extraversion, hostility, and self-esteem. Of these, perhaps most focal is self-esteem. Research has indicated that narcissism is positively but moderately related to self-esteem, with the correlation varying by self-esteem measures ( $r = .35$  across measures; Brown & Zeigler-Hill, 2004). Campbell, Rudich, and Sedikides (2002) conclude, “Narcissism does not appear simply to reflect exceptionally high self-esteem” (p. 365).

Numerous studies have sought to develop or validate measures of narcissism. Of the extant measures, the most frequently used is the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1981). Emmons (1984) investigated the construct validity of the NPI and found four factors, which he labeled: (1) *Exploiteness/Entitlement* (the belief that one is adept at manipulating people, and also a sense of entitlement to do so); (2) *Leadership/Authority* (the belief that one possesses an extraordinary ability to influence others, and the preference for leadership and authority roles in general); (3) *Superiority/Arrogance* (the belief that one is just “better” than others and is a born leader); (4) *Self-absorption/Self-admiration* (an elevated sense of vanity and the belief that one is special). Emmons (1987) and Watson and Biderman (1993) provided additional construct validity evidence on a hierarchical rep-

---

Timothy A. Judge, Jeffery A. LePine, and Bruce L. Rich, Department of Management, Warrington College of Business, University of Florida.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Timothy A. Judge, Department of Management, Warrington College of Business, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-7165. E-mail: tjudge@ufl.edu

resentation of narcissism, whereby the four dimensions also indicate a higher-order narcissism factor.

Given the intense interest in narcissism in personality/social psychology, one might be quite surprised to find that narcissism has been studied very little in industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology. In fact, of the 4,010 studies identified in the PsycINFO database with narcissism in its keywords or abstract, there were no studies published in the two flagship I-O journals, *Journal of Applied Psychology* or *Personnel Psychology*. However, drawing from the extant research in personality/social psychology, we suggest that narcissism may play an important role in predicting ratings of criteria that constitute a large portion of the job performance domain. In fact, the relationship between narcissism and ratings to performance criteria is likely to be relevant to I-O scholars and practitioners for two fundamental reasons.

First, because narcissism broadly reflects strong self-admiration and behavioral tendencies which may not be viewed positively by others (Penney & Spector, 2002), it is possible that narcissism influences self- and other perceptions differently, and insight into this possibility may be important given that differences in perceptions are the foundation for certain types of performance management and development practices (Brett & Atwater, 2001). In essence, narcissism may provide an explanation for differences in the way we perceive our behavior relative to the way others see our behavior, and this explanation is different than what is assumed by scholars who may attribute differences to a number of factors including the amount of information available to the rater regarding the behavior being rated, a general self-serving bias, attribution processes, or differences in understanding regarding the value of certain behaviors to the organization (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). To date, however, there has been no research published (in any journal in the PsycINFO database) that compares the influence of narcissism with both self- and other ratings of job performance criteria. Thus, one purpose of our research is to investigate relationships between narcissism and self- and other ratings of job performance criteria.

Second, we suggest that narcissism may have value as a predictor of job performance criteria over and above other well-known personality traits. Although relationships between the Big Five traits and job criteria such as leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002), contextual performance or citizenship behaviors (Organ & Ryan, 1995), and job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991) are well established, narcissism is an aspect of personality that is not reflected well in the Big Five (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Moreover, narcissism reflects a set of attitudes, beliefs, and behavioral tendencies that likely impact each of these organizational criteria in unique ways. To date, however, only a few studies have even linked narcissism to these criteria. Exceptions include Deluga (1997) who linked narcissism to the perceived greatness of U.S. presidents and Penney and Spector (2002) who linked narcissism to self-reported counterproductive behaviors. As another example, Soyer, Rovenpor, and Kopelman (1999) found a nonsignificant relationship between narcissism and self-reported sales performance. Thus, a second purpose of our research is to investigate the degree to which narcissism predicts job performance criteria over and above the Big Five traits.

Before continuing, we note that our choice of performance criteria was guided by research on multidimensional models of job performance, which include leadership, workplace deviance, con-

textual performance, and task performance (Borman & Brush, 1993; Campbell, 1990; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Traditionally, *leadership* has constituted an aspect of performance in jobs that included explicit accountability for the performance of a collective (group, team, organization) or unit of work. However, the changing nature of the workforce (e.g., increased diversity) and of the nature of work itself (e.g., increased use of teams) have increased the prevalence of leadership as an aspect of job performance (Lord & Smith, 1999). Elements of *workplace deviance* (or counterproductive performance), defined as voluntary behavior that harms the well-being of the organization (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002), have been included as aspects of job performance by several scholars (e.g., Murphy, 1989; Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

In fact, recent research suggests that managers weigh deviance as much or more than performance of specific job duties when completing overall performance evaluations (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). *Contextual performance* includes those behaviors that contribute to the organization by fostering a positive social and psychological climate (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Examples of contextual performance include assisting coworkers when they need it, being courteous and respectful to peers, making constructive suggestions, being a good sport, and putting forth extra effort on the job. Finally, *task performance* includes those behaviors that are generally recognized as part of the job and directly contribute to the organization's technical core (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Although these four criteria do not exhaust the domain of job performance criteria, they likely represent a large portion of this domain across a broad set of jobs, and as we explain in the next section, we expect each to be related to narcissism.

### Relationship of Narcissism to Self Versus Other Ratings

Given the obvious link between narcissism and self-enhancement (Robins & Beer, 2001), an interesting and important question is whether narcissists have enhanced views of their abilities and competence, relative to those who score low on the trait. Although this question has been studied in personality psychology (Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002; John & Robins, 1994), the self-enhancing tendencies of narcissists are less studied in the work domain. Given the social desirability of leadership (Meindl, 1985) and performance, one reasonable application of narcissism is in the area of self- and other views of these focal criteria in the workplace.

Research by Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides (2002) revealed that narcissists (high overall scorers on the NPI) tended to have inflated views on traits reflecting an agentic orientation (e.g., intelligent), but not on traits reflecting a communal orientation (e.g., caring). Narcissists tend to see themselves as superior to others, perhaps as a means of constructing for themselves a positive self-image (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Indeed, the *DSM-IV* defining characteristics of narcissists include grandiosity and an exaggeration of their talents and accomplishments (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). John and Robins (1994) found that narcissists tend to exhibit a self-enhancement bias, such that they judged themselves more favorably. These authors speculate that the inflationary effects of narcissism are likely to be most apparent when the judgment is in an ego-involving context. Because, in general, few individuals would be indifferent to being labeled a poor leader, or deviant, or a poor performer, we assume that such

judgments are ego-involving. Thus, though no research is directly on-point, we believe that narcissists will have enhanced views of their leadership, workplace deviance, and contextual and task performance compared to people who are low in narcissism. Because, as John and Robins (1991) note, "All clinical accounts of narcissism concur that narcissistic individuals hold unrealistically exaggerated beliefs about their abilities and achievements" (p. 209), those scoring high on narcissism should be especially susceptible to self-enhancement with respect to these criteria.

This self-enhancement hypothesis, however, only addresses the effect of narcissism in predicting self-perceptions (i.e., how narcissism relates to self-ratings). Thus, when trying to understand the relative effects of narcissism on self- and other ratings, it is necessary to compare the effects of narcissism on self-reports with the effects on other reports of performance criteria. Given the self-enhancing nature of narcissism, we expect narcissists to evaluate themselves more positively irrespective of the criterion. An equally interesting and important issue, then, is the relationship of narcissism to other reports of the criteria. Given the nature of narcissism and its origins in clinical psychology, it appears that it generally would be an undesirable characteristic at work from the perspective of those who work with narcissists. However, the reason for this undesirability (at least as perceived by others) is likely to vary as a function of the criterion under consideration. Thus, in the next section we discuss linkages between narcissism and each of the criteria.

### Leadership

Narcissists are motivated to gain the admiration of others and receive affirmation of their superiority. Morf and Rhodewalt (2001) argue that the process of gaining admiration and affirmation is self-defeating in the long-term because the tactics so used (e.g., aggressing at and derogating others, self-aggrandizement, low intimacy strivings) undermine interpersonal relationships. Indeed, the pursuit of self-esteem, something narcissists are particularly predisposed toward, is argued to be costly in terms of others' perceptions (Crocker & Park, 2004). Moreover, the excessive agentic focus of narcissists, which causes them to focus on their goals at the expense of others' goals (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001), also should serve to undermine narcissists in a social context. Finally, narcissists characteristically lack empathy (Brown & Bosson, 2001). Given the centrality of empathy to leadership (Hogan & Hogan, 2002), this further suggests that whereas narcissists may view themselves as superior leaders, others will form the opposite conclusion. Thus, we expect narcissism to be negatively related to others' perceptions of leadership.

### Workplace Deviance

Penney and Spector (2002) found that narcissism was positively related to deviant or counterproductive work behaviors ( $r = .27, p < .05$ ). Why might narcissism be linked to deviance in the workplace? Because narcissists are coercive (Baumeister, Catanese, & Wallace, 2002), and may be motivated to derogate others (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001), one would expect narcissists to be more predisposed to engage in behaviors that ultimately harm the organization. Moreover, research suggests that narcissists are likely to engage in aggressive behavior, especially when their self-concept

is threatened (Stucke & Sporer, 2002). Bushman and Baumeister (1998) found that narcissists were more likely to engage in aggressive behavior because they are hypervigilant to perceived threats. Narcissists may be predisposed to engage in aggressive and other deviant behavior because they are predisposed to see their work environment in negative, threatening ways. Finally, Soyer et al. (1999) found that narcissists were more comfortable with ethically questionable sales behaviors, suggesting that narcissists are less bound to organizational rules of propriety. Putting these perspectives together, narcissism may be linked to deviance through both a perceptual and behavioral process: narcissists may be predisposed to perceive threats in the workplace, and they may be more likely to respond aggressively to those threats that are perceived. Thus, we expect narcissism to be positively related to other ratings of individuals' workplace deviance.

### Contextual and Task Performance

Given their agentic focus (Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002), that their self-esteem is likely to be especially contingent on the hallmarks of success (Roberts & Robins, 2000), and that projecting an image of competence is especially important to narcissists (Elliot & Thrash, 2001), one would expect narcissists to have unrealistic views of their performance capabilities, such that they believe themselves more capable or competent than they are in reality (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). Thus, one would expect narcissists to see themselves as effective performers. However, such self-enhancing tendencies may be detrimental to performance because they are built on a fragile base of self-esteem (which is easily shattered in the wake of failure) and the tendency to excuse away failures (Robins & Beer, 2001). The narcissistic pursuit of self-esteem also may hinder performance through diminished learning and poorer self-regulation (Crocker & Park, 2004). Overall, this research leads us to expect that narcissism will be negatively related to both contextual and task performance. Soyer et al. (1999) found that narcissism was unrelated to salesperson performance, although the measure of narcissism was somewhat unusual (a clinical measure based on the *DSM-III*) and the measure of sales performance was self-reported by individuals.

As a result of the foregoing support, next we present hypotheses for each of the criteria included in this study:

H-1a: Narcissism will be positively related to self-ratings of leadership.

H-1b: Narcissism will be negatively related to other ratings of individuals' leadership.

H-2a: Narcissism will be negatively related to self-ratings of workplace deviance.

H-2b: Narcissism will be positively related to other ratings of individuals' workplace deviance.

H-3a: Narcissism will be positively related to self-ratings of contextual performance.

H-3b: Narcissism will be negatively related to other ratings of individuals' contextual performance.

H-4a: Narcissism will be positively related to self-ratings of task performance.

H-4b: Narcissism will be negatively related to other ratings of individuals' task performance.

### Relationship of Narcissism to Contextual Versus Task Performance

Although in the previous section we argued that narcissism will be negatively related to other ratings of individuals' task and contextual performance, there are reasons to believe that this negative relationship will be stronger with one of these criteria. First, to a large extent, narcissistic tendencies appear to be the very opposite of those that reflect an effective contextual performer. As noted previously, narcissists tend to lack empathy, engage in aggressive behavior, and have self-serving motives. Accordingly, narcissists should be especially unlikely to contribute positively to the organization's social and psychological climate by helping others, being courteous and a good sport, and going above and beyond the call of duty for the greater good. Although narcissistic tendencies should detract from task performance as well for reasons stated earlier, the correspondence of these tendencies with the behavioral elements of contextual performance appears to be much stronger.

A second reason why we expect narcissism to more strongly predict other ratings of contextual performance than task performance is that the behavioral activities that comprise contextual performance are more discretionary and less explicitly rewarded than the behavioral activities that comprise task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Accordingly, a behavioral predisposition such as narcissism should play a stronger role in predicting contextual performance because there is less information and fewer incentives in the "situation" regarding which specific types of behavior to enact. In essence, contextual performance constitutes the "weaker" criterion in the sense that individuals should perceive more freedom to act, and in this type of situation, individual differences in personality are more likely to influence behavior (Mischel, 1997; Weiss & Adler, 1984). Indeed, research has consistently demonstrated that personality traits are stronger predictors of contextual performance than task performance (e.g., Hatrup, O'Connell, & Wingate, 1998; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Thus, in the same way that personality is more likely to predict task performance when individuals have autonomy in how to go about their work (Barrick & Mount, 1993), due to its discretionary nature, contextual performance gives individuals autonomy in deciding whether to perform the behaviors, suggesting that narcissists' selfish desires will be more evident with contextual than task performance.

Finally, narcissists are more likely to engage in behaviors that they perceive as serving their own goals rather than others' goals (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Narcissists will be more likely to direct effort toward activities that reflect task performance given that these behaviors are more likely to be recognized and directly rewarded than contextual performance. Moreover, acts of contextual performance may be viewed by narcissists as self-defeating because in contributing to others' welfare through acts that are

often unrecognized, the narcissist's perceived standing is lowered from a comparative sense.

H-5: Narcissism will predict more strongly and negatively other ratings of contextual performance than other ratings of task performance.

### Inflation Versus Enhancement

In investigating the degree to which narcissism is related to self-ratings and other ratings of various criteria, and the differences in these relationships, we need to comment on what our study does *not* address. Specifically, we are not studying inflation in ratings in the sense that we are not concerned with whether individuals over- and underestimate their performance relative to how others estimate their behavior. Rather, we are interested in whether narcissism leads people to evaluate themselves more positively and also whether narcissism leads to evaluations by others that are less positive. Specifically, do those people who score high on narcissism rate themselves more favorably than do those who score low on narcissism, and are those who score high on narcissism rated less favorably by others than are those who score low on narcissism? Thus, we are not interested in self-other differences (difference scores) in criterion ratings and whether narcissism predicts these differences. Rather, our concern is the degree to which narcissism is associated with enhanced self-ratings (more favorable self-ratings than would otherwise be the case [for someone high vs. low on narcissism]), as well as the relationship of narcissism to other ratings of the same criteria, and a comparison of these relationships.

### Role of Big Five Traits

Finally, there are two reasons why it may be important to consider whether narcissism adds to the prediction of leadership ratings and job performance over and above the Big Five traits. First, the Big Five traits are thought to constitute the majority of the domain of personality, and several Big Five traits predict leadership (Judge et al., 2002) and performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991) ratings. Second, narcissism itself is related to some of the Big Five traits, so there is the question of concept redundancy. Specifically, narcissism correlates with Extraversion positively, and Agreeableness and Neuroticism negatively, though these correlations are not especially strong (Graziano & Tobin, 2001). Moreover, the trait that is the best Big Five predictor of job performance, and one of the best predictors of leadership (i.e., Conscientiousness), is generally unrelated to narcissism (Ruiz, Smith, & Rhodewalt, 2001). For these reasons, we expect that controlling for the Big Five will not undermine the effect of narcissism. Nevertheless, we do control for the Big Five traits in the analyses.

### Method Overview

In order to test our hypotheses, we conducted two studies. In Study 1, we used narcissism to predict self- and other ratings of leadership. In Study 2, we used narcissism to predict self- and other ratings of leadership, workplace deviance, contextual performance, and task performance.

## Study 1

### Method

#### Setting and Participants

Participants were master's degree candidates at a large university in the southeastern United States. Roughly one third of the participants were students in a Master of Business Administration (MBA) program; the other two thirds were students in a Master of Science in Management (MSM) program. Of the students in the MBA program, 24% were female, 84% were White, and 16% were members of a minority group (African American, Hispanic American, or Native American). The average MBA student had 4.3 years of work experience. Of the students in the latter (MSM) program, 51% were female, 68% were White, 9% were African American, 13% were Asian, and 10% were of other international origins. Typically, students in the MSM program had only limited full-time work experience.

#### Procedure

In order to gain insight into their capabilities as managers and leaders, individuals in both programs were assessed on their personality (Big Five personality traits, narcissism) and leadership. Individuals self-reported their personalities and their own leadership behaviors. Separately, individuals' leadership behaviors also were confidentially evaluated by 3–6 other raters. These other raters were instructed to be people with whom the individual has "worked most closely—supervisors, coworkers, or fellow students with whom they have worked on team projects." (We did not obtain data on the roles of these other raters, though we believe most of them to be "peers" [coworkers and fellow students]). Individuals were promised that their results were completely confidential. All surveys were returned directly to the first author, by both participants and the raters of those participants, in their respective sealed envelope(s) to ensure confidentiality. As an incentive and a benefit, individuals were promised and given separate feedback reports that summarized their personality and leadership scores. The reports were provided after the personality and leadership surveys were completed. Because these reports were the only benefit to participating, and participation was not mandatory, it seems unlikely that individuals completed the other surveys themselves. In all, 139 of the 159 individuals had complete sets of surveys, for a response rate of 87%.

#### Measures

**Narcissism.** Participants' narcissism was assessed with Emmons' amendment of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981). The abridged NPI was derived from Emmons' (1987) factor analytic study of the 54-item Raskin and Hall (1979) instrument. The NPI has been shown to be a reliable self-report inventory measuring individual differences in narcissism as a personality trait (Emmons, 1987; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). The NPI, consisting of 37 forced choice dichotomous (1 = *yes* or 0 = *no*) items, has shown considerable evidence of construct validity and internal consistency (for reviews, see Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988).

Prior confirmatory factor studies by Emmons (1984, 1987) indicate that the NPI comprises an overall measure that, in turn, is composed of four factors: *Leadership/Authority* (e.g., "I would prefer to be a leader," "I like having authority over people"); *Self-absorption/Self-admiration* (e.g., "I think I am a special person," "I like to look at myself in the mirror"); *Superiority/Arrogance* (e.g., "I always know what I am doing," "People can learn a great deal from me"); and *Exploitativeness/Entitlement* (e.g., "I find it easy to manipulate people," "I expect a great deal from other people"). Past research generally has treated narcissism both as a general factor (e.g., Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993), as well as a multidimensional construct (e.g., Watson & Biderman, 1993). Accordingly, we conducted a

second-order factor analysis to determine whether a higher-order hierarchical measurement approach (whereby narcissism can be analyzed at both the facet and overall dimension levels) was justified. In the second-order factor analysis, the first-order factors consisted of the four narcissism dimensions, which were indicated by corresponding parcels. The second-order factor was the overall narcissism factor, which was indicated by the four narcissism dimensions (first order factors). If this hierarchical model fits the data well, and the first- and second-order factor loadings are significant, then support for the hierarchical measurement approach would be provided by the results. Indeed, results indicated that the hierarchical model fit the data reasonably well ( $\chi^2_{50} = 83.89$ ; Root-mean-square Residual [RMR] = .07; Root-mean-square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .07; Comparative fit index [CFI] = .90), the four first-order factors were indicated by the parcels ( $\lambda_y = .57$ ,  $\bar{t} = 4.26$ , all  $p < .01$ ), and the overall (second-order) narcissism factor was significantly ( $\bar{t} = 4.43$ , all  $p < .01$ ) indicated by the four first-order narcissism dimensions ( $\bar{\gamma} = .77$ ). These results support the aggregation of the dimensions into a higher-order factor. The reliability of overall 37-item narcissism scale was  $\alpha = .90$ .

**Big Five personality traits.** The Big Five traits were measured with the 60-item NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Using a 0 = *Strongly disagree* to 4 = *Strongly agree* scale, individuals evaluated their Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness with 12-item scales. The five scales were computed by summing the responses to each of these items. The reliabilities of the Big Five scales were: Neuroticism,  $\alpha = .86$ ; Extraversion,  $\alpha = .74$ ; Openness,  $\alpha = .76$ ; Agreeableness,  $\alpha = .69$ ; Conscientiousness,  $\alpha = .81$ .

**Leadership.** We measured leadership with the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1993), a 30-item measure that contains five subscales (Challenging, Inspiring, Enabling, Modeling, Encouraging). Past research has used the LPI as a measure of transformational leadership (Fields & Herold, 1997). Moreover, research suggests that the LPI assesses an overarching construct of transformational leadership (Carless, 2001). As previously noted, individuals rated themselves using the LPI and were also rated by three others. Accordingly, we averaged the 30 items for both self- and other reports. For the self-reported LPI, the reliability of the 30-item scale was  $\alpha = .92$ . For the other LPI reports, the average reliability of the 30-item scale was  $\bar{\alpha} = .95$ . There was significant agreement among the other raters in terms of their leadership ratings ( $ICC(1) = .28$ ,  $p < .05$ ), so we averaged across the raters to form a single transformational leadership scale. The interrater reliability of the other ratings was  $ICC(2) = .54$ . The self-other correlation was  $\bar{r}$ . Although this correlation is relatively modest, self-ratings tend to display weak correlations with supervisor, peer, and follower ratings of performance and leadership criteria (Brett & Atwater, 2001).

#### Results

Correlations and descriptive statistics for Study 1 variables are presented in Table 1. To test not only the effect of narcissism on self- and other ratings, but also the differences in the relative effects (whether narcissism is more strongly related to self- vs. other reports), we utilized multivariate regression (Edwards, 1995; Greene, 1990, pp. 509–519). The advantages of multivariate regression are twofold. First, it provides separate estimates of the effect of the explanatory variable (in this case, narcissism and the Big Five traits) on self- and other ratings. Second, it provides a statistic, in the form of Wilks'  $\lambda$ , that tests the equivalence of the effect of the explanatory variable across the two (self and other) equations. A significant  $\lambda$  (which is distributed as an F-statistic) indicates that the effect of the explanatory variable is different in the two equations. Because it is important to show unique effects of specific traits beyond the five-factor model traits, we controlled for the Big Five traits in all regressions. Finally, for informational

Table 1  
Means (*M*), Standard Deviations (*SD*), and Intercorrelations Among Study 1 Variables

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Narcissism	0.52	0.15	(.90)							
2. Neuroticism	18.91	8.03	-.11	(.86)						
3. Extraversion	30.64	5.53	.36**	-.40**	(.74)					
4. Openness to experience	29.18	6.60	.04	-.01	.09	(.76)				
5. Agreeableness	30.80	5.45	-.24**	-.17*	.25**	-.01	(.69)			
6. Conscientiousness	33.53	6.13	-.10	-.22**	.14	-.05	.23**	(.81)		
7. Leadership—self	7.33	0.91	.35**	-.22**	.37**	.25**	.19*	.23**	(.92)	
8. Leadership—other (peer)	7.74	0.85	.20*	-.10	.15	.10	.09	-.01	.15	(.95)

Note. Listwise  $N = 134$ . Reliability ( $\alpha$ ) estimates are listed on the diagonal.

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

purposes, we also report standardized effect size estimates in the form of partial eta-squared ( $\eta^2$ ) from the multivariate regressions and standardized regression ( $\hat{\beta}$ ) estimates from univariate OLS regressions.

Results of this analysis are presented in Table 2. As the table shows, narcissism significantly and positively predicted both self- ( $\hat{\beta} = .36, p < .01$ ) and other ( $\hat{\beta} = .19, p < .05, p < .05$ ) ratings of leadership, supporting H-1a but not supporting H-1b. Although narcissism was positively related to both self- and other ratings of leadership, the coefficient was significantly stronger for self-ratings than for other ratings of leadership ( $F = 11.00, p < .01$ ). The stronger effect of narcissism on self-ratings of leadership is further illustrated by the standardized effect size estimates, which show that narcissism explains more unique variance in self-ratings of leadership ( $\eta^2 = .12$ ) than in other ratings ( $\eta^2 = .04$ ). Thus, though narcissism did not negatively predict other ratings of leadership as expected, it did positively predict self-ratings, and moreover did to a significantly greater degree than other ratings. Finally, we should note that three of the Big Five traits were related to self- but not other leadership ratings. Specifically, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness were more strongly and more positively related to self-reports of leadership than to other reports.<sup>1</sup>

## Study 2

### Method

#### Sample and Procedures

The sample consisted of 143 male and female members of a beach patrol located within the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Approximately 21% ( $N = 30$ ) of these participants were female; participants ranged in age from 18 to 48 years. Participation in the study was voluntary; however, in exchange for their participation, beach patrol members who returned surveys received \$10. The response rate for full-time employees was 96%. Data were collected from three sources. First, a confidential packet was hand delivered to all employees. This packet included a questionnaire to measure self-perceptions of personality (Big Five and narcissism) and leadership behavior. Significant others completed a measure of employees' narcissism and were provided with a confidential return envelope. Finally, immediate supervisors provided data on employees' leadership, workplace deviance, and task and contextual performance. All surveys were returned directly to the third author, by both participants and the raters of those participants, in their respective sealed envelope(s) to ensure confidentiality.

Individuals for whom complete survey responses were unavailable were excluded from the study. This resulted in a final sample size of  $N = 131$ .

### Measures

**Narcissism.** As in Study 1, narcissism was assessed with the 37-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981). The participant was asked, using the same dichotomous (yes-no) scale that has been used in past research, whether each of the 37 NPI items described themselves. The reliability of the 37-item scale was  $\alpha = .87$ . As in Study 1, we conducted a second-order factor analysis to determine whether it is appropriate to treat narcissism as both a multidimensional and aggregate construct. The hierarchical model, which used three parcels as indicators of each of the four narcissism dimensions, and then used the four narcissism dimensions as indicators of the second-order overall factor, fit the data reasonably well ( $\chi^2_{50} = 98.55$ ; Root-mean-square Residual [RMR] = .07; Root-mean-square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .08; Comparative fit index [CFI] = .92), the four first-order factors were indicated by the parcels ( $\hat{\lambda}_y = .63, \bar{t} = 6.29$ , all  $p < .01$ ), and the overall (second-order) narcissism factor was significantly ( $\bar{t} = 6.54$ , all  $p < .01$ , all  $p < .01$ ) indicated by the four first-order narcissism dimensions ( $\bar{\gamma} = .72$ ). Thus, we utilized an overall measure of narcissism by averaging responses across the 37 items.

**Big Five personality traits.** The Big Five personality traits were self-reported by participants using the 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). This measure was constructed to allow for efficient assessment of the Big Five dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness when there is no need for more differentiated measurement of individual facets. The BFI does not use single adjectives as items. Instead, one or two prototypical trait adjectives served as the item core to which instructive, clarifying, or contextual information was added. For example, the Extraversion adjective *energetic* served as the basis for the BFI item "I am full of energy," and the Openness adjective *imaginative* became the BFI item "I have an active imagination." Thus, the BFI items are short and avoid complex sentence structures, retaining the advantages of adjectival items (brevity and simplicity) while avoiding some of their pitfalls (ambiguous or multiple meanings and salient desirability) (John & Srivastava, 1999).

<sup>1</sup> Given the potentially multidimensional nature of narcissism (Raskin & Hall, 1981), in addition to self- versus other views being influenced by the overall narcissism factor, the dimensions of narcissism may be relevant. Accordingly, we repeated the analysis reported in Table 2 utilizing the overall narcissism factor, with an analysis utilizing the four narcissism dimensions. The results indicated that none of the narcissism dimensions significantly predicted self- or other reports of leadership.

Table 2  
*Multivariate Regressions Predicting Self-Rating and Other (Peer) Ratings of Leadership (Study 1)*

Independent Variable	Self-Rating (S)			Other Rating (O)			S-O Difference
	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	Wilks' $\lambda$ (F)
Neuroticism	-.01	.00	-.06	-.01	.00	-.06	0.41
Extraversion	.02	.01	.12	.00	.00	.03	0.85
Openness to experience	.03**	.08**	.24**	.01	.01	.08	5.61**
Agreeableness	.03*	.04*	.20*	.02	.02	.15	3.72*
Conscientiousness	.03**	.05**	.21**	.00	.00	-.05	3.52*
Narcissism	2.02**	.12**	.36**	1.16*	.04*	.19*	11.00**

Note.  $\hat{B}$  = unstandardized regression coefficient from multivariate regression. Partial  $\eta^2$  = unique variance explained by independent variable. Wilks'  $\lambda$  = difference between coefficient estimates for self- and other ratings (distributed as F-statistic).  $\hat{\beta}$  = standardized regression coefficient from univariate OLS regression.  
 \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Despite its brevity, the BFI does not sacrifice either content coverage or psychometric properties. For example, the eight-item Extraversion scale includes items from at least four of the six facets postulated by Costa and McCrae (1992)—namely, gregariousness, activity, assertiveness, and positive emotions. Responses to each item were recorded on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Scales were computed by averaging participants' responses for the items. Reliabilities of the five factors—ranging in this study from .80 to .85—proved to be consistent with prior research that has demonstrated alpha reliabilities of the BFI scales typically in the range of .75 to .90.

**Leadership.** Leadership behavior was measured with 12 leadership items from Bass and Avolio's (1990) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). We utilized these items because research repeatedly has shown that these dimensions load the highest on the overall transformational leadership construct (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Participants were rated by their immediate supervisor on the frequency with which the participant engages in each of the behaviors from 1 (*Not at all*) to 5 (*Frequently, if not always*). Participants also rated their own transformational leadership behaviors on the same scale. Self- and other scales were computed by averaging the 12 items for each (self- and other) measure. The reliability of this measure was  $\alpha = .85$  for participants' self-reports and  $\alpha = .96$  for the other (supervisor) reports.

**Workplace deviance.** We used the 24-item scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) to assess workplace deviance. In a factor analytic study using self-ratings of these items, Bennett and Robinson found two correlated, but distinct, scales reflecting the distinction in the intended target of the harmful behavior. Therefore, both interpersonal deviance (harmful to people in the organization) and organizational deviance (harmful to the organization) were assessed. However, past research has found these two dimensions to be highly related (Lee & Allen, 2002). Thus, we opted to treat this as a single workplace deviance variable by aggregating across items ( $\alpha = .91$  and  $\alpha = .82$  for self- and other [supervisor] ratings, respectively). Immediate supervisors rated their subordinates on the frequency with which they engage in workplace deviance from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Daily*). Participants also rated their own workplace deviance on the same scale. Example items included, "Played a mean prank on someone at work" and "Taken property from work without permission."

**Contextual performance.** Participants and supervisors provided ratings of contextual performance using the 24-item scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). This scale was originally designed to assess five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior suggested by Organ (1988): altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue. Responses to each item were

recorded on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all*) to 5 (*Frequently, if not always*). Participants rated their own contextual performance using the 24-item scale. Participants' supervisors independently rated them using the same set of items. We note that the sportsmanship items were reverse-scored so that higher scores indicate higher sportsmanship. Reliabilities of the five factors ranged from .83 to .94. Research indicates that the behavioral domains of organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance overlap theoretically and empirically (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Accordingly, we aggregated the five dimensions into an overall contextual performance factor. Supporting this decision, the second-order factor loadings were strong ( $\hat{\gamma} = .81$ ) and significant ( $t = 9.13$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Moreover, the five dimensions displayed a similar pattern of correlations with narcissism and the Big Five traits. Specifically, across both self- and other reports of the four narcissism facets, and self- and other (supervisor) reports of contextual performance, the average difference in the correlations of each facet with the five OCB dimensions was only .05. Some narcissism facets were more variable in their relation to the OCB dimensions than others. The superiority/arrogance narcissism facet, for example, was more variable in its relationship with the OCB dimensions than the other narcissism facets or the overall narcissism construct. Even in this case, though, the standard deviation in correlations was relatively small (i.e., the highest was  $SD = .09$ ). Thus, the decision to aggregate the five OCB dimensions into a single overall measure appeared to be well justified. Accordingly, we computed an overall measure of contextual performance by averaging the 24 items for each report. The reliability of this measure was  $\alpha = .86$  for participants' self-reports and  $\alpha = .94$  for the other (supervisor) reports.

**Task performance.** Ratings of task performance were assessed using Williams and Anderson's (1991) measure of in-role behaviors. Williams and Anderson have shown that their In-Role Behavior scale measures a construct distinct from contextual performance. Participants rated themselves on a six-item in-role performance scale which asked to what degree, from 1 (*Not at all*) to 5 (*Frequently, if not always*), did they meet the formal requirements of their job. Example items included, "Performs the tasks that are expected as part of this job" and "Adequately completes responsibilities." Supervisors rated their subordinates using the same six-item scale. Self- and other (supervisor) scales were computed by averaging the six items for each (self- and other) measure. The reliability of this measure was  $\alpha = .83$  for participants' self-reports and  $\alpha = .94$  for the other reports.

Results

The means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations for all Study 2 variables are shown in Table 3. Internal consistency reliabilities for the measures are presented on the diagonal. As shown in Table 1, the correlation between task and contextual performance is quite high (self-ratings,  $\hat{r} = .59$ ; other [supervisor] ratings,  $\hat{r} = .79$ ), which, like Study 1, dwarfs the different source correlations of the same variable (e.g., self- and other [supervisor] ratings of contextual performance correlated  $\hat{r} = .19$ ). Although this is a common finding (Brett & Atwater, 2001), it does not necessarily mean the two variables have no discriminant validity. For example, LePine and Van Dyne (1998) found a strong correlation between task and contextual performance ( $\hat{r} = .69$ ), yet they also found that contextual performance explained additional variance in job performance after the effect of in-role performance was taken into account.

As in Study 1, we used the same analytical procedure (multivariate regression) to assess our hypotheses, controlled for the influence of the Big Five traits, and report the same information. In Study 2, there are four criteria we investigated: leadership, workplace deviance, contextual performance, and task performance.

For leadership, results in Table 4 indicate that narcissism significantly and positively predicted self-ratings of leadership ( $\hat{\beta} = .22, p < .01$ ), but significantly negatively predicted other ratings of leadership ( $\hat{\beta} = -.20, p < .05$ ). Thus, both H-1a and H-1b were supported by the results. Moreover, the significance of the Wilks'  $\lambda$  statistic ( $F = 7.09, p < .01$ ), and the direction of the effects, indicates that the effects of narcissism on self- and other ratings of leadership are significantly different. Results also indicated that three of the Big Five traits—Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, and Conscientiousness—also were associated with enhanced leadership ratings. Specifically, Neuroticism was negatively related to self- (but not other) ratings of leadership, whereas Openness and Conscientiousness were positively related to self- (but not other) ratings of leadership.

For workplace deviance, results shown in Table 5 indicate that narcissism was positively ( $\hat{\beta} = .13, p = .06$ ) related to self-ratings of workplace deviance, which fails to support H-2a. Narcissism was positively related to other ratings of participant workplace deviance ( $\hat{\beta} = .24, p < .01$ ), supporting H-2b. Moreover, the pattern of results and significant Wilks'  $\lambda$  ( $F = 4.63, p < .01$ ) reveal that the effect of narcissism on workplace deviance was significantly stronger for other ratings of deviance than for self-ratings. Two of the Big Five traits—Openness to Experience and Conscientiousness—more strongly negatively predicted self-reports of workplace deviance compared to other reports.

Tables 6 and 7 contain the results testing the effects of narcissism on contextual and task performance. In Table 6, results indicate that narcissism was not significantly related to self-reports of contextual performance (failing to support H-3a). However, narcissism was significantly negatively related to other reports of contextual performance ( $\hat{\beta} = -.25, p < .01$ ), supporting H-3b, and the effects of narcissism on self- versus other reports of workplace deviance were significantly different in the two regressions ( $F = 5.53, p < .01$ ) such that narcissism more strongly negatively predicted other than self-reports of contextual performance. Narcissism was not related to self- or other reports of task

Table 3  
Means (M), Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Among Study 2 Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Narcissism	0.59	0.19	(.87)													
2. Neuroticism	2.31	0.78	-.10	(.81)												
3. Extraversion	3.79	0.75	.31**	-.24**	(.85)											
4. Openness to Experience	3.87	0.67	.20*	-.04	.22**	(.83)										
5. Agreeableness	4.10	0.65	-.03	-.26**	.26**	.15	(.82)									
6. Conscientiousness	4.26	0.61	-.01	-.26**	.30**	.10	.50**	(.80)								
7. Leadership—self	3.78	0.59	.34**	-.33**	.42**	.40**	.35**	.40**	(.85)							
8. Leadership—other	3.72	0.93	-.08	-.14	.10	.12	.08	.14	.16	(.96)						
9. Workplace deviance—self	1.59	0.49	.12	.11	-.05	-.19*	-.37**	-.40**	-.26**	-.15	(.91)					
10. Workplace deviance—other	1.23	0.28	.24**	.14	.12	-.10	-.05	-.07	.02	-.41**	.20*	(.82)				
11. Contextual performance—self	4.09	0.47	.12	-.21*	.30**	.34**	.49**	.67**	.63**	.12	-.44**	-.14	(.86)			
12. Contextual performance—other	4.01	0.74	-.14	-.16	.04	.10	.06	.14	.17*	.80**	-.12	-.53**	.19*	(.94)		
13. Task performance—self	4.66	0.51	.05	-.21*	.22**	.23**	.40**	.60**	.37**	.12	-.35**	-.11	.59**	.16	(.83)	
14. Task performance—other	4.36	0.79	-.03	-.08	.06	-.03	-.06	.12	.12	.65**	-.15	-.36**	.18*	.79**	.09	(.94)

Note. Listwise  $N = 131$ . Reliability ( $\alpha$ ) estimates are listed on the diagonal.  
\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . In all cases, others are supervisors.

Table 4  
*Multivariate Regressions Predicting Self-Rating and Other (Supervisor) Ratings of Leadership (Study 2)*

Independent Variable	Self-Rating (S)			Other Rating (O)			S-O Difference
	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	Wilks' $\lambda$ (F)
Neuroticism	-.14**	.05**	-.21**	-.10	.01	-.09	3.51**
Extraversion	.09	.02	.11	.10	.01	.08	1.45
Openness to Experience	.26**	.13**	.29**	.21	.03	.16	10.22**
Agreeableness	.11	.02	.12	-.01	.00	-.01	1.15
Conscientiousness	.22**	.06**	.23**	.09	.00	.06	4.09*
Narcissism	.68**	.07**	.22**	-.96*	.04*	-.20*	7.09**

Note.  $\hat{B}$  = unstandardized regression coefficient from multivariate regression. Partial  $\eta^2$  = unique variance explained by independent variable. Wilks'  $\lambda$  = difference between coefficient estimates for self- and other ratings (distributed as F-statistic).  $\hat{\beta}$  = standardized regression coefficient from univariate OLS regression.

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

performance.<sup>2</sup> Thus, H-4 was not supported by the results. Results did indicate that openness was positively related to self- and other ratings of contextual performance, though the former effect was significantly stronger than the latter ( $F = 8.93$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Conscientiousness was positively related to self- but not other ratings of both contextual and task performance.<sup>3</sup>

#### Differential Effect of Narcissism on Other Ratings of Task Versus Contextual Performance

In H-5, we predicted that narcissism would be more strongly negatively related to other (supervisor) reports of contextual than to task performance. In a multivariate regression predicting other reports of task and contextual performance, the results revealed that narcissism significantly negatively predicted contextual performance ( $\hat{\beta} = -.25$ ,  $p < .01$ ), whereas it did not predict task performance ( $\hat{\beta} = -.11$ , ns). Moreover, these coefficient estimates were significantly different ( $F = 5.65$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Thus, H-5 was supported by the results.

#### Discussion

Results presented in this manuscript suggest that narcissism may differentially influence self- and other perceptions of behavior as reflected in four important organizational criteria. Specifically, controlling for the Big Five traits, narcissism had different associations with self- and other ratings of a number of criteria (leadership, workplace deviance, contextual performance, and task performance), albeit the specific patterns of relationships varied by the criterion and by the source of the ratings. Overall, despite the paucity of organizational empirical research on the topic (for exceptions, see Penney & Spector, 2002; Soyer et al., 1999), it appears that narcissism may be relevant to understanding ratings of several important organizational behaviors. Turning to the results more specifically, two key findings are particularly worthy of discussion.

First, narcissism was generally negatively related to other/supervisor reports of the criteria. Specifically, though narcissism was not negatively related to other reports of leadership in Study 1, nor to task performance in Study 2, it was negatively related to other

ratings of leadership and other ratings of contextual performance in Study 2, and positively related to other ratings of workplace deviance in Study 2. It is noteworthy that these results were observed with independent sources (self-reports of narcissism and other reports of the criteria).

One inconsistency in the results was that, in Study 1, narcissism was positively related to other reported leadership, whereas in Study 2, narcissism, as hypothesized, was negatively related to other reported leadership. In hindsight, these results appear to be consistent with previous theorizing in the narcissism literature. Specifically, Robins and Beer (2001) hypothesize that, because narcissists emphasize immediate personal gain and self-aggrandizement over long-term relationships, narcissism has short-term benefits but long-term costs. Because most of the other raters in Study 1 were fellow classmates and team members, it is likely they had known the individuals for a shorter period of time than the other raters in Study 2. Thus, the more negative leadership perceptions others held of narcissists in Study 2 might be ex-

<sup>2</sup> As in Study 1, we repeated the analyses with the overall narcissism factor, relating the four narcissism dimensions to the four Study 2 criteria. The results indicated that, when entered into multivariate regressions together, none of the narcissism dimensions significantly predicted self-ratings of the four criteria. However, when predicting other/supervisor reports, one narcissism dimension—self-absorption/self-admiration—significantly negatively predicted three of the criteria: leadership, contextual performance, and task performance.

<sup>3</sup> In both studies, we also collected “significant other” measures of narcissism, whereby 1-2 individuals who knew the participants well (spouse or partner, family member, close friend) rated participants using the same version of the NPI (with appropriate modification in instructions) as participants used to evaluate themselves. In order to investigate the relative effect of the other reports of narcissism, we entered the other report (measuring narcissism overall) into the multivariate regression controlling for the overall self-report measure of narcissism. Across all criteria in both studies, when adding the other measure of narcissism to the multivariate regression model including the self-report of overall narcissism, the other report was associated with neither self- nor other reports of the criteria. Thus, it does not appear that significant others’ perceptions of participants’ narcissism added beyond self-reports.

Table 5  
*Multivariate Regressions Predicting Self- and (Other) Supervisor Ratings of Workplace Deviance (Study 2)*

Independent Variable	Self-Rating (S)			Other Rating (O)			S-O Difference
	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	Wilks' $\lambda$ (F)
Neuroticism	.00	.00	-.02	.06†	.03†	.15†	1.55
Extraversion	.07	.01	.09	.04	.01	.11	1.01
Openness to Experience	-.14*	.05*	-.20**	-.06†	.01†	-.14†	3.80*
Agreeableness	-.17*	.04*	-.19*	.01	.00	.01	2.89†
Conscientiousness	-.23**	.07**	-.32**	-.02	.00	-.06	4.76**
Narcissism	.37†	.02†	.13†	.38**	.06**	.24**	4.63**

Note.  $\hat{B}$  = unstandardized regression coefficient from multivariate regression. Partial  $\eta^2$  = unique variance explained by independent variable. Wilks'  $\lambda$  = difference between coefficient estimates for self- and other rating (distributed as F-statistic).  $\hat{\beta}$  = standardized regression coefficient from univariate OLS regression. †  $p < .10$ . \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

plained by length and depth of knowledge. Considering the role of time and experience in models of narcissism may be an interesting area for future research.

A second key finding was that, with a sole exception (task performance), across the criteria and the studies, narcissism was related to an enhanced self-view in that the multivariate regression results revealed that narcissism more positively predicted (or in the case of workplace deviance, less positively predicted) self-reports of the criteria than other reports. Thus, consistent with the hypotheses, narcissism appears to reflect a grandiose self-view.

One might wonder why the Big Five traits were not significant predictors of task and contextual performance. Although the correlations reported in Table 3 are not strong, they are consistent with prior research on the validity of the Big Five traits. Specifically, the correlation between Conscientiousness and task performance in this study is not strong ( $r = .11$ ). However, it is very close to the average uncorrected correlation between direct measures of Conscientiousness and performance ( $\bar{r} = .14$ ) reported by Hurtz and Donovan (2000). As these authors note, the validities of the Big Five traits "tend to be low to moderate in magnitude" (p. 876). Our results are consistent with their meta-analytic findings;

indeed, across the five traits the uncorrected correlations in Table 3 differ from Hertz and Donovan's corresponding correlations by only, on average, .05. Whether subsequent studies would find higher correlations for the Big Five relative to narcissism is a question that should be addressed in future research.

It is noteworthy that, along with narcissism, both Openness and Conscientiousness were more strongly associated with self- than other ratings of the criteria. Frankly, we find the results for Openness befuddling. Although research suggests that Openness does predict leadership (Judge et al., 2002), we are aware of no research suggesting that Openness leads to self-enhancement in leadership ratings or evaluations of other criteria. Thus, it remains to be seen if future research replicates this result, and can provide a conceptual rationale for the relationship. The results for Conscientiousness are easier to explain. Conscientiousness is among the more socially desirable Big Five traits (McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Stöber, 2001), and conscientious individuals are more likely to engage in self-deception (Lee & Klein, 2002; Martocchio & Judge, 1997; Stöber, Dette, & Musch, 2002). Thus, Conscientiousness may be more strongly related to self- than other ratings of criteria due to self-deception. One might wonder whether the psycholog-

Table 6  
*Multivariate Regressions Predicting Self- and Other (Supervisor) Ratings of Contextual Performance (Study 2)*

Independent Variable	Self-Rating (S)			Other Rating (O)			S-O Difference
	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	Wilks' $\lambda$ (F)
Neuroticism	-.01	.00	-.01	-.11	.01	-.11	0.90
Extraversion	.00	.00	-.01	.01	.00	.01	0.01
Openness to Experience	.18**	.11**	.25**	.19*	.04*	.17*	8.93**
Agreeableness	.12*	.04*	.19**	-.02	.00	-.02	2.74
Conscientiousness	.42**	.33**	.56**	.10	.01	.09	29.35**
Narcissism	.17	.01	.05	-.99**	.07**	-.25**	5.53**

Note.  $\hat{B}$  = unstandardized regression coefficient from multivariate regression. Partial  $\eta^2$  = unique variance explained by independent variable. Wilks'  $\lambda$  = difference between coefficient estimates for self- and other rating (distributed as F-statistic).  $\hat{\beta}$  = standardized regression coefficient from univariate OLS regression. †  $p < .10$ . \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 7  
*Multivariate Regressions Predicting Self- and Other (Supervisor) Ratings of Task Performance (Study 2)*

Independent Variable	Self-Rating (S)			Other Rating (O)			S-O Difference
	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\hat{B}$	Partial $\eta^2$	$\hat{\beta}$	Wilks' $\lambda$ (F)
Neuroticism	-.04	-.03	.00	-.03	.00	-.03	0.30
Extraversion	-.01	-.01	.00	.05	.00	.05	0.15
Openness to Experience	.13	.17	.04	.01	.00	.01	2.80
Agreeableness	.08	.09	.01	-.13	.11	-.10	1.38
Conscientiousness	.44**	.52**	.24**	.18	.02	.14	20.18**
Narcissism	.05	.03	.00	-.44	.01	-.11	0.80

Note  $\hat{B}$  = unstandardized regression coefficient from multivariate regression. Partial  $\eta^2$  = unique variance explained by independent variable. Wilks'  $\lambda$  = difference between coefficient estimates for self- and other rating (distributed as F-statistic).  $\hat{\beta}$  = standardized regression coefficient from univariate OLS regression.  
 $\dagger p < .10$ . \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

ical tendency to positively self-deceive is the same for Conscientiousness and narcissism. We think they may be different. Whereas narcissists enhance out of a sense of grandiosity (true arrogance [Emmons, 1987]), conscientious individuals may enhance for a more defensive reason. A self-image as a competent person is important to conscientious individuals (Burriss & Navara, 2002), as is work itself (Digman, 1997). Thus, conscientious individuals may feel the need to defensively maintain a self-image as a model employee. We realize that this is speculation beyond our results and requires future research to corroborate.

### Implications

Given the social undesirability of narcissism (few would wish to be described as vain, self-absorbed, egotistical, selfish, conceited, and grandiose), and its clinical lineage, organizations might be expected to screen out narcissists, at least implicitly, in hiring decisions. In addition, to the degree that narcissism leads to an enhanced self-perception, while having weaker or even negative effects on others' perceptions, organizations might exercise caution in utilizing self-ratings of work criteria, especially those that are likely to be viewed as socially desirable or ego threatening. Finally, we suggest that there may be three categories of jobs in which narcissism may be even more undesirable.

First, narcissism may be an important liability in jobs where a realistic conception of one's talents and abilities are critical. Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro, and Rusbult (2004, p. 401) describe narcissists as those who "glorify the self" and overestimate their intelligence and attractiveness. Narcissists also have been shown to have an exaggerated sense of personal control over their world (Watson, Sawrie, & Biderman, 1991). If narcissism leads to an inflated self-concept (something our results do not specifically address) and an exaggerated sense of control in this manner, it could be damaging in jobs where accurate self-assessments are required. Overconfident negotiators, for example, tend toward self-enhancement biases and reach less favorable outcomes as a result (Kramer, Newton, & Pommerenke, 1993).

Second, narcissism may be detrimental in team contexts that require cooperation and a positive social-psychological climate. Indeed, to the extent that narcissists value competition over coop-

eration and are interpersonally dismissive and abrasive (Sedikides et al., 2004), they may be the very antithesis of the prototypical team player. Moreover, narcissists have a grandiose sense of self-importance and believe they are extraordinary performers; this may translate into a climate of competitiveness and distrust. Narcissism may even be problematic in situations where the narcissist admits he or she has not performed well given that narcissists derogate those who are close to them who outperform them (Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993).

Finally, narcissists derogate unfavorable evaluators, and tend to aggress against those whom they believe threaten them (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Thus, narcissism may be particularly problematic in a 360-degree ratings context given that the narcissists will tend to enhance their ratings and aggress against those who may rate them less favorably. In fact, the situation may be especially problematic when the narcissist being rated is in a position of power with respect to being able to adversely affect the raters' jobs and careers.

The results pertaining to enhanced self- (compared to other) ratings also have other practical and theoretical implications. That narcissists tend to self-enhance is not new. John and Robins (1994) found that narcissists rated their own contribution in group discussions more favorably than their contribution was rated by others. Gabriel, Critelli, and Ee (1994) found that narcissists rated themselves as more intelligent and attractive than they were rated by others. The application of narcissism to self-other differences in work criteria, though, is a new advance. Raskin, Novacek, and Hogan (1991) argued that narcissists self-enhance for both defensive (need to maintain grandiose self-perceptions) and nondefensive (true self-esteem) reasons. In short, it appears that narcissists report themselves as better both out of an honest belief and also as a defensive strategy to maintain appearances. Applying these results to the workplace, it would be interesting to determine if narcissistic behaviors such as hostility, aggression, and derogation have a downward effect on peer ratings whereas the grandiose self-views have an upward effect on other ratings. One implication of the results is that self-ratings may need to be interpreted by researchers and organizational representatives carefully. As John

and Robins (1994) noted, "Judgments about others will be more accurate than judgments about the self" (p. 216).

### *Limitations*

In reflecting on our results, two possible limitations are apparent. First, the tendency for self-ratings of performance to be higher than other ratings, both in our own data (see Table 3) and in prior research (see Harris & Schaubroeck [1988], p. 54), reminds the reader that we did not study self-other differences in average ratings. Since these approaches—analysis of self-other differences in correlations is not the same as an analysis of mean differences—are quite different, our focus on the former to the exclusion of the latter should have little impact on our results.

A more serious limitation with this study is the possible confound between our substantive interpretation of narcissism and common source variance. Specifically, because narcissism was measured with self-reports, what we have interpreted as the self-enhancing effects of narcissism could be due to a same-source (i.e., method variance) confound. Although this is a legitimate concern that cannot be directly refuted, three aspects of the results assuage these concerns. First, the stronger relationship of narcissism to other reports of task versus contextual performance cannot be attributed to a same-source confound because the findings do not follow this "self-to-self stronger than self-to-other" pattern. Second, narcissism did predict independent ratings of the criteria, including leadership, deviance, and contextual performance. Finally, although as we noted in a previous footnote, significant other ratings of narcissism did not add beyond self-reports. However, when considered alone, the significant other reports did correlate with several of the criteria, which again would not be predicted if our results were solely due to common source inflation. Thus, there is reason to believe that same-source effects do not confound our interpretations, but the possibility must nonetheless be acknowledged.

### *Future Research*

Lasch (1979) discussed how narcissism could be analyzed on a cultural basis and concluded that American society had become, collectively, more narcissistic. This raises the issue of whether there can be narcissistic organizations, or narcissistic work groups. If leaders in an organization display features of narcissism, do these features transmit to others in the organization? Similarly, can employees' narcissism in work groups have a contagious effect on their peers? Harvey L. Pitt, shortly before he was forced to resign as chair of the Security and Exchange Commission, declared, "It is an enormous advantage to the public to have somebody who knows about the securities business and the securities law as I do, and it would be unthinkable to deprive people of my expertise" (Race, 2002). In thinking about the culture of narcissism, it is possible the contagion is such that narcissistic leaders, by communicating their superiority, undermine followers' self-esteem. Indeed, self-aggrandizement and derogation of others is a hallmark of narcissism (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). In sum, the cultural effects of narcissism is a topic worthy of future organizational research.

In the literature on narcissism, one of the common arguments is that narcissists are overly sensitive to feedback from others (Morf

& Rhodewalt, 2001). One of the reasons this is argued is because narcissists' self-esteem is thought to be particularly fragile or unstable (Rhodewalt, Madrain, & Cheney, 1998). Though feedback has a rich tradition of research in organizational behavior (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996), we are aware of no research that has investigated how narcissists react to negative feedback. Based on research in the narcissism domain (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998), we would hypothesize that narcissists' self-esteem is particularly affected by negative feedback, and that their response to negative feedback is manifested in more extreme affective (feelings of anger and shame), cognitive (external attributional processes), and behavioral (derogation of the source of the feedback as well as comparison to others) reactions. We should note that these reactions would need to be studied dynamically, as narcissists' reactions are different in the short- versus long-term (Robins & Beer, 2001). Moreover, the reactions of narcissists depend on threats to the ego; the greater the threat to the ego, the more extreme narcissists react (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Thus, the degree to which the feedback is ego-threatening is an issue to be taken into consideration as well, especially in applied contexts where self-other ratings discrepancies may be used as information for development purposes. For example, research might investigate the possibility that narcissists get less out of development practices that utilize multisource feedback than they do with other development practices that may not be so ego involving (e.g., educational and other stretching experiences).

As noted earlier, because our focus in this paper was on the degree to which narcissism leads to enhanced self- and other-perceptions, we did not study inflation in ratings. To do so requires a rather complex analytical approach in which self- versus other ratings serve as a difference score, and one must determine whether the effect of the explanatory variable (in this case narcissism) is the same for those who overestimate (self- greater than other ratings) or underestimate (other greater than self-ratings) themselves. Our findings suggest that narcissism causes enhancement in the sense that it results in a higher score than would otherwise be the case (a roomful of people scoring high on narcissism would rate themselves more positively on leadership than a roomful of people scoring average on narcissism). But, we do not know whether those self-views are actually inflated, even with the comparison to others, because it is possible that others give narcissists less-favorable-than-deserved ratings because they dislike them. Without being able to measure a concept objectively (quite difficult in the case of leadership, deviance, or contextual performance), the question of whether narcissists have inflated (better than deserved) views of themselves, or whether others have deflated views of them (worse than deserved), cannot be answered. Where objective criteria are available, this would be an interesting and important issue to study.

Finally, another interesting area for future research is how narcissism affects interpersonal relationships at work. Although narcissism is, by nature, a self-focused trait, it is commonly argued to have profound interpersonal implications. Narcissists are argued to lack empathy, are repelled by intimacy, seek adulation, and derogate others when threatened (Stucke & Sporer, 2002). Moreover, some argue that narcissists use interpersonal relationships to bolster their self-esteem (Campbell, 1999). Indeed, Campbell (1999) found that narcissists were more attracted to admiring than

to caring romantic partners. Campbell and Foster (2002) found that narcissists were less committed to their romantic partners, partly based on the belief that they had other attractive alternatives. Given the ego-laden nature of work context to many, these findings would appear to have implications for the friendships narcissists seek out at work, their reactions to coworkers, and their commitment to their organizations and colleagues. Thus, it is important to understand the effect of narcissists on others, but it is equally important to understand how narcissists are affected by others, and how they alter their own work environments.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441–462.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1–26.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 111–118.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Wallace, H. M. (2002). Conquest by force: A narcissistic reactance theory of rape and sexual coercion. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 92–135.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349–360.
- Borman, W. W., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, 6, 1–21.
- Borman, W. W., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99–109.
- Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). 360° feedback: Accuracy, reactions, and perceptions of usefulness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 930–942.
- Brown, R. P., & Bosson, J. K. (2001). Narcissus meets Sisyphus: Self-love, self-loathing, and the never-ending pursuit of self-worth. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 210–213.
- Brown, R. P., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2004). Narcissism and the non-equivalence of self-esteem measures: A matter of dominance? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 585–592.
- Burris, C. T., & Navara, G. S. (2002). Morality play—or playing morality?: Intrinsic religious orientation and socially desirable responding. *Self and Identity*, 1, 67–76.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219–229.
- Bushman, B. J., Bonacci, A. M., van Dijk, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2003). Narcissism, sexual refusal, and aggression: Testing a narcissistic reactance model of sexual coercion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1027–1040.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 687–732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, W. K. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1254–1276.
- Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 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., Rudich, E. A., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 358–368.
- Carless, S. A. (2001). Assessing the discriminant validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 233–239.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R. The Revised NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 392–414.
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 49–65.
- Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1246–1256.
- Edwards, J. R. (1995). Alternatives to difference scores as dependent variables in the study of congruence in organizational research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 64, 307–324.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2001). Narcissism and motivation. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 216–219.
- Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 291–300.
- Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 11–17.
- Fields, D. L., & Herold, D. M. (1997). Using the Leadership Practices Inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 569–579.
- Freud, S. (1914). On narcissism: An introduction. In J. Sandler, E. S. Person, & P. Fonagy (Eds.), *Freud's "On narcissism: An introduction"* (pp. 3–32). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gabriel, M. T., Critelli, J. W., & Ee, J. S. (1994). Narcissistic illusions in self-evaluations of intelligence and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality*, 62, 143–155.
- Graziano, W. G., & Tobin, R. M. (2001). The distributed processing of narcissists: Paradox lost? *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 219–222.
- Greene, W. H. (1990). *Econometric analysis*. New York: Macmillan.
- Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43–62.
- Hatrup, K., O'Connell, M. S., & Wingate, P. H. (1998). Prediction of multidimensional criteria: Distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 305–319.
- Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (2002). Leadership and sociopolitical intelligence. In R. E. Riggio & S. E. Murphy (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 75–88). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869–879.
- 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 and Social Psychology*, 66, 206–219.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The "Big Five" Inventory—Versions 4a and 5a*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John

- (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765–780.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: Historical review, a meta-analysis and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 254–284.
- Kramer, R. M., Newton, E., & Pommerenke, P. L. (1993). Self-enhancement biases and negotiator judgment: Effects of self-esteem and mood. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 56*, 110–133.
- Lasch, C. L. (1979). *The culture of narcissism*. New York: Norton.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 131–142.
- Lee, S., & Klein, H. J. (2002). Relationships between conscientiousness, self-efficacy, self-deception, and learning over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1175–1182.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 52–65.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 853–868.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential effects of Big-Five personality characteristics and general cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 326–336.
- Lord, R. G., & Smith, W. G. (1999). Leadership and the changing nature of performance. In D. R. Ilgen & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), *The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development* (pp. 192–239). Santa Barbara, CA: New Lexington Press.
- Martocchio, J. J., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Relationship between conscientiousness and learning in employee training: Mediating influences of self-deception and self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 764–773.
- McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2000). Variance in faking across noncognitive measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 812–821.
- Meindl, J. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 78–102.
- Mischel, W. (1997). On the future of personality measurement. *American Psychologist, 32*, 246–254.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Explorations in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 668–676.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177–196.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475–480.
- Murphy, K. R. (1989). Dimensions of job performance. In R. Dillon & J. Pellingrino (Eds.), *Testing: Applied and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 218–247). New York: Praeger.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytical review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775–802.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality, 36*, 556–563.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 126–134.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 107–142.
- Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (1993). Psychometric properties of the Leadership Practices Inventory—Updated. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 191–199.
- Publius Ovidius Naso. *Metamorphoses* (Ed. Brookes More). <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Aabo%3Aphi%2C0959%2C006&query=toc>
- Race, T. Executives are smitten, and undone, by their own images. (2002, July 29). *New York Times* (<http://www.nytimes.com>).
- Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.
- Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The narcissistic personality inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*, 159–162.
- Raskin, R., Novaceck, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 911–918.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 890–902.
- Rhodewalt, F., Madrain, J. C., & Cheney, S. (1998). Narcissism, self-knowledge orientation, and emotional reactivity: The effect of daily experiences on self-esteem and affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 75–87.
- 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 and Social Psychology, 73*, 672–685.
- Roberts, B. W., & Robins, R. W. (2000). Broad dispositions, broad aspirations: The intersection of personality traits and major life goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 1284–1296.
- Robins, R. W., & Beer, J. S. (2001). Positive illusions about the self: Short-term benefits and long-term costs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 340–352.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555–572.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 66–80.
- 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*, 537–555.
- Sedikides, C., Rudich, E. A., Gregg, A. P., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy?: Self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 400–416.
- Soyer, R. B., Rovenpor, J. L., & Kopelman, R. E. (1999). Narcissism and achievement motivation as related to three facets of the sales role: Attraction, satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14*, 285–304.
- Stöber, J. (2001). The Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17): Convergent validity, discriminant validity, and relationship with age. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 17*, 222–232.
- Stöber, J., Dette, D. E., & Musch, J. (2002). Comparing continuous and

dichotomous scoring of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 78, 370–389.

Stucke, T. S., & Sporer, S. L. (2002). When a grandiose self-image is threatened: Narcissism and self-concept clarity as predictors of negative emotions and aggression following ego-threat. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 509–532.

Taylor, S. E., Lerner, J. S., Sherman, D. K., Sage, R. M., & McDowell, N. K. (2003). Portrait of the self-enhancer: Well adjusted and well liked or maladjusted and friendless? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 165–176.

Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525–531.

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

Watson, P. J., & Biderman, M. D. (1993). Narcissistic Personality Inventory factors, splitting, and self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 61, 41–57.

Watson, P. J., Sawrie, S. M., & Biderman, M. D. (1991). Personal control, assumptive worlds, and narcissism. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6, 929–941.

Weiss, H. M., & Adler, S. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6, 1–50.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behavior. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.

Received May 28, 2004  
 Revision received June 9, 2005  
 Accepted July 4, 2005 ■



**AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
 SUBSCRIPTION CLAIMS INFORMATION**

Today's Date: \_\_\_\_\_

We provide this form to assist members, institutions, and nonmember individuals with any subscription problems. With the appropriate information we can begin a resolution. If you use the services of an agent, please do **NOT** duplicate claims through them and directly to us. **PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND IN INK IF POSSIBLE.**

PRINT FULL NAME OR KEY NAME OF INSTITUTION	MEMBER OR CUSTOMER NUMBER (MAY BE FOUND ON ANY PAST ISSUE LABEL)	
ADDRESS	DATE YOUR ORDER WAS MAILED (OR PHONED)	
CITY STATE/COUNTRY ZIP	<input type="checkbox"/> PREPAID <input type="checkbox"/> CHECK <input type="checkbox"/> CHARGE CHECK/CARD CLEARED DATE: _____	
YOUR NAME AND PHONE NUMBER	(If possible, send a copy, front and back, of your cancelled check to help us in our research of your claim.) ISSUES: <input type="checkbox"/> MISSING <input type="checkbox"/> DAMAGED	
TITLE	VOLUME OR YEAR	NUMBER OR MONTH

*Thank you. Once a claim is received and resolved, delivery of replacement issues routinely takes 4–6 weeks.*

(TO BE FILLED OUT BY APA STAFF)

DATE RECEIVED: _____	DATE OF ACTION: _____
ACTION TAKEN: _____	INV. NO. & DATE: _____
STAFF NAME: _____	LABEL NO. & DATE: _____

Send this form to APA Subscription Claims, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE. A PHOTOCOPY MAY BE USED.**