NARCISSISM AND OTHER-DEROGATION IN THE ABSENCE OF EGO THREAT

A dissertation presented

by

Sun Woong Park

to

The Department of Psychology

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of

Psychology

Northeastern University

Boston, Massachusetts

June 3, 2013

NARCISSISM AND OTHER-DEROGATION IN THE ABSENCE OF EGO THREAT

by

Sun Woong Park

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology

In the College of Science of

Northeastern University

June 3, 2013

Abstract

The purpose of the present research was to investigate whether and to what extent narcissism is related to other-derogation in the absence of ego threat. Most research on narcissism and other-derogation has been conducted in the context of ego threat (e.g., Kernis & Sun, 1994). It was found that when encountering negative information that threatens one's ego, people high in narcissism derogate the source of threat to a greater extent than those low in narcissism. However, the question of whether narcissistic other-derogation operates even without apparent ego threat still remains unanswered.

Across four studies, the same analytic strategy was used. Judges completed a self-report measure of narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988) and rated targets' personality using the 100-item California Adult Q-Sort (CAQ; Block, 2008). The degree of other-derogation was assessed with a CAQ prototype of the optimally adjusted person. Specifically, the extent to which each judge's personality rating of a given target was dissimilar to the CAQ prototype of the optimally adjusted person was calculated and represented target-derogation, with high scores indicating high target-derogation. Finally, judges' narcissism scores were correlated with target-derogation scores.

In Study 1, part of a larger dataset (Vogt & Colvin, 2003), judges watched four videotaped dyadic interactions and rated the personality traits of each individual identified as the target person. All judges rated the same four targets. Judges' narcissism was positively

related to the degree of target-derogation. In other words, the more narcissistic judges were, the more negatively they evaluated targets.

In Study 2, each judge rated the personality of a friend who served as his or her target. Targets rated their own personality as well. Again, judges' narcissism was positively correlated with target-derogation. The positive relation remained statistically significant after controlling for targets' self-derogation.

In Study 3, judges were asked to imagine the average Northeastern University student and rate this hypothetical person's personality. Given the possibility that judges based the personality ratings of the average student on their own personality, they rated their own personality as well. In addition, judges completed a self-report measure of self-esteem. Judges' narcissism was positively related to the derogation of the average Northeastern University student, after controlling for self-derogation. When target-derogation was regressed on narcissism and self-esteem, narcissism was positively and self-esteem was negatively related to target-derogation.

In Study 4, judges rated the personality of either an individual they knew fairly well and liked, or an individual they knew fairly well and disliked. In the "dislike" condition, no meaningful pattern was observed. In the "like" condition, however, regression analyses revealed that narcissism was positively and self-esteem was negatively related to target-derogation although both were marginally significant.

In conclusion, people high in narcissism derogate another's personality more than those low in narcissism. However, this tendency was not observed among people high in self-esteem who also have a highly favorable self-view. Therefore, other-derogation appears to be a self-regulatory strategy unique to narcissism and unrelated to self-esteem.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: General Introduction to Narcissism

In the ancient Greek myth, *Metamorphoses*, Narcissus was a terribly attractive young man who was so proud of himself that he could love no one else but himself. His stunning appearance mesmerized numerous nymphs, one of which was Echo, who fell in love with Narcissus at first sight. After a long period of unrequited love, she met him and tried to throw her arms around his neck. But Narcissus said: "Hands off! I would rather die than you should have me!" Broken hearted, Echo hid herself in the recesses of the woods.

Forbidding physical contact is a very explicit and strong way of derogating others. In India, for instance, there is a group of people called *Dalit* whose social status is too low to be included in the Caste system. They are considered too repulsive to even touch, so they are commonly called *Untouchables*. Although there was nothing despicable about Echo, Narcissus still responded to Echo in a derogatory way by strongly refusing physical contact.

It is important to note that Echo only wanted to love (not despise) Narcissus because this is precisely where the myth of Narcissus and the psychological literature on narcissism diverge from each other. Most research on narcissistic other-derogation has occurred in the context of ego threat where self-esteem was threatened by negative feedback (e.g., Kernis & Sun, 1994). However, the question of whether narcissism is related to other-derogation even in the absence of ego threat has not been thoroughly examined. In this dissertation, I investigated whether and to what extent narcissism is related to the tendency to judge another person's personality in a derogatory way when there is no apparent threat to ego.

Definition of Narcissism

Narcissism as a research topic was first introduced by the British sexologist-physician Havelock Ellis (1898) to refer to an autoerotic sexual condition and has been studied by personality and psychopathology theorists such as Kenberg (1975), Kohut (1977), and Millon (1981). It was recognized as a mental disorder with the publication of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders III* (DSM; American Psychiatric Association, 1980). Although numerous articles have been published since then, there is a considerable amount of confusion and disagreement regarding the conceptualization of narcissism (for a review, see Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). Currently, narcissistic personality disorder is defined as a "pervasive pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy" (American Psychiatric Association, 1994, p. 714) that accompanies characteristics such as a sense of entitlement, interpersonal exploitation, and arrogance.

Narcissism became a popular topic in the fields of personality and social psychology after the publication of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988) that provided a self-report measure of narcissism derived from criteria presented in the *DSM-III*. The debate of whether narcissism as assessed by the NPI is comparable to ratings assessed by structured interviews by clinicians is still ongoing (Brown, Budzek, & Tamborski, 2009; Miller & Campbell, 2008, 2010; Miller, Gaughan, Kamen, & Campbell, 2009; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Trull & McCrae, 2002). In the studies reported in this dissertation, narcissism was quantitatively assessed by the NPI, so the findings reported below may or may not be applied to clinically assessed narcissism. Although narcissism was assessed quantitatively and continuously, people who score high on narcissism are referred to

as narcissists whereas those who score low on narcissism as nonnarcissists throughout the dissertation.

Narcissism as a Self-Regulatory Process

The signature characteristic of narcissism is the determination to build, buttress, defend, and enhance a grandiose self (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Morf, Torhetti, & Schurch, 2011). However, this determination encounters two potential challenges. First, narcissists want to prove their superiority to themselves as well as people around them, so their self-esteem is contingent on external evaluations (i.e., success or failure) and thus highly fluctuating (Kernis, 2003; Rhodewalt, Madrian, & Cheney, 1998). Second, narcissists' self-image is unrealistically positive, so constant management is required to keep their highly inflated self-view alive. Based on these observations of narcissism, Morf and Rhodewalt (2001) conceptualized narcissism as "a distinctive dynamic system of social, cognitive, and affective self-regulatory processes" (p. 178). In other words, narcissism is not a static quality that individuals carry with them; rather, it actively regulates social perceptions and interactions. This self-regulatory process includes narcissists' perceptions of themselves and others, as well as intrapersonal and interpersonal strategies narcissists utilize to maintain their haughty ego, as reviewed in Chapter 2.

There are two things worth mentioning regarding narcissism as a self-regulatory process. First, the effort to maintain a positive self-image is constant, so dubbed "the never-ending pursuit of self-worth" (Brown & Bosson, 2001) or "addiction to esteem" (Baumeister & Vohs, 2001). Put differently, narcissistic self-regulation is continuously ongoing regardless of whether things go right or wrong.

Second, narcissists' highly enhanced self-view revolves around agentic (i.e., competence as an independent individual) rather than communal (i.e., interpersonal connectedness) characteristics (for detailed descriptions of the agency model of narcissism, see Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006; Campbell & Foster, 2007). This tendency is observed whether the self-concept is assessed with explicit or implicit measures (Campbell, Bosson, Goheen, Lakey, & Kernis, 2007; Campbell et al., 2002). Similarly, the relation between narcissism and agency can be "heard" in daily language. When asked to write about a nostalgic event, narcissists made more agentic references in their essays than nonnarcissists (Hart, Sedikides, Wildschut, Arndt, Routledge, & Vingerhoets, 2011).

These two characteristics of narcissistic self-regulation, taken together, provide a solid basis for the suspicion that narcissism would be positively related to other-derogation even in the absence of ego threat. Narcissists' pursuit of self-worth is constant. They endlessly engage in intrapersonal and interpersonal strategies to enhance their self-image and feel good about themselves. At the same time, narcissists are concerned only about agentic, not communal, values. Interpersonal relationships are not an end but a means to boost narcissists' high self-view (Campbell, 1999). Therefore, narcissists are more likely than nonnarcissists to devalue others, whether strangers or friends, in order to feel good about themselves. Narcissists' other-derogating tendency may be stronger when they encounter negative information that threatens their self-esteem, but it should be present in everyday life even when there is no apparent ego threat.

Chapter 2: Review of Empirical Studies

Narcissism and Highly (and Overly) Favorable Self-View

Research on narcissism has consistently demonstrated the positive relation between narcissism and highly favorable self-perceptions. Narcissism is related to favorable self-ratings of intelligence and physical attractiveness (Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002; Gabriel, Critelli, & Ee, 1994), as well as extraversion, likeability, sense of humor, and adjustment (Carlson, Vazire, & Oltmanns, 2011). Narcissism is positively related to subjective well-being, and negatively related to loneliness, anxiety, sadness, and depression (Rose, 2002; Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro, & Rusbult, 2004; Watson & Biderman, 1993; Wink, 1992). Compared to nonnarcissists, narcissists report being more unique and special (Emmons, 1984).

Narcissistic self-perception is not only highly positive but also *overly* positive. Narcissism is related to the tendency to rate one's intelligence and physical attractiveness higher than relatively objective criteria (i.e., intelligence test and consensus among people, respectively; Gabriel et al., 1994). Also, narcissists exaggerate their achievements and performance more than nonnarcissists. Following participation in a leaderless group discussion, narcissism was related to the tendency to overestimate one's own performance relative to ratings by other group members (Gosling, John, Craik, & Robins, 1998; John & Robins, 1994; Robins & Beer, 2001). Narcissism has been related to the tendency to overestimate final course grades (Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998). Furthermore, compared to nonnarcissists, narcissists rate their personality more positively than their close friends do. Narcissism was

related to overly positive self-ratings on likeability, well-being, intelligence, honesty, sense of

humor, and attractiveness relative to friends' ratings (Carlson, Naumann, & Vazire, 2011;

Carlson, Vazire et al., 2011).

Narcissism under Ego Threat

Given the highly enhanced self-view, it is difficult to imagine that individuals with

narcissistic characteristics would readily incorporate negative information about themselves

into their favorable self-concept. Indeed, research has found that they respond to ego threat

(e.g., negative evaluation of their performance or personality) in a self-defensive way.

Narcissists show self-serving attributions more strongly than nonnarcissists. Narcissists and

nonnarcissists did not differ in the extent to which they denigrated the importance of the test

they had just failed; however, narcissists blamed their collaborator for failure and usurped

credit for success to a greater extent than nonnarcissists (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, &

Elliot, 2000).

When negative feedback was provided on their performance, narcissists showed more

behavioral aggression (i.e., more white noise blast) toward the evaluator than nonnarcissists

because they perceived the negative feedback as a serious threat to their haughty ego

(Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). In a similar study, high scorers on narcissism who had

relatively fragile self-concepts expressed more anger and verbal aggression after negative

feedback than low scorers on narcissism who had relatively secure self-concepts (Stucke &

Sporer, 2002). This tendency got stronger when success was followed by failure (Rhodewalt &

Morf, 1998). Narcissists made more internal attributions for success at a task than

nonnarcissists. However, when initial success was followed by failure at a similar, subsequent

task, they reported exceptional anger, presumably because their previous internal attributions implied that failure was also due to them.

The positive relation of narcissism to anger and aggression has been observed when one's ego was threatened by social rejection as well (Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Compared to nonnarcissists, narcissists expressed higher levels of anger when they recalled an event in which they were rejected by their peers (Study 1) and when they were rejected by other participants in a laboratory (Study 2). Narcissists were behaviorally more aggressive than nonnarcissists toward a peer who had rejected them socially (Study 3) and even toward a new, innocent peer who had not rejected them (Study 4).

Therefore, it is clear that narcissism manifests itself in a strongly negative way when responding to ego threat whether it comes in the form of poor evaluation of performance or social rejection. In addition, its manifestation is expressed in various ways, including expression of negative emotions and actual aggressive behavior.

Narcissism and Other-Derogation

Derogating another person is one form of aggression toward others (Stucke & Sporer, 2002). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to suspect that narcissists under ego threat would derogate the source of the threat to a greater extent than nonnarcissists would. This suspicion has been confirmed by empirical studies. Narcissists derogated the personality of a peer who had just outperformed them on a task to a greater degree than nonnarcissists (Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; South, Oltmanns, & Turkheimer, 2003). Also, when negative feedback on performance was provided, narcissism was negatively related to ratings of the evaluator's competence (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Smalley & Stake, 1996).

Despite the link between narcissism and other-derogation under ego threat, few studies have directly investigated whether narcissistic other-derogation occurs in the absence of ego threat. In one study (South et al., 2003), participants viewed 20 photos in which a woman posed with either ambiguous facial expressions or body positions and guessed what she was doing. After completing the test, participants rated the personality of the woman on 12 positive and 12 negative items. The authors subtracted scores on positive items from scores on negative items, producing a single measure of other-derogation. This measure was not related to narcissism, so the authors concluded that narcissistic other-derogation is not present without ego threat. However, the nonsignificant relation between narcissism and other-derogation may have been due to the nature of the target. Specifically, after watching a woman expressing ambiguous behavior in the still photos, participants may have thought that there was not enough information about the target on which to base their judgment. In the present research, I investigated the relation between narcissism and other-derogation in realistic contexts in which participants possessed more information about targets (e.g., rating the personality of an acquaintance).

There are several studies that support narcissistic other-derogation under no apparent ego threat. In correlational studies using self-reports, narcissism was positively related to hostility (a disposition to get angry and aggressive toward others; Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995), psychological entitlement (a belief that one inherently deserves better than others; Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004), and grandiosity (a fantasy of being exceptionally superior to others and unique; Raskin et al., 1991). Although participants in these studies were not under ego threat, people high in narcissism displayed characteristics related to other-derogation to a greater degree than those

low in narcissism. Furthermore, when asked to report on social comparison experiences in

everyday life, narcissism was related to the tendency to evaluate oneself more positively than

the comparison targets (Krizan & Bushman, 2011). Thus, it seems reasonable to suspect that

narcissism would be related to other-derogation in the absence of ego threat.

Two Portraits of Self-Love: Narcissism and Self-Esteem

People have an innate desire to evaluate themselves, and social comparison (i.e.,

comparing oneself with other individuals) is one way to satisfy the desire, especially when

there is no objective criterion available (Festinger, 1954). Given that there are no objective

criteria for assessing personality characteristics, personality evaluation is a social process. In

other words, individuals get to know how agreeable, for example, they are by observing how

others behave and by comparing their own behavior with others. Thus, derogating another's

personality can be a very efficient way to positively evaluate one's own personality. Some

may even argue that thinking highly of oneself necessitates thinking lowly of others. This idea

can be tested by investigating whether individuals high in narcissism and individuals high in

self-esteem differ in terms of how they think about and behave toward others.

Both narcissism and self-esteem are related to a highly positive self-view, and thus the

two constructs have been found to correlate with each other. The average correlation

coefficient between the two is about .30 (Bosson, Lakey, Campbell, Zeigler-Hill, Jordan, &

Kernis, 2008; Rosenthal, Montoya, Ridings, Rieck, & Hooley, 2011). However, there are a

few critical differences between the two. First, as mentioned earlier, narcissists value only

agentic characteristics, whereas individuals with high self-esteem value both agentic and

communal characteristics (Campbell et al., 2002). Second, narcissists' self-view is highly

contingent on external evaluations (i.e., success or failure) and thus fluctuates to a great extent

(Rhodewalt et al., 1998; Kernis, 2003). Third, self-esteem is a cognitive and affective evaluation of one's own worthiness. In contrast, narcissism may at best be more of a motivation than an evaluation (Baumeister & Vohs, 2001). The combination of these differences yields the following two predictions: (1) narcissists are willing to sacrifice their interpersonal relationships in effort to maintain their highly positive self-views in the domain of agency, especially when they encounter negative information threatening their self-worth; and (2) although people with high self-esteem also maintain their positive self-views, maintenance does not include sabotaging interpersonal relationships because they value communion. Previous research has supported these predictions.

Campbell and colleagues (2002) examined the difference between narcissism and self-esteem in the context of the better-than-average effect, a tendency to rate one's own positive traits as better than the average person (Alicke & Govorun, 2005). Although both narcissism and self-esteem were related to the better-than-average effect on agentic traits, only self-esteem was related to the effect on communal traits. When participants were asked to compare themselves with their romantic partner, it was found that narcissism, but not self-esteem, was positively related to the extent to which participants rated positive traits higher relative to their partner. In other words, compared to nonnarcissists, narcissists were more willing to utilize their partner's personality as a means to enhance their self-image; however, this tendency was not observed in those with high self-esteem. It should be noted that participants in Campbell et al. (2002) were not under any kind of threat to ego during the tasks.

Research on aggression and other-derogation also confirmed the difference between narcissism and self-esteem. Among the studies reviewed above, five of them included self-esteem in addition to narcissism to predict aggression or other-derogation (Bushman &

Baumeister, 1998; Kernis & Sun, 1994; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Smalley & Stake, 1996; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). With the exception of one study (Kernis & Sun, 1994), self-esteem was not significantly related to the tendency to behave aggressively toward or derogate the source of ego threat.

These results indicate that although both narcissism and self-esteem embrace a highly positive self-view, only narcissism is related to the utilization of interpersonal relationships as a means to maintain a favorable self-image. Put differently, thinking highly of oneself does not have to necessitate thinking lowly of others, and other-derogation is a strategy relevant only to narcissism. In the present study, both narcissism and self-esteem were included to examine this idea (Studies 3 and 4).

Four Issues with Assessing Narcissism using the NPI

Most research on narcissism in the areas of personality and social psychology has quantitatively measured narcissism using the NPI. Cain et al. (2008) reported that approximately 77% of personality and social research on narcissism used the NPI as the main or only measure of narcissism since 1985. However, several criticisms of the validity of the NPI have been documented in recent articles (Brown et al., 2009; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Trull & McCrae, 2002). Because narcissism in the present study was assessed solely by the NPI, it is important to acknowledge those criticisms.

Clinical and subclinical narcissism. Although the developers of the NPI used the *DSM-III* behavioral criteria for the narcissistic personality as a conceptual template (Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988), the scores on the NPI have been considered to represent "normal" or "subclinical" narcissism. However, it seems that this labeling has more to do with the fact that the NPI is generally administered to normal populations than the possibility that

the NPI only assesses normal or subclinical narcissism. Using both clinical and student

samples, Miller and colleagues (2009) examined whether self-reported NPI scores and ratings

of narcissistic personality disorder derived from a semi-structured interview converged. The

correlation coefficient between the two scores was .54 for the clinical sample and .59 for the

student sample, which attests to reasonably strong convergent validity, especially considering

that the scores were derived from two different assessment methods (i.e., self-report and

interview). This finding does not support the claim that the NPI does not measure, and thus is

not descriptive of, clinical narcissism or narcissistic personality disorder (Pincus &

Lukowitsky, 2010; Trull & McCrae, 2002). Based on the results, Miller and Campbell (2011)

encourage the field to "refrain from referring to these NPI scores as normal or nonpathological

narcissism, as there is nothing inherently normal or nonpathological about high scores on this

scale" (p. 150). Although the debate over whether narcissism assessed by the NPI is

comparable to ratings assessed using structured interviews by clinicians is still underway

(Miller & Campbell, 2008, 2010; Miller et al., 2009; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Trull &

McCrae, 2002), it is my position that the findings from the present study can potentially be

applied to clinical narcissism.

Total and subscale scores of the NPI. Since narcissism is multidimensional

(American Psychiatric Association, 1980, 1994), researchers on narcissism have shown great

interest in factors underlying narcissism, but without general consensus. Different researchers

have suggested different factor structures: seven factors (Raskin & Terry, 1988); four factors

(Emmons, 1984, 1987); three factors (Ackerman, Witt, Donnellan, Trzesniewski, Robins, &

Kashy, 2011; Kubarych, Deary, & Austin, 2004); or two factors (Corry, Merritt, Mrug, &

Pamp, 2008).

However, in most studies on anger, aggression, or other-derogation, only the total narcissism score was analyzed (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Campbell et al., 2002; Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Smalley & Stake, 1996; Stucke & Sporer, 2002; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Although it is difficult to hypothesize how factors of narcissism would be related to other-derogation due to the lack of previous research, analyzing data using both total narcissism and its factors can potentially be conducive to the understanding of the construct of narcissism. Therefore, data analyses in the present study were conducted using the total and subscale scores (Studies 1, 3, and 4).

Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. For the past few decades, researchers have paid attention to the possibility that the construct of narcissism is heterogeneous and has, at least, two different forms (Miller, Hoffman, Gaughan, Gentile, Maples, & Campbell, 2011; Pincus, Ansell, Pimentel, Cain, Wright, & Levy, 2009). Although both forms of narcissism share superiority to others or special status in common, grandiose narcissism manifests itself via inflated self-view, dominance, aggression, and exhibition, whereas vulnerable narcissism involves helplessness, emptiness, low self-esteem, and shame (for a review, see Cain et al., 2008). Most experts agree that symptoms of narcissistic personality disorder listed in the *DSM* (American Psychiatric Association, 1980, 1994) are more relevant to grandiose narcissism than vulnerable narcissism and, accordingly, the NPI which was developed based on the *DSM* criteria generally measures grandiose narcissism (Cain et al., 2008). Because the analyses conducted in the present research were solely based on the NPI, the results may not apply to vulnerable narcissism.

Overlap between narcissism and self-esteem. As mentioned earlier, narcissism as assessed by the NPI is consistently related to self-esteem (Bosson et al., 2008; Rosenthal et al.,

2011). Researchers differ in how to interpret this finding (for a comprehensive review, see Bosson et al., 2008). On the one hand, some researchers argue that the original NPI is flawed in that a number of items are confounded with self-esteem and that only items that are unrelated to self-esteem should be used to assess narcissism (Rosenthal & Hooley, 2010; Rosenthal et al., 2011). On the other hand, others argue that it is hard to imagine that individuals high in grandiose narcissism as assessed by the NPI do not report high self-esteem (regardless of whether their self-esteem is warranted or not) and that self-esteem should be a part of grandiose narcissism (Miller, Maples, & Campbell, 2011).

One way to deal with this issue of the overlap between narcissism and self-esteem is statistically controlling for self-esteem. This method has been used in several studies. After controlling for self-esteem, narcissism was no longer related to indicators of psychological well-being (Brown et al., 2009; Rose, 2002; Sedikides et al., 2004). However, self-esteem did not account for the relation between narcissism and negative social behaviors such as reduced romantic commitment (Campbell & Foster, 2002), pathological gambling (Lakey, Rose, Campbell, & Goodie, 2008), or greedy exploitation of natural resources reserved for a community (Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005).

Furthermore, there is evidence that narcissism and self-esteem function as mutual suppressors in predicting antisocial behavior. Specifically, entering self-esteem into a regression equation increases the positive relation between narcissism and antisocial behavior, whereas entering narcissism increases the negative relation between self-esteem and antisocial behavior (Donnellan, Trzesniewski, Robins, Moffitt, & Caspi, 2005; Locke, 2009; Paulhus, Robins, Trzesniewski, & Tracy, 2004). Thus, in the present study, the relation between narcissism and other-derogation was examined using both zero-order correlations and

regressions with self-esteem partialled out to examine the overlap between narcissism and self-esteem (Studies 3 and 4).

Overview

The present dissertation research examined whether and to what extent narcissism is related to the derogation of another's personality in the absence of ego threat. In each of the four studies, judges' narcissism scores were correlated with how negatively they rated targets' personality. In Study 1, judges watched four videotaped targets interacting with another person and rated each target's personality. All judges watched the same four targets. In Study 2, each judge rated the personality of his or her own target who was the judge's friend. In Study 3, judges were asked to imagine the average Northeastern University student and rate this hypothetical person's personality. In Study 4, judges rated the personality of either an individual they knew quite well and liked, or an individual they knew quite well and disliked. Across the four studies, the same California Adult Q-Sort (CAQ; Block, 2008) was used to describe targets' personality. The CAQ consists of 100 statements that describe a full range of personality including cognitive, emotional, and social attributes. Sample CAQ items are "Behaves in a sympathetic and considerate manner," "Is productive, gets things done," "Is irritable; over-reacts to minor frustrations," and "Feels satisfied with self." Overall, I hypothesized that narcissism would be positively related to target-derogation.

Chapter 3: Study 1

In Study 1, the relation between narcissism and other-derogation was investigated with strangers serving as targets. Judges (i.e., participants) watched four videotaped dyadic interactions of targets interacting with another person. After watching each target, judges rated the target's personality on the 100-item CAQ (Block, 2008). They also completed a self-report measure of narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The "optimally adjusted person" prototype using the CAQ was used to assess how positively the judges rated the personality of the targets (Block, 2008).

The data presented in Study 1 were a subset of data collected as part of a larger research project on personality and interpersonal perception. Subsets of the data have been published elsewhere (Carney, Colvin, & Hall, 2007; Colvin & Longueuil, 2001; Vogt & Colvin, 2003, 2005). Although I did not collect the data, I analyzed them to examine my own hypothesis. Only the procedures and measures that pertain to Study 1 are described.

Method

Targets and Judges

There were four videotaped targets selected from a previous study unrelated to the current study (two males and two females; for detailed information about the targets, see Vogt & Colvin, 2003). Each video was 12 min long and consisted of the target interacting with another person in three different contexts: (1) a getting-acquainted interaction with an

opposite-sex stranger; (2) a cooperative task with the same stranger; and (3) a casual interaction with a same-sex close friend.

Judges were recruited by posting notices around campus at Northeastern University. Across two waves of data collection that spanned approximately 6 months, 93 participants (51 women) completed the project. However, 79 judges (45 women) whose data were complete were included in the present analyses. The mean age was 20.41 years ($SD = 3.19$). Approximately, 72% of judges identified themselves as European American, 11% as African American, 9% as Asian American, 4% as Latino American, and 4% as other. Participants were paid for their time and could earn up to $100 for completing all five research sessions.

Procedure

Judges came to the laboratory on five occasions, each time for a 2-hour research session. They completed a battery of personality measures including a measure of narcissism. After watching the video of each target, they rated target's personality using the CAQ.

Measures

Judges' narcissism. Judges completed the 40-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). They responded on a 4-point scale to indicate how accurately each statement described them. Although the original NPI required participants to select one of two opposing statements that best described them, the Likert response format has been used in previous studies (Jordan, Spencer, Zanna, Hoshino-Browne, & Correll, 2003; McGregor, Nail, Marigold, & Kang, 2005). The NPI includes items such as "I really like to be the center of attention," and "I am an extraordinary person." Responses across the 40 items were averaged. Cronbach's alpha for the present sample was .89. In addition, four subscales were created following Emmons (1984, 1987): Leadership/Authority ($\alpha = .85$); Self-absorption/Self-

admiration (α = .69); Superiority/Arrogance (α = .62); and Exploitativeness/Entitlement (α = .56).

Judges' ratings of targets' personality. After watching a 12 min long interaction of each target, judges described target's personality using the CAQ (Block, 2008). Each CAQ item was printed on a separate card. The task required the judges to place the items into a forced, approximately normal, nine-category distribution that ranged from 1 (*not at all characteristic*) to 9 (*highly characteristic*). Each CAQ profile has a mean of 5.00 and a standard deviation of 2.09. The reliability and validity of the CAQ has been well-established (Block, 2008; Ozer, 1993).

CAQ prototype of optimally adjusted person. We used the "optimally adjusted person prototype" developed by Block (2008) to summarize personality ratings. To create the prototype, Block (2008) asked nine clinical psychologists or psychiatrists to sort the CAQ to describe the characteristics of a hypothetical optimally adjusted, high functioning person. The clinicians' ratings were aggregated, resulting in the optimally adjusted individual prototype (Block, 2008, p. 131). The Spearman-Brown reliability for this aggregated prototype was .97. The scores, ranging from 1 to 9, were used to indicate how positive, favorable, or desirable each CAQ item is. Two exemplar CAQ items rated as highly positive (score of 9) are "has warmth; has the capacity for close relationships" and "is dependable and responsible." Two exemplar items rated as highly negative (score of 1) are "feels cheated and victimized by life" and "has a brittle ego defense system." Two exemplar items rated as neither positive nor negative (score of 5) are "is a talkative person" and "has a rapid personal tempo."

Target-derogation. The extent to which a judge derogated a target's personality was calculated using the following method. The target's personality profile described by the judge

using the CAQ was correlated with the optimally adjusted person prototype, one judge's

ratings at a time. The resulting correlation coefficient indicates how positively the judge rated

the target, with high scores implying positive evaluations of the target (i.e., high adjustment).

Next, this correlation coefficient was multiplied by -1 because the focus of the present study

was on how *negatively* the judge rated the target's personality (i.e., target-derogation). The

resulting value indicates the extent to which the judge derogated the target, with higher scores

implying more derogation. [1] Target-derogation scores were calculated for each target; in

addition, composite scores were created by averaging target-derogation scores for the four

targets (α = .54).

Results

Judges' Narcissism

Narcissism did not differ between men ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.43$) and women ($M = 2.61$,

$SD = 0.32$), $t(77) = 1.57$, $p = .12$. Also, there were no significant interactions between judges'

narcissism and sex on target-derogation for the four targets, $|t|$s < 1.84, *ns*. Therefore, judges'

sex was not further analyzed.

Judges' Narcissism and Target-Derogation[2]

As shown in Table 1, judges' narcissism was positively related to the derogation of

each target, rs $\geq$ .22, ps $\leq$ .06. Composite target-derogation scores were also related to

narcissism. These findings indicate that narcissists rated targets' personality more negatively

than nonnarcissists in the absence of ego threat. When it comes to the subscales of narcissism,

a consistent pattern emerged only for the subscale of Superiority/Arrogance, such that judges

who scored higher on this subscale derogated targets' personality more than those who scores

lower. When target-derogation was regressed on the four subscales, no meaningful pattern of

results was found (see Table 3), implying that total narcissism is a better predictor of target-derogation than the subscales.

Judges' Target-Derogation

Some readers may wonder if judges rated targets' personality simply by relying on their stereotypical impression of college students rather than carefully rating each target, especially given that targets were strangers (Cronbach, 1955). However, the mean target-derogation scores of the four targets rated by judges ranged from -.50 to .29 (see Table 2). Six dependent t-tests examining differences in average target-derogation among the four targets were all significant, $|t|$s > 2.51, ps < .01. Furthermore, correlations between the four target-derogation scores were not consistent. These findings, taken together, indicate that judges did not blindly rate targets' personality and indeed differentiated their ratings of targets.

Discussion

Study 1 provides initial evidence that narcissism is positively related to other-derogation even in the absence of ego threat. However, the utilization of the same four targets may hinder the generalization of the link between narcissism and other-derogation because it is possible that the four targets provided in Study 1 may have displayed specific characteristics in common that triggered other-derogation among people high in narcissism. For example, the four targets may have exhibited submissive behavior that triggered condescension among narcissistic judges; alternatively, they may have emitted social power, which threatened judges high in narcissism. To examine this possibility, judges in Study 2 rated their own target.

Chapter 4: Study 2

The purpose of Study 2 was to replicate the findings from Study 1 but by having judges rate their own friend rather than a common set of targets. Because each judge had a unique target, the replication would fail to support the possibility that shared characteristics of targets triggered other-derogation among individuals high in narcissism, thus potentially excluding the alternative explanation to the findings in Study 1. However, it is still possible that highly narcissistic individuals make friends with those who have a poor self-concept. To test this possibility, targets' ratings of their own personality were also collected.

In Study 2, targets rated their own personality using the CAQ and recommended two friends who knew them well. The two friends, who served as judges, rated targets' personality and completed a measure of narcissism. The data presented in Study 2 were a subset of data collected as part of a larger research project on personality and self-perception. Only the procedures and measures that pertain to Study 2 are described.

Method

Targets, Judges, and Procedure

Targets were undergraduate students at Northeastern University who participated in a research project in exchange for course credit. As part of participation, they completed a battery of self-report measures using an online survey program (www.qualtrics.com), engaged in several tasks, and recommended two friends who had known them for at least one year. Friends (i.e., judges) were contacted by email and asked to complete an online survey. If they

had not completed the surveys within one week, they were contacted one more time. Friends
were not compensated for their participation.

Because Study 2 examined how judges' narcissism was related to how negatively they
perceived another's personality, I selected one judge (i.e., friend) for each target instead of
aggregating the responses. The selection was conducted using the following method. First,
judges whose data were complete were selected. Second, when the data from both judges were
complete, a coin was flipped for random selection. As a result, 66 pairs of targets and judges
remained in the analyses. Targets were 66 college students (73% women), and their mean age
was 18.83 years ($SD = 1.16$). Approximately, 50% of targets identified themselves as
European American, 29% as Asian American, 6% as Latino American, 3% as African
American, and 12% as other. Approximately, 59% of judges were women. Judges' age and
ethnicity were not collected.

Measures

Targets' ratings of their own personality. Targets rated their own personality using
the CAQ. Instead of the traditional Q-Sort procedure that requires Q-sorters to sort the 100
CAQ items to the forced, approximately normal nine-category distribution, the ratings were on
a Likert scale from 1 (*not at all descriptive*) to 6 (*very descriptive*).

Judges' ratings of targets' personality. Judges rated targets' personality on the CAQ
on a 6-point scale.

Judge-rated relationship quality. Judges answered the following four questions about
their relationship with the target: "Compared to other friends of yours, how close are you to
this friend?"; "Compared to other friends of yours, how much do you like this friend?";
"Compared to other friends of yours, how well do you know this friend?"; and "For how many

years have you known your friend?" The first three questions were answered using a 6-point

scale.

Judges' narcissism. Judges completed the 18-item NPI (Rosenthal & Hooley, 2010;

Rosenthal et al., 2011; Raskin & Terry, 1988; α = .90) using a 6-point scale. Because an

abbreviated version of the NPI was used, the subscales were not created.

Judges' target-derogation and targets' self-derogation. Two scores were created to

indicate judges' derogation of targets' personality and targets' derogation of their own

personality in the same way as Study 1.

Results

Judges' Narcissism

Judges' narcissism was higher for men ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.70$) than for women ($M =$

2.89, $SD = 0.91$), $t(64) = 2.36$, $p = .02$. However, the narcissism $\times$ sex interaction on target-

derogation was not significant, $t = 0.76$, $p = .45$. Therefore, judges' sex was not further

analyzed.

Judges' Narcissism and Target-Derogation

As shown in Table 4, the more narcissistic judges were, the more they derogated

targets ($r = .26$), replicating Study 1. This finding was not due to the possibility that judges

relatively high in narcissism made friends with those who had poor self-concepts, which

would have resulted in a significant positive correlation between judges' narcissism and

targets' self-derogation; instead, the correlation was not significant ($r = .03$).

There was a marginally significant correlation between how negatively judges rated

targets' personality and how negatively targets rated their own personality, $r = .24$, $p = .06$. Put

differently, judges tended to form negative impressions of targets whose self-evaluations were

also negative. This finding suggests that judges and targets had similar perceptions of targets'

adjustment. To examine whether target-derogation is a negatively biased perception by

narcissistic judges, independent of a shared perception between judges and targets, a multiple

regression was conducted with judges' narcissism and targets' self-derogation as the predictors

and judges' target-derogation as the criterion. Both judges' narcissism (β = .25, p = .04) and

targets' self-derogation (β = .23, p = .06) uniquely predicted target-derogation although the

latter was marginally significant. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that target-derogation

is a bias operating in narcissistic judges' mind.

Relationship Quality and Target-Derogation

Table 4 displays correlations between variables related to relationship quality. The

extent to which judges felt close to targets was positively related to how much they liked, how

well they knew, and how long they had known targets. The extent to which judges liked

targets was irrelevant to how long they had known the targets. Among the four variables of

relationship quality, only "Liking" was negatively related to target-derogation. In other words,

the more judges liked targets, the less they derogated the targets.

Discussion

Study 2 demonstrated the positive link between judges' narcissism and target-

derogation when judges rated the personality of a close friend. In the discussion section of

Study 1, the possibility was raised that the four targets provided in Study 1 shared specific

characteristics in common that may have triggered target-derogation among people high in

narcissism more than people low in narcissism. However, it is extremely unlikely that all the

targets in Study 2 shared the same characteristics leading to target-derogation. Furthermore,

the positive link between judges' narcissism and target-derogation remained significant after

controlling for targets' self-derogation, which suggests that the relation between narcissism and target-derogation is independent of targets' self-perceptions of personality.

Narcissism was positively related to target-derogation regardless of whether targets were strangers (Study 1) or close friends (Study 2). This finding leads to the possibility that narcissists are more likely than nonnarcissists to have formed a derogatory impression of people in general. To test this possibility, judges in Study 3 rated the personality of the "average" Northeastern University student. According to findings from cognitive psychology (Murphy, 2002), people have different opinions about what is "typical" of a given object although there is a substantial overlap among them. Thus, individuals may have different portraits of the average Northeastern University student. More importantly, narcissists may have a more negative portrait than nonnarcissists.

Chapter 5: Study 3

Study 3 had two goals. The first goal was to examine the link between narcissism and other-derogation when a target is a hypothetical, average person. Studies 1 and 2 have found that narcissists formed more negative impressions of targets whether they were strangers or close friends than nonnarcissists did. This finding raises the possibility that narcissistic other-derogation may operate when rating the personality of *people in general* (i.e., the average Northeastern University student) as well as specific individuals as in Studies 1 and 2. The second goal was to examine whether other-derogation is necessary for maintaining a highly favorable self-view. Thinking highly of oneself may necessitate, either explicitly or implicitly, a poor opinion of others. In order to investigate this possibility, self-esteem was included in Study 3. If narcissism, but not self-esteem, is related to other-derogation, it would be reasonable to conclude that other-derogation is a specific strategy that narcissists use to maintain their positive self-view.

Judges in Study 3 were asked to imagine the average Northeastern University student and rate this hypothetical person's personality. One concern for this design is a phenomenon that Cronbach (1955) called "assumed similarity." When asked to judge another's personality, people may draw from their own personality because they assume their personality may be similar to others' personality. This tendency may increase when evaluating the average person of a group to which judges belong. Put simply, when asked to evaluate the personality of the average Northeastern University student, judges who are also students of Northeastern

University may exhibit similar personality ratings between the average student and themselves because they are part of the Northeastern University student group. To examine this possibility, judges in Study 3 were asked to rate their own personality as well.

Method

Judges and Procedure

Judges were 72 undergraduate students at Northeastern University (47.2% women) who participated in the study in exchange for partial course credit. The mean age was 18.97 ($SD = 1.25$). Approximately, 53% of judges identified themselves as European American, 26% as Asian American, 4% as Latino American, 6% as African American, and 11% as other. They were invited to the lab to complete a battery of questionnaires using an online survey program (www.qualtrics.com).

Measures

Judges' ratings of the personality of the average Northeastern University student. Judges were asked to imagine the average Northeastern University student and rate this hypothetical person's personality using the CAQ. Instead of the Q-sort procedure, they used a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all descriptive*) to 7 (*very descriptive*).

Judges' ratings of their own personality. Judges rated their own personality on the CAQ using a 7-point scale.

Judges' narcissism. Judges completed the 40-item, forced-choice version of the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988; $\alpha = .79$). Each question contains a pair of statements, one of which reflects narcissism (e.g., "I am an extraordinary person" vs. "I am much like everybody else"). The total score on the NPI can range from 0 to 40, with 40 representing the highest level of trait narcissism. In addition to total narcissism, subscales were calculated (Emmons, 1984,

1987) including Leadership/Authority (α = .80); Self-absorption/Self-admiration (α = .60); Superiority/Arrogance (α = .52); and Exploitativeness/Entitlement (α = .26).

Judges' self-esteem. Judges completed the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965; α = .86). This measure included items such as "I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others." Responses were made on a 7-point scale.

Judges' target-derogation and judges' self-derogation. Two scores were created to indicate judges' derogation of the average student's personality and judges' derogation of their own personality in the same way as Study 1.

Results

Judges' Narcissism

Narcissism did not differ between men (*M* = 15.55, *SD* = 5.74) and women (*M* = 14.97, *SD* = 5.74), *t*(70) = 0.40, *p* = .69. Also, there was no significant interaction between judges' narcissism and sex on the derogation of the average student's personality, *t* = 0.22, *p* = .83. Therefore, judges' sex was not further analyzed.

Narcissism, Self-Esteem, Target-Derogation, and Self-Derogation

Table 5 displays correlations between narcissism, self-esteem, target-derogation, and self-derogation. Narcissism was positively related to self-esteem (*r* = .34), consistent with previous findings (Bosson et al., 2008; Rosenthal et al., 2011). Both narcissism and self-esteem were negatively related to self-derogation. In other words, the self-view of individuals high in narcissism and self-esteem was more positive than for those low in narcissism and self-esteem.

Although there was a positive relation between narcissism and target-derogation (*r* = .14), it was not significant. As suspected, however, there was a significant positive

correlation between judges' target- and self-derogation ($r = .25$), suggesting that judges' personality ratings of the average Northeastern University student and themselves were similar (assumed similarity; Cronbach, 1955). To statistically control for assumed similarity, judges' target-derogation was regressed on both judges' self-derogation and judges' narcissism. As shown in Table 6 (Model 3), target-derogation was positively related to narcissism ($\beta = .24$), after controlling for self-derogation. That is, after controlling for how negatively judges rated their own personality, judges' narcissism significantly predicted the derogation of the average student. This finding supports the link between narcissism and other-derogation.

Next, we examined how narcissism and self-esteem uniquely predicted target-derogation by regressing target-derogation on narcissism and self-esteem (see Table 6, Model 5). The results revealed that narcissism was positively related ($\beta = .24$) and self-esteem was negatively related ($\beta = -.29$) to target-derogation. Put differently, entering self-esteem into a regression equation increased the positive relation between narcissism and target-derogation, which is consistent with Paulhus et al. (2004). When targets' self-derogation was included in the regression model (Model 6), only the relation between narcissism and target-derogation remained significant.

In addition, regression analyses were conducted using the subscales. As shown in Table 7, none of the subscales uniquely predicted target-derogation, indicating that total narcissism is a better predictor of target-derogation than the subscales.

Discussion

The zero-order correlation between narcissism and derogation of the average student was not significant. As expected, however, judges showed a tendency to use their own personality as a reference when they rated the average person of a group to which they

belonged (i.e., the average Northeastern University student), such that those with a favorable self-view described the average person in a positive way, and vice versa. After this tendency was statistically removed, the relation between narcissism and derogation of the average person became significant.

Another question Study 3 attempted to answer was how narcissism and self-esteem, the so-called "two portraits of self-love" (Campbell et al., 2002), are related to target-derogation. Controlling for each other, narcissism was positively and self-esteem was negatively related to target-derogation, indicating that they are indeed two different portraits of self-love. This finding suggests that thinking highly of oneself does not necessarily require a poor opinion of others and that target-derogation is unique to narcissism.

One finding from Study 2 demonstrated the negative relation between target-derogation and the extent to which judges liked targets ($r = -.46$), indicating that judges engaged in target-derogation to the extent that they disliked the targets. This leads to an interesting question: Do narcissists rate the personality of an individual whom they say they like more negatively than nonnarcissists do? Judges in Study 2 were recommended and presumably liked by the targets; however, this does not mean that judges were equally fond of targets. To answer the question, judges in Study 4 either rated a person whom they knew quite well and liked, or a person whom they knew quite well and disliked.

Chapter 6: Study 4

The purpose of Study 4 was to examine whether narcissism is positively related to target-derogation even when targets are individuals whom judges explicitly say they like. Judges were randomly assigned to a "like" or "dislike" condition. Judges in the "like" condition were asked to rate the personality of a person whom they knew quite well and liked whereas judges in the "dislike" condition were asked to rate the personality of a person whom they knew quite well and disliked.

Method

Judges and Procedure

Judges were 149 undergraduate students at Northeastern University (66.9% women) who participated in exchange for partial course credit. The mean age was 19.14 ($SD = 1.41$). Approximately, 70% of judges identified themselves as European American, 16% as Asian American, 6% as Latino American, 2% as African American, and 6% as other. They were invited to the lab to complete a battery of questionnaires using an online survey program (www.qualtrics.com).

Measures

Judges' ratings of targets' personality. Judges in the "like" condition were asked to think of a person whom they knew quite well and liked, and to rate this person's personality. Judges in the "dislike" condition were asked to think of a person whom they knew quite well

and disliked, and to rate this person's personality. Judges rated targets' personality on the CAQ with a Likert scale ranging from 1(*not at all descriptive*) to 7 (*very descriptive*).

Judges' narcissism. Judges completed the 40-item, forced-choice version of the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988; α = .80). In addition to total narcissism, subscales were calculated (Emmons, 1984, 1987): Leadership/Authority (α = .75); Self-absorption/Self-admiration (α = .73); Superiority/Arrogance (α = .49); and Exploitativeness/Entitlement (α = .31).

Judges' self-esteem. Judges completed the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965; α = .87). Responses were made on a 7-point scale.

Judge-rated relationship quality. Judges answered the following four questions about their relationship with their target: "Compared to other friends of yours, how close are you to this friend?"; "Compared to other friends of yours, how much do you like this friend?"; "Compared to other friends of yours, how well do you know this friend?"; and "For how many years have you known your friend?" The first three questions were answered using a 7-point scale.

Judges' target-derogation. The extent to which judges derogated targets' personality was calculated in the same way as Study 1.

Results

Mean narcissism and mean self-esteem did not differ between the two conditions except for the subscale of Leadership/Authority, indicating that both variables were well-balanced in the two conditions (see Table 8). Judges in the "like" condition felt closer to targets, liked them more, and knew them better than judges in the "dislike" condition did. The length of acquaintanceship between judges and targets was longer for the "like" condition than the "dislike" condition.

Judges' Narcissism

Narcissism did not differ between men ($M = 14.48$, $SD = 6.42$) and women ($M = 15.95$, $SD = 5.89$), $t(147) = 1.46$, $p = .15$. Also, one 3-way and two 2-way interactions including judges' sex were not significant, $|t|s < 1.31$, $ps > .19$. Therefore, judges' sex was not further analyzed.

Judges' Narcissism and Target-Derogation

Judges' target-derogation was regressed on narcissism, condition, and the cross-product between narcissism and condition. The results revealed that the main effect of condition was significant, $\beta = .90$, $p < .001$. Target-derogation was much lower in the "like" condition ($M = -.50$, $SD = .22$) than the "dislike" condition ($M = .08$, $SD = .26$). Neither the interaction nor the main effect of narcissism was significant, $|\beta|s < .18$, $ps > .34$.

Although the 2-way interaction was not significant, I further analyzed the data per condition because the primary interest was in the "like" condition. In the "like" condition, there was a tendency for target-derogation to be positively related to narcissism ($r = .13$) and negatively related to self-esteem ($r = -.12$), but neither of them was significant. However, when target-derogation was regressed on narcissism and self-esteem (see Table 9), target-derogation had a marginally positively relation with narcissism, $\beta = .26$, $p = .06$, and marginally negative relation with self-esteem, $\beta = -.25$, $p = .06$. In other words, the relation between narcissism and target-derogation became stronger after controlling for self-esteem, which replicates the findings of Study 3 (Table 6, Model 5) and Paulhus et al. (2004). In the "dislike" condition, narcissism was not related to target-derogation either in a zero-order correlation or regression. Finally, different regression models using the subscales of narcissism were examined, but no meaningful pattern was observed (see Table 9).

Relationship Quality and Target-Derogation

Target-derogation was negatively related to judges' liking of and closeness to targets in both the "like" and "dislike" conditions (see Table 10). However, the negative relation between length of acquaintanceship and target-derogation occurred only in the "dislike" condition, suggesting the longer the lengths of acquaintanceship were, the less derogatory judges' ratings were.

Discussion

The purpose of Study 4 was to examine whether the link between narcissism and other-derogation is observed even when targets are individuals whom judges explicitly say they like. Although narcissism was positively related and self-esteem was negatively related to other-derogation, neither was statistically significant. However, these relations became marginally significant after controlling for each other, thus replicating the findings in Study 3. This finding is discussed in detail in the general discussion section. When targets were individuals that judges disliked, neither narcissism nor self-esteem was related to other-derogation.

Chapter 7: General Discussion

Narcissism has been conceptualized as a self-regulatory process that maintains a highly favorable self-view (Campbell et al., 2006; Campbell & Foster, 2007; Morf et al., 2011; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Other-derogation is believed to be a specific strategy that narcissists use to deal with ego threat (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Smalley & Stake, 1996; South et al., 2003). The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate whether and to what extent narcissism is related to other-derogation even in the absence of ego threat in four different contexts.

In Study 1, judges watched the same four videotaped targets interacting with another person and rated each target's personality. Judges' narcissism was positively related to the derogation of each target's personality. In other words, the more narcissistic the judges were, the more negatively they evaluated the targets.

In Study 2, each judge rated the personality of his or her own target who was the judge's friend. Targets rated their own personality as well. Judges' narcissism was positively correlated with target-derogation, replicating the finding in Study 1. This positive relation remained significant after controlling for targets' self-derogation, indicating that narcissistic other-derogation occurs independent of targets' own personality ratings.

In Study 3, judges were asked to imagine the average Northeastern University student and rate this hypothetical person's personality. Given the possibility that judges' ratings of the average student were based on their own personality, judges rated their own personality as

well. In addition, judges completed a self-report measure of self-esteem. Judges' narcissism

was positively related to their derogation of the average Northeastern student, controlling for

their own self-derogation. When target-derogation was regressed on narcissism and self-

esteem, narcissism was positively and self-esteem was negatively related to target-derogation.

In Study 4, judges rated the personality of either an individual they knew fairly well

and liked, or an individual they knew fairly well and disliked. In the "dislike" condition, no

meaningful pattern of results was observed. In the "like" condition, however, regression

analyses revealed that narcissism was positively and self-esteem was negatively related to

target-derogation although both results were marginally significant.

Taken together, these findings indicate that narcissists are more likely than

nonnarcissists to derogate another's personality even when there is no apparent threat to their

ego. These results are contradictory to the conclusion of South and colleagues (2003) that

"individuals with narcissistic traits do not have a baseline level of negativity greater than the

average person" (p. 23). This difference may be explained by the different nature of targets.

Target stimuli in South et al. (2003) were still photos of a stranger who was intentionally

sending out ambiguous nonverbal messages, which is quite different from everyday

interactions with others. In contrast, targets in the present study were relatively realistic, except

for Study 3. Targets were actual acquaintances of judges (Studies 2 and 4) or videotaped

individuals interacting with another person (Study 1). The finding that narcissism was

positively related to other-derogation in realistic contexts suggests that narcissists in everyday

life may utilize other-derogation as a means to maintain a highly favorable self-view.

In fact, this finding is consistent with the argument that narcissism entails a constant

pursuit of self-worth (Brown & Bosson, 2001). If narcissism is related to the constant effort to

build, buttress, defend, and enhance a grandiose self (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Morf et al., 2011), it should be present whether or not there is ego threat. Although other-derogation has been studied as a strategy to deal with ego threat in most precious research (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Smalley & Stake, 1996), the present study strongly suggests that other-derogation is a strategy that operates even in the absence of ego threat.

Furthermore, both strangers and close friends are subject to other-derogation. It might be an interesting research avenue to investigate if there are cases in which narcissists rate targets' personality more favorably than nonnarcissists. Given narcissists' obsession with social status (Campbell, 1999), for instance, narcissists may evaluate the personality of their favorite celebrities more positively than nonnarcissists' ratings (c.f., Horton & Sedikides, 2009).

The results of the present study support the argument that narcissists are more concerned about agency than communion (Campbell, 1999; Campbell & Foster, 2007). More narcissistic individuals in Campbell et al. (2002) rated their romantic partner lower on positive traits relative to themselves than less narcissistic ones did. In the present study, although there was no direct comparison between self and targets, people high in narcissism were more likely than those low in narcissism to derogate the personality of their close friends (Study 2) and even an individual whom they said they liked (Study 4) although the latter was marginally significant controlling for self-esteem. These findings suggest that narcissists are willing to sacrifice their interpersonal relationships to maintain their favorable self-image.

Earlier I raised the possibility that maintaining a highly favorable self-view may require a negative opinion of others (i.e., other-derogation) because personality judgment is more likely to depend on social comparison processes than objective criteria (Festinger, 1954).

However, this speculation was not supported by the findings in Studies 3 and 4. Although both narcissism and self-esteem embrace a highly favorable self-view, narcissism was positively and self-esteem was negatively related to other-derogation, after controlling for each other. In other words, unlike narcissists who have negative evaluations of others, people with high self-esteem think highly of others while maintaining a positive self-view. This difference implies that there are two distinct portraits of self-love (Campbell et al., 2002).

However, why this distinctive pattern emerged only from the regression analyses warrants more discussion. As discussed earlier, narcissists' overly favorable self-view pertains only to agentic characteristics, whereas people with high self-esteem value both agentic and communal characteristics (Campbell et al., 2006; Campbell & Foster, 2007; Campbell et al., 2007; Campbell et al., 2002; Hart et al., 2011; Paulhus & John, 1998). When narcissism and self-esteem were entered in regression analyses to predict other-derogation, the overlap between the two variables was statistically removed. Thus, it is likely that agency was accentuated in narcissism after self-esteem was partialled out, and communion was accentuated in self-esteem after narcissism was partialled out. "Pure" agency without the countervailing influence of communion (i.e., emphasis on personal competence without concerns for others) may lead to negative evaluations of others. In contrast, "pure" communion without the countervailing influence of agency (i.e., emphasis on interpersonal relationships without concerns for personal competence) may lead to positive evaluations of another's personality (also see Paulhus et al., 2004).

It is important to note that narcissism and other-derogation exhibited significant zero-order correlations when judges rated the personality of targets who were assigned by an experimenter in Studies 1 and 2. However, judges' task was complicated in later studies. In

Study 3, judges rated the personality of the average person of the group to which they belonged, so it is likely that they assumed similarity between their own personality and the average person's personality as evidenced by the positive correlation between the two ratings. In Study 4, judges rated the personality of an individual whom they said they liked. Thus, the idea that 'I like this person' was very salient while rating the personality of the target, which potentially masked narcissistic other-derogation.

In Studies 1, 3, and 4, the link between narcissism and other-derogation was investigated using both total and subscale scores of narcissism. However, no meaningful pattern was observed regarding the subscales. In contrast, the total scores were consistently related to other-derogation. Thus, it seems that narcissistic other-derogation is more characteristic of total narcissism than any specific factor of narcissism.

Across the four studies, other-derogation was calculated based on clinicians' positivity judgment of each CAQ item. One concern for these analyses is that clinicians and student judges may not agree on how positive or favorable each CAQ item is. For example, it is possible that clinicians regard impulsivity as a negative characteristic whereas students consider it positive. If this is the case, it is more complimentary than derogatory for student judges to rate targets high on impulsivity. To determine whether the concept of positivity by clinicians and students was similar, I asked six undergraduate students to rate the positivity of each CAQ item on a nine-point scale. The six sets of student ratings were averaged ($\alpha = .96$). The clinician- and student-ratings were highly correlated, $r = .90$, $p < .001$, indicating that the concept of positivity is similar for clinicians and students.

The findings from the present studies have implications for treatments of narcissism. Treatments of narcissistic personality disorder often include reducing unrealistically positive

self-evaluation and condescending behavior (Cukrowicz, Poindexter, & Joiner, 2011). Another

approach focuses on activating communal values through, for example, compassion meditation

which fosters altruistic emotions and concern for other people (Gilbert, 2005; Thomaes &

Bushman, 2011). Other-derogation seems to be relevant to both approaches. It is possible that

narcissists maintain overly positive self-evaluation in part because they perceive others in a

derogatory way. Also, narcissists may not care about building close relationships because they

fail to discover good qualities in others and thus believe that others do not deserve their

commitment. Therefore, helping narcissists realize that other individuals are as worthy as they

are may decrease overly positive self-views and increase communal orientation.

One limitation of the present study is that the results do not address why narcissism is

related to other-derogation. It is possible that narcissists engage in other-derogation more than

nonnarcissists in order to maintain their highly positive self-view. Alternatively, narcissists

who already feel superior to others may simply look down upon others. In fact, these

competing possibilities resemble two different perspectives on the development of narcissism.

On the one hand, some theorists argue that narcissism is a compensatory mechanism for an

underlying fragile self-concept, which results in active pursuit of a highly favorable self-

concept (Kernberg, 1975; Kohut, 1977). On the other hand, other theorists argue that

narcissism is a consequence of praise bombarded on children, independent of actual behavior

or performance, which leads to a chronic positive distortion of self-concept (Millon, Grossman,

Millon, Meagher, & Ramnath, 2004). More research is required to resolve this controversy.

Another limitation is that the data from the present study do not speak to the perceived

threat that participants may have felt. Although there was no experimental manipulation to

induce ego threat in the present study, it is still possible that narcissists who are highly

sensitive to threat (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998) may have perceived threat while evaluating targets. For example, rating the personality of a close friend may pose a threat to ego simply because it reminds narcissists of times when he or she outperformed them (Krizan & Bushman, 2011). Similarly, the videotaped targets in Study 1 may have exhibited excellent social skills, which was construed as ego threat. This possibility can be investigated by adding perceived threat as a variable in future research.

Finally, it should be noted that the focus of the present study was on other-derogation exhibited in self-reported perceptions of others, not actual behavior toward others. While having a conversation with another person, for example, narcissists may exhibit specific behaviors such as refocusing the topic of a conversation or intentionally ignoring what their conversation partner says (Vangelisti, Knapp, & Daly, 1990). It will be a meaningful research avenue to examine how narcissism is related to behavioral other-derogation in the absence of ego threat.

In conclusion, individuals with narcissistic characteristics think poorly of others, whether strangers or close others. This tendency is present with or without ego threat. Although the present study does not address whether other-derogation is a cause or consequence of highly inflated self-views, it is clear that narcissistic individuals are willing to derogate others even if they are close friends.

References

Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the Narcissistic Personality Inventory really measure? *Assessment, 18*, 67-87. doi:10.1177/1073191110382845

Alicke, M. D., & Govorun, O. (2005). The better-than-average effect. In M. D. Alicke, D. A. Dunning, & J. I. Krueger, (Eds.), *The self in social judgment* (pp. 85-106). New York: Psychology Press.

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

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

Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? Decoding the narcissism-popularity link at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 132-145. doi:10.1037/a0016338

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Narcissism as addiction to esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 206-210.

Block, J. (2008). *The Q-sort in character appraisal: Encoding subjective impressions of persons quantitatively*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bosson, J. K., Lakey, C. E., Campbell, W. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Jordan, C. H., & Kernis, M. H. (2008). Untangling the Links between Narcissism and Self-esteem: A Theoretical and Empirical Review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 1415-1439.

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., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the meaning and measure of narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 951-964. doi:10.1177/0146167209335461

Buffardi, L. E., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Narcissism and social networking web sites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1303-1314. doi:10.1177/0146167208320061

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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.219

Cain, N. M., Pincus, A. L., & Ansell, E. B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*, 638-656.

Campbell, W. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 1254-1270. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1254

Campbell, W., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83*, 29-45. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Campbell, W. K., Bosson, J. K., Goheen, T. W., Lakey, C. E., & Kernis, M. H. (2007). Do narcissists dislike themselves "deep down inside"? *Psychological Science, 18*, 227-229. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01880.x

Campbell, W., Brunell, A. B., & Finkel, E. J. (2006). Narcissism, interpersonal self-regulation, and romantic relationships: An agency model approach. In K. D. Vohs, E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Self and relationships: Connecting intrapersonal and interpersonal processes* (pp. 57-83). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Campbell, W., Bush, C., Brunell, A. B., & Shelton, J. (2005). Understanding the social costs of narcissism: The case of the tragedy of the commons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1358-1368. doi:10.1177/0146167205274855

Campbell, W., & Foster, C. A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 484-495. doi:10.1177/0146167202287006

Campbell, W., & Foster, J. D. (2007). The narcissistic self: Background, an extended agency model, and ongoing controversies. In C. Sedikides, S. J. Spencer (Eds.), *The self* (pp. 115-138). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Campbell, W., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*, 329-347. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2000.2282

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. doi:10.1177/0146167202286007

Carlson, E. N., Furr, R., & Vazire, S. (2010). Do we know the first impressions we make? Evidence for idiographic meta-accuracy and calibration of first impressions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*, 94-98. doi:10.1177/1948550609356028

Carlson, E. N., Naumann, L. P., & Vazire, S. (2011). Getting to know a narcissist inside and

    out. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds*.) Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic

    personality disorder* (pp. 285-299). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Carlson, E. N., Vazire, S., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2011). You probably think this paper's about

    you: Narcissists' perceptions of their personality and reputation. *Journal of Personality*

    and Social Psychology, 101, 185-201. doi:10.1037/a0023781

Carney, D. R., Colvin, C., & Hall, J. A. (2007). A thin slice perspective on the accuracy of first

    impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*, 1054-1072.

    doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2007.01.004

Colvin, C. R., & Longueuil, D. (2001). Eliciting self-disclosure: The personality and

    behavioral correlates of the Opener Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *35*, 238-

    246. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2000.2315

Corry, N., Merritt, R., Mrug, S., & Pamp, B. (2008). The factor structure of the Narcissistic

    Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 90*, 593-600.

    doi:10.1080/00223890802388590

Cronbach, L. (1955). Processes affecting scores on 'understanding of others' and 'assumed

    similarity.' *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 177-193. doi:10.1037/h0044919

Cukrowicz, K. C., Poindexter, E. K., & Joiner, Jr., T. E. (2011). Cognitive behavioral

    approaches to the treatment of narcissistic personality disorder. In W. Campbell, J. D.

    Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder:*

    Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments (pp. 457-465). Hoboken,

    NJ US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Dabbs, J., & Colvin, C. R. (1998). *Agency and communion*. Unpublished manuscript.

    Northeastern University.

Donnellan, M., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (2005). Low

    Self-Esteem Is Related to Aggression, Antisocial Behavior, and Delinquency.

    Psychological Science, 16, 328-335. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01535.x

Dunning, D., Meyerowitz, J. A., & Holzberg, A. D. (1989). Ambiguity and self-evaluation:

    The role of idiosyncratic trait definitions in self-serving assessments of ability. *Journal

    of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1082-1090. doi:10.1037/0022-

    3514.57.6.1082

Ellis, H. (1898). Auto-eroticism: A psychological study. *Alienist and Neurologist, 19*, 260-299.

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality

    Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 291-300.

    doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_11

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and

    Social Psychology, 52*, 11-17. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.11

Farwell, L., & Wohlwend-Lloyd, R. (1998). Narcissistic processes: Optimistic expectations,

    favorable self-evaluations, and self-enhancing attributions. *Journal of Personality, 66*,

    65–83. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00003

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison process. *Human Relations, 7*, 117–140.

    doi:10.1177/001872675400700202

Friedman, J. N. W., Oltmanns, T. F., Gleeson, M. E. J., Turkheimer, E. (2006). Mixed

    impressions: Reactions of strangers to people with pathological personality traits.

    Journal of Research in Personality, 40, 395-410. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.01.005

Funder, D., & Colvin, C. (1991). Explorations in behavioral consistency: Properties of persons,

    situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 773-794.

    doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.773.

Funder, D. C., Furr, R., & Colvin, C. (2000). The Riverside Behavioral Q-sort: A tool for the

    description of social behavior. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 451-489. doi:10.1111/1467-

    6494.00103

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.

    doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00798.x

Gilbert, P. (2005). *Compassion: Conceptualisations, research and use in psychotherapy*. Hove,

    UK: Routledge.

Gosling, S. D., John, O. P., Craik, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (1998). Do people know how they

    behave? Self-reported act frequencies compared with on-line codings by observers.

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1337-1349. doi:10.1037/0022-

    3514.74.5.1337

Hart, C. M., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., Arndt, J., Routledge, C., & Vingerhoets, A. M.

    (2011). Nostalgic recollections of high and low narcissists. *Journal of Research in

    Personality, 45*, 238-242. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2011.01.002

Hayes, A. F., & Dunning, D. (1997). Construal processes and trait ambiguity: Implications for

    self-peer agreement in personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social

    Psychology, 72*, 664-677. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.664

Horton, R. S., & Sedikides, C. (2009). Narcissistic responding to ego threat: When the status of the evaluator matters. *Journal of Personality, 77*, 1493-1525. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00590.x

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*, 206-206. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.206

Jordan, C. H., Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., Hoshino-Browne, E., & Correll, J. (2003). Secure and defensive high self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 969-978. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.969

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

Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 14*, 1-26. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1401_01

Kernis, M. H., & Sun, C. (1994). Narcissism and reactions to interpersonal feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28*, 4-13. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1994.1002

Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of self*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Krizan, Z., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). Better than my loved ones: Social comparison tendencies among narcissists. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, 212-216. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.031

Kubarych, T. S., Deary, I. J., & Austin, E. J. (2004). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Factor structure in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 857-872. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00158-2

Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). *Interpersonal perception: A theory and method of research*. New York, NY: Springer.

Lakey, C. E., Rose, P., Campbell, W., & Goodie, A. S. (2008). Probing the link between narcissism and gambling: The mediating role of judgment and decision-making biases. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 21*, 113-137. doi:10.1002/bdm.582

Locke, K. D. (2009). Aggression, narcissism, self-esteem, and the attribution of desirable and humanizing traits to self versus others. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 99-102. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.10.003

McGregor, I., Nail, P. R., Marigold, D. C., & Kang, S. (2005). Defensive pride and consensus: Strength in imaginary numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 978-996. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.978

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 449-476.

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. (2010). The case for using research on trait narcissism as a building block for understanding narcissistic personality disorder. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1*, 180-191. doi:10.1037/a0018229

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. (2011). Addressing criticisms of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI). In W. Campbell, J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 146-152). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Miller, J. D., Gaughan, E. T., Pryor, L. R., Kamen, C. C., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). Is research using the narcissistic personality inventory relevant for understanding

narcissistic personality disorder? *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 482-488.

doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.02.001

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. (2011).

Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of*

Personality, 79, 1013-1042. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00711.x

Miller, J. D., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. (2011). Comparing the construct validity of scales

derived from the Narcissistic Personality Inventory: A reply to Rosenthal and Hooley

(2010). *Journal of Research in Personality, 45*, 401-407. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.12.004

Millon, T. (1981). *Disorders of personality*. New York: Wiley.

Millon, T., Grossman, S., Millon, C., Meagher, S., & Ramnath, R. (2004). *Personality*

disorders in modern life (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Morf, C. C. (1994). *Interpersonal consequences of narcissists' continual effort to maintain*

and bolster self-esteem. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance:

Explorations in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 668-

676. doi:10.1177/0146167293196001

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-

regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177-196.

doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_1

Morf, C. C., Torchetti, L., & Schürch, E. (2011). Narcissism from the perspective of the

dynamic self-regulatory processing model. In W. Campbell, J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The*

handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches,

empirical findings, and treatments (pp. 56-70). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Murphy, G. L. (2002). *The big book of concepts*. Cambridge, MA US: MIT Press.

Oltmanns, T. F., Friedman, J. N. W., Fiedler, E. R., & Turkheimer, E. (2004). Perceptions of people with personality disorders based on thin slices of behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 216-229. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00066-7

Ozer, D. J. (1993). The Q-sort method and the study of personality development. In D. C. Funder, R. D. Parke, C. Tomlinson-Keasey, & K. Widaman (Eds.), *Studying lives through time: Personality and development* (pp. 147-168). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1197-1208. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1197

Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 1025-1060. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00041

Paulhus, D. L., Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Tracy, J. L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*, 303-328. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_7

Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 21*, 365-379. doi:10.1037/a0016530

Pincus, A. L., & Lukowitsky, M. R. (2010). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 6*, 421-446. doi:10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131215

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590-590. doi:10.2466/pr0.1979.45.2.590

Raskin, R., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 911-918. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.911

Raskin, R. N., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 890-902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890

Rhodewalt, F., Madrian, J. C., & Cheney, S. (1998). Narcissism, self-knowledge organization, and emotional reactivity: The effect of daily experiences on self-esteem and affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 75-87. doi:10.1177/0146167298241006

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

Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 672-685. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.672

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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.2.340

Rose, P. (2002). The happy and unhappy faces of narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33,* 379-391. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00162-3

Rosenthal, S. A., & Hooley, J. M. (2010). Narcissism assessment in social–personality

     research: Does the association between narcissism and psychological health result from

     a confound with self-esteem? *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*, 453-465.

     doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.05.008

Rosenthal, S. A., Montoya, R., Ridings, L. E., Rieck, S. M., & Hooley, J. M. (2011). Further

     evidence of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory's validity problems: A meta-analytic

     investigation—response to Miller, Maples, and Campbell (this issue). *Journal of

     Research in Personality, 45*, 408-416. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2011.06.004

Sedikides, C., Rudich, E., Gregg, A., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal

     narcissists psychologically healthy? Self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personality and

     Social Psychology, 87*, 400–416. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.400

Smalley, R. L., & Stake, J. E. (1996). Evaluating sources of ego-threatening feedback: Self-

     esteem and narcissism effects. *Journal of Research in Personality, 30*, 483-495.

     doi:10.1006/jrpe.1996.0035

South, S. C., Oltmanns, T. F., & Turkheimer, E. (2003). Personality and the derogation of

     others: Descriptions based on self- and peer report. *Journal of Research in Personality,

     37*, 16-33. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00526-3

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. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.05015

Thomaes, S., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). Treating narcissus: A basic research perspective. In W.

     Campbell, J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality*

disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments (pp. 476-484).

Hoboken, NJ US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Trull, T. J., & McCrae, R. R. (2002). A five-factor perspective on personality disorder research.

In P. r. Costa, T. A. Widiger (Eds.), *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of*

personality (2nd ed.) (pp. 45-57). Washington, DC: American Psychological

Association. doi:10.1037/10423-004

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. (2003). 'Isn't it fun to get the respect that we're going to

deserve?' Narcissism, social rejection, and aggression. *Personality and Social*

Psychology Bulletin, 29, 261-272. doi:10.1177/0146167202239051

Vangelisti, A. L., Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. A. (1990). Conversational narcissism.

Communication Monographs, 57, 251-274. doi:10.1080/03637759009376202

Vogt, D. S., & Colvin, C. R. (2003). Interpersonal orientation and the accuracy of personality

judgments. *Journal of Personality, 71*, 267-295. doi: 10.1111/1467-6494.7102005

Vogt, D. S., & Colvin, C. R. (2005). Assessment of accurate self-knowledge. *Journal of*

Personality Assessment, 84, 239-251. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8403_03

Watson, P. J., & Biderman, M. D. (1993). Narcissistic Personality Inventory factors, splitting

and self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61*, 41–57.

doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6101_4

Wink, P. (1991). Self- and object-directedness in adult women. *Journal of Personality, 59,*

769-791. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1991.tb00931.x

Footnotes

[1]Target-derogation scores were analyzed both with and without Fishers' r-to-z transformation. The results from both analyses were very similar. The results reported in this dissertation were based on correlation coefficients without the transformation.

[2]The correlation between narcissism and each CAQ item was reported in the appendices (see Tables 11 to 15).

Table 1

Judges' Narcissism Correlated with Target-Derogation in Study 1

	Target-derogation (*r*)				
Judges' narcissism	Female 1	Female 2	Male 1	Male 2	Composite
Total narcissism	.30**	.23*	.22+	.27*	.38***
Leadership/Authority	.21+	.24*	.20+	.18	.32**
Self-absorption/Self-admiration	.11	.11	.15	.19+	.22+
Superiority/Arrogance	.22*	.25*	.24*	.27*	.38***
Exploitativeness/Entitlement	.42***	.21+	.15	.27*	.39***

$+ p \leq .09.$ * $p \leq .05.$ ** $p \leq .01.$ *** $p \leq .001.$

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Target-Derogation in Study 1

Target	Female 1	Female 2	Male 1	Male 2	*M* (*SD*)
Female 1	_	.43***	.21+	.12	-.44 (.25)
Female 2		_	.24*	.13	-.50 (.25)
Male 1			_	.27*	-.23 (.30)
Male 2				_	.29 (.24)

+ $p \le .07$. * $p \le .05$. *** $p \le .001$.

Table 3

Target-Derogation Regressed on the Subscales of Judges' Narcissism in Study 1

Narcissism subscales	Target-derogation (β)				
	Female 1	Female 2	Male 1	Male 2	Composite
Leadership/Authority	-.07	.11	.02	-.19	-.04
Self-absorption/Self-admiration	-.03	-.04	.05	.12	.04
Superiority/Arrogance	.07	.14	.19	.26	.26+
Exploitativeness/Entitlement	.43***	.10	.02	.20	.27*

$+ p \le .10$. $* p \le .05$. $*** p \le .001$.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables in Study 2

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	M (SD)
1. Judges' narcissism	.26*	-.22+	-.28*	-.21+	-.18	.03	3.04 (0.89)
2. Judges' target-derogation	_	-.19	-.46***	-.15	.01	.24+	-.48 (.27)
3. Judge-rated "close"		_	.63***	.76***	.33**	.10	5.48 (0.81)
4. Judge-rated "like"			_	.52***	.10	-.12	5.65 (0.67)
5. Judge-rated "know"				_	.35**	.11	5.38 (0.87)
6. Years known					_	.04	4.89 (3.99)
7. Targets' self-derogation						_	-.49 (.21)

+ $p \leq .09$. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables in Study 3

Variable	Average person	Self	Self-esteem	M (SD)
Derogation of average person	_	.25*	-.21+	-.43 (.29)
Derogation of self		_	-.70***	-.43 (.27)
Self-esteem			_	4.97 (1.06)
Narcissism	.14	-.30**	.34**	15.28 (6.11)
Leadership/Authority	.14	-.34**	.27*	3.74 (2.47)
Self-absorption/Self-admiration	.06	-.37**	.48***	3.32 (1.96)
Superiority/Arrogance	.10	-.02	-.02	2.63 (1.73)
Exploitativeness/Entitlement	.19	.16	-.01	1.78 (1.30)

$+ p \le .08. \ * p \le .05. \ ** p \le .01. \ *** p \le .001.$

Table 6

Regression Models in Study 3

Model	Criterion	Predictor	*t*	β
1	Narcissism	Target-derogation	2.01	.23*
		Self-derogation	-3.13	-.36**
2	Self-esteem	Target-derogation	-0.43	-.04
		Self-derogation	-7.72	-.69***
3	Target-derogation	Narcissism	2.02	.24*
		Self-derogation	2.67	.32**
4	Target-derogation	Self-esteem	-0.43	-.07
		Self-derogation	1.21	.20
5	Target-derogation	Narcissism	1.98	.24*
		Self-esteem	-2.37	-.29*
6	Target-derogation	Narcissism	2.13	.26*
		Self-esteem	-0.83	-.13
		Self-derogation	1.45	.23

* *p* ≤ .05. ** *p* ≤ .01. *** *p* ≤ .001.

Table 7

Target-Derogation Regressed on Predictor Variables in Study 3

Variables	Target-derogation (β)			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Leadership/Authority	.08	.23	.17	.24
Self-absorption/Self-admiration	-.01	.12	.13	.16
Superiority/Arrogance	.03	-.02	-.02	-.04
Exploitativeness/Entitlement	.16	.03	.10	.03
Self-derogation	_	.36**	_	.26
Self-esteem	_	_	-.31*	-.16

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics and Independent t-*tests in Study 4*

Variable	Like (*n* = 76) *M* (*SD*)	Dislike (*n* = 73) *M* (*SD*)	Independence *t*-test
Narcissism	15.95 (5.89)	14.48 (6.42)	1.45
Leadership/Authority	4.28 (2.16)	3.36 (2.32)	2.50*
Self-absorption/Self-admiration	3.50 (2.26)	3.30 (2.20)	0.54
Superiority/Arrogance	2.62 (1.65)	2.45 (1.71)	0.60
Exploitativeness/Entitlement	1.41 (1.27)	1.51 (1.23)	-0.48
Self-esteem	5.39 (1.09)	5.20 (0.96)	1.12
Like	6.59 (0.77)	2.59 (1.75)	18.23***
Close	6.50 (0.86)	3.10 (1.86)	14.41***
Know	6.42 (0.75)	4.36 (1.49)	10.72***
Years	8.20 (5.98)	4.77 (4.77)	3.78***
Target-derogation	-.50 (.22)	.08 (.26)	-15.13***

* $p \le .05$. *** $p \le .001$.

Table 9

Target-Derogation Regressed on Predictor Variables in Study 4

Condition	Variable	Target-derogation (β)		
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Like condition (*n* =76)	Self-esteem	-.25+		-.20
	Narcissism	.26+		
	Leadership/Authority		.10	.15
	Self-absorption/Self-admiration		-.07	.05
	Superiority/Arrogance		-.02	-.04
	Exploitativeness/Entitlement		.13	.12
Dislike condition (*n* =73)	Self-esteem	-.10		-.13
	Narcissism	.00		
	Leadership/Authority		.11	.15
	Self-absorption/Self-admiration		-.02	.00
	Superiority/Arrogance		-.04	-.04
	Exploitativeness/Entitlement		-.21+	-.21+

+ $p \le .09$.

Table 10

Correlations for Study Variables per Condition in Study 4

Condition	Variable	Target-derogation	Like	Close	Know	Years
	Target-derogation	_	-.50***	-.30**	-.01	-.16
	Like		_	.58***	.19	.00
	Close			_	.45***	-.03
	Know				_	.16
Like condition	Years					_
	Narcissism	.13	-.02	-.01	-.01	-.14
(n =76)	Leadership/Authority	.12	-.05	-.03	.02	-.20+
	Self-absorption/Self-admiration	-.04	.07	-.03	-.11	-.15
	Superiority/Arrogance	.06	-.02	.06	.08	.08
	Exploitativeness/Entitlement	.15	.01	-.04	-.04	.18
	Self-esteem	-.12	.09	-.01	-.10	-.14
	Target-derogation	_	-.67***	-.54***	-.22+	-.32**
	Like		_	.76***	.47***	.37***
	Close			_	.62***	.38***
	Know				_	.31**
Dislike condition	Years					_
	Narcissism	-.04	.05	-.08	.15	.01
(n =73)	Leadership/Authority	.03	.04	-.04	.21+	-.02
	Self-absorption/Self-admiration	-.01	.02	-.12	.07	.02
	Superiority/Arrogance	-.02	.10	.00	.15	.08
	Exploitativeness/Entitlement	-.19+	.08	.01	.01	-.03
	Self-esteem	-.10	.11	.05	.11	-.04

+ $p \le .09$. * $p \le .05$. ** $p \le .01$. *** $p \le .001$.

Table 11

Judges' Narcissism Correlated with Judge-Rated CAQ Items of Targets in Study 1

CAQ item	Correlations with ratings of targets				Adjustment score
	Female 1	Female 2	Male 1	Male 2	
86. Denies unpleasant thoughts	.23*	.16	.38***	-.01	1
23. Tends to blame others for mistakes	.33**	.03	.19	.23*	3
22. Feels a lack of meaning in life	.04	.04	.07	.31**	1
19. Seeks reassurance from others	.15	.03	.13	.30**	5
12. Tends to be self-defensive	.28**	-.12	.06	.11	3
40. Generally fearful	.13	.27*	.04	.22*	2
97. Emotionally bland	.27*	.08	.01	.06	2
27. Condescending toward others	-.03	.10	.26*	-.11	3
14. Genuinely submissive	.24*	.10	.03	.25*	4
55. Self-defeating	.25*	.13	.23*	.17	1
13. Thin-skinned; sensitive to criticism	.13	.14	.24*	.09	3
67. Self-indulgent	.24*	.16	.02	.06	5
46. Tends to fantasize and daydream	.21*	-.05	.09	.24*	5
99. Self-dramatizing; histrionic	.24*	-.07	.05	.14	4
24. Prides self on being rational	.08	.22*	-.18	.19	5
28. Liked and accepted by others	-.32**	-.10	-.08	-.14	7
71. Has high aspiration for self	-.31**	-.14	-.03	-.02	6
96. Values own independence	-.24*	-.14	-.13	-.28**	8
11. Protective of others	-.12	-.27*	.04	-.08	6
20. Has a rapid personal tempo	-.27*	-.16	-.01	-.15	5
77. Straightforward, candid, and frank	-.01	-.27*	-.20	-.05	8
92. Has social poise and presence	-.27*	-.09	-.13	.10	7
54. Sociable and gregarious	-.01	-.26*	-.15	-.11	5
3. Has a wide range of interests	-.25*	-.19	-.23*	-.11	8
98. Verbally fluent	-.25*	.03	-.07	.10	6
56. Responds to and appreciates humor	-.19	-.18	-.20	-.24*	7
75. Has internally consistent personality	.06	-.24*	-.06	.02	6
60. Has insight into own motives	-.23*	-.09	-.19	-.21	9
65. Tries to stretch limits	-.23*	-.01	.16	.09	4
74. Feels satisfied with self	.00	.06	-.05	-.23*	6
80. Interested in opposite sex members	-.13	-.04	-.18	-.23*	7
84. Cheerful and happy	-.09	-.08	-.22*	-.13	7
88. Personally charming	-.22*	-.10	-.10	.02	6

* $p \le .05$. ** $p \le .01$. *** $p \le .001$.

Table 12

Judges' Narcissism Correlated with Judge-Rated CAQ Items of Targets in Study 2

CAQ item	r	Adjustment score
91. Power oriented	.37**	5
31. Regards self as physically attractive	.33**	5
65. Tries to stretch limits	.33**	4
13. Thin-skinned; sensitive to criticism	.32**	3
99. Self-dramatizing; histrionic	.31**	4
63. Judges people in conventional ways	.30**	4
62. Rebellious and nonconforming	.29*	5
16. Introspective; thinks about self	.24*	6
69. Sensitive to demands	.24*	4
23. Tends to blame others for own mistakes	.23+	3
27. Condescending toward others	.23+	3
66. Enjoys aesthetic impressions	.23+	7
22. Feels a lack of meaning in life	.22+	1
4. Talkative	.21+	5
14. Genuinely submissive	.21+	4
40. Generally fearful	.21+	2
78. Feels cheated and victimized by life	.21+	1
95. Gives advice	-.34**	5
70. Behaves in ethically consistent manner	-.30**	8
6. Fastidious, careful, and precise	-.29*	5
2. Dependable and responsible	-.24*	9
71. Has high aspiration for self	-.24*	6
83. Sees the heart of important problems	-.24*	8
29. Is turned to for advice and reassurance	-.22+	6
8. Has high degree of intelligence	-.21+	6

$+ p \leq .10.$ * $p \leq .05.$ ** $p \leq .01.$

Table 13

Judges' Narcissism Correlated with Judge-Rated CAQ Items of Targets in Study 3

CAQ item	*r*	Adjustment score
75. Internally consistent personality	.27*	6
39. Thinks and associates ideas in unusual	.25*	5
29. Is sought for advice	.24*	6
17. Is sympathetic or considerate	.21+	8
89. Compares self to others	-.27*	4
67. Self-indulgent	-.24*	5
3. Wide range of interests	-.22+	8
31. Regards self as physically attractive	-.22+	5
58. Enjoys sensuous experiences	-.22+	7
79. Has persistent preoccupying thoughts	-.22+	3
15. Skilled at pretending, humor	-.20+	7

$+ p \leq .09.$ $* p \leq .05.$ $** p \leq .01.$

Table 14

Judges' Narcissism Correlated with Judge-Rated CAQ Items of Targets in the "Like"

Condition in Study 4

CAQ item	r	Adjustment score
31. Regards self as physically attractive	.34**	5
12. Self-defensive	.32**	3
80. Interested in opposite sex	.31**	7
82. Has fluctuating moods	.30**	5
32. Aware of impression made on others	.29**	7
1. Is critical, skeptical, not easily impressed	.27*	6
73. Eroticizes situations	.26*	4
76. Projects own feelings onto others	.26*	2
91. Power oriented	.25*	5
93. Sex-typed	.25*	6
94. Expresses hostility directly	.25*	6
74. Satisfied with self	.24*	6
52. Assertive	.23*	6
65. Pushes and tries to stretch limits	.21+	4
22. Lacking personal meaning in life	.20+	1
36. Is subtly negativistic	.20+	2
89. Compares self to others	.20+	4
18. Initiates humor	.19+	6
25. Over-controls needs and impulses	.19+	3
34. Over-reactive to minor frustrations	.19+	4
38. Hostile towards others	.19+	2
5. Behaves in giving way	-.31**	7
11. Protective of close ones	-.21+	6

$+ p \leq .10. * p \leq .05. ** p \leq .01.$

Table 15

Judges' Narcissism Correlated with Judge-Rated CAQ Items of Targets in in the "Dislike"

Condition in Study 4

CAQ item	r	Adjustment score
46. Engages in personal fantasy and daydream	.20+	5
91. Power oriented	-.30**	5
71. High aspiration level	-.28*	6
59. Concerned with functioning of own body	-.25*	4
60. Insight into own motives and behavior	-.25*	9
19. Seeks reassurance	-.25*	5
13. Thin-skinned; sensitive to criticism	-.24*	3
24. Proud of being rational	-.24*	5
99. Self-dramatizing	-.22+	4
61. Creates and exploits dependency in people	-.22+	3
41. Is moralistic	-.21+	4

$+ p \leq .10. * p \leq .05. ** p \leq .01.$