NARCISSISM AND PERFORMANCE IN
A MANAGEMENT EDUCATION TEAMWORK PROJECT

A Thesis
by
RYAN JAMES FELTY

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

May 2012
Department of Psychology

NARCISSISM AND PERFORMANCE IN
A MANAGEMENT EDUCATION TEAMWORK PROJECT


A Thesis
by
RYAN JAMES FELTY
May 2012


APPROVED BY:


_____
Brian G. Whitaker, Ph.D.
Chair, Thesis Committee


_____
Shawn M. Bergman, Ph.D.
Member, Thesis Committee


_____
Jacqueline Z. Bergman, Ph.D.
Member, Thesis Committee


_____
James C. Denniston, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Psychology


_____
Edelma D. Huntley, Ph.D.
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

FOREWORD

This thesis is written in accordance with the style of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th Edition)* as required by the Department of Psychology at Appalachian State University.

ABSTRACT

NARCISSISM AND PERFORMANCE IN A MANAGEMENT EDUCATION
TEAMWORK PROJECT. (May 2012)

Ryan James Felty, B.A., University of Charleston

M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Brian G. Whitaker, Ph.D.

Based on the extant literature, we integrate Self-Enhancement theory and Social
Exchange theory to hypothesize that individual-level maladaptive subclinical narcissism will
be negatively related to peer performance ratings and that team-level maladaptive subclinical
narcissism will be negatively related to both team-level task performance ratings and team-
level organizational citizenship behaviors directed at individuals (OCB-I; Williams &
Anderson, 1991). Longitudinal data were collected from 89 undergraduate students enrolled
in Introductory Organizational Behavior courses. Student levels of maladaptive subclinical
narcissism were measured during the first two weeks of the semester. OCB-I evaluations
(Williams & Anderson, 1991) were used to assess the prevalence of OCB-Is within work
groups across the lifespan of the team project. Peer performance ratings were measured using
an instructor-designed rubric. Final grades for each team were obtained in order to assess
task performance. Results  suggest that (a) team-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement influences
task performance, (b) team-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement influences changes in OCB-Is
over time, and (c) individual-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement influences peer performance
ratings.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis of self-love to the memory of a selfless woman: Cheryl L. Rude (1959-

2002). Her priceless guidance continues to resonate, and I am grateful for her influence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my chair, Dr. Brian G. Whitaker, for his unwavering enthusiasm

and guidance. I would also like to express sincere gratitude to my other committee members,

the Drs. Shawn M. and Jacqueline Z. Bergman, for their collaboration and support.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Study Abstract

Recent cross-temporal research indicates that mean levels of college students' subclinical narcissism has been increasing since the 1980s (Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008a). The notion that the most recent generation of workers will be more narcissistic than the last has potentially detrimental implications for organizations. Research is needed to determine the influence of subclinical narcissism on the performance of teamwork tasks due to the widespread utilization of work groups by the modern organization (Cascio, 1995; Gordon, 1992). Based on the extant literature, we integrate Self-Enhancement theory and Social Exchange theory to hypothesize that individual-level maladaptive subclinical narcissism will be negatively related to peer performance ratings and that team-level maladaptive subclinical narcissism will be negatively related to both team-level task performance ratings and team-level organizational citizenship behaviors directed at individuals (OCB-I; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Longitudinal data were collected from 89 undergraduate students enrolled in Introductory Organizational Behavior courses. Student levels of maladaptive subclinical narcissism were measured via Ackerman et al.'s (2011) Exhibitionism/Entitlement subscale of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979) during the first two weeks of the semester. OCB-I evaluations (Williams & Anderson, 1991) were used to assess the prevalence of OCB-Is within work groups across the lifespan of the team project. Peer performance ratings were measured using an instructor-designed rubric assessing relative contributions to the task. Final grades for each team were obtained in order to assess task performance. Data were analyzed via hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Results  suggest that (a) team-level

Exhibitionism/Entitlement influences task performance, (b) team-level

Exhibitionism/Entitlement influences changes in OCB-Is over time, and (c) individual-level

Exhibitionism/Entitlement influences peer performance ratings. Our findings suggest the

necessity for practitioners to consider individual differences in the strategic formation of work

groups.

**Narcissism and Performance in a Management Education Teamwork Project**

The widespread utilization of work groups by the modern organization has created a demand for effective team-building practices that are guided by evidence-based strategies (Cascio, 1995; Gordon, 1992). Several factors have contributed to this growing demand; for example, the pursuit of worker productivity continues to become more complex for modern organizations because relatively fewer job tasks can be performed effectively by only one individual (Ott, Parkes, & Simpson, 2008). Expanding international markets and global competition have dampened the effectiveness of traditional approaches (Levi, 2007), and there is a tendency for jobs to shift from routine to nonroutine tasks due to developments in technology and other advancements (Mohrman, Cohen, & Mohrman, 1995). These factors suggest that work teams will continue to occupy a pivotal role within the modern organization. Organizations that are concerned with successfully achieving their goals in these dynamic times must understand the relevance of personality traits and their influence on consistent work-related behaviors (Oswald & Hough, 2010). Specifically, the prevalent utilization of work teams requires an understanding of the individual differences that contribute to effective group processes, including the effects of personality traits on interpersonal relations, group maintenance, and team viability (Sundstrom, DeMeuse, & Futrell, 1990).

An organization's strategic composition of effective work groups may be partially determined by its quality of employees, especially of those that are in the pool of availability for participation in collaborative tasks. Of particular interest, a cross-temporal meta-analysis

of the personality of American college students that were enrolled between 1979 and 2006 indicated that mean subclinical narcissism scores have been steadily increasing over the past few generations (Twenge et al., 2008a). In a comparison between the most recent student subclinical narcissism scores and of those collected between 1979 and 1985, it was found that almost two thirds of the most recent students had earned scores that were above the previous generations' averages. Specifically, the comparison suggested a 30% mean increase in scores.

The organizational implications of this phenomenon is clear: Because narcissistic tendencies have been linked to a number of organizationally-relevant, maladaptive behaviors (Blickle, Schlegel, Fassbender, & Klein, 2006; Penney & Spector, 2002), empirical research is needed to determine how this significant generational difference in subclinical narcissism may foreshadow necessary changes in common business practices, including the strategic composition of work teams and the deliberate selection of individuals for work groups.

**Subclinical Narcissism**

Is it possible to have too much self-love? In ancient mythology, Narcissus was vain enough to fall in love with his own image. According to legend, his immense pride served as an unfortunate barrier to potentially rewarding interpersonal relationships, and he died whilst paralyzed in admiration of his own reflection at a pool of water. Accordingly, modern psychological researchers have used the derivative "narcissism" to define a personality trait that is positively correlated with having higher perceptions of self-image (Jackson, Ervin, & Hodge, 1992).

Our current understanding of subclinical narcissism as a personality trait has dramatically evolved from its origins in psychoanalytic literature. Psychologists were first introduced to

the term when Ellis (1898) characterized Narcissus-like individuals with a tendency to be void of other-focused sexual emotions due to overwhelming self-admiration. Freud took notice and popularized the term for clinical psychologists in an essay that applied these principles in an understanding of various relationships between his concepts of id, ego, and superego (Crockatt, 2006). Freud's descriptions of self-love were noted and have influenced the modern clinical theories.

According to the fourth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV;* American Psychiatric Association, 1994*),* personality is the natural vehicle for one's characteristic manner of thinking, feeling, behaving, and relating to others. Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) is a clinical diagnosis that is reserved for individuals experiencing significant functional impairment and distress as a result of their narcissistic dispositions, but the disorder serves as a foundation for the subclinical construct. NPD is characterized by pervasive patterns of grandiosity, need for admiration, and a general lack of empathy. These individuals possess a vulnerable self-esteem. When they perceive a threat to self-image, narcissists tend to react affectively with shock, humiliation, and shame; behaviorally, they will defend the self with expressions of rage, disdain, or anger. Individuals with NPD may be diagnosed due to an inflated sense of self-importance that is revealed in exaggerations of their accomplishments. They may be preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, or brilliance whilst believing that they are unique in ways that can only be understood by other "special" people. Other diagnostic criteria include a sense of entitlement evident by unreasonable expectations, exploitative interpersonal relationships with others, a pattern of envying others or believing that others are envious of themselves, and the expression of arrogant, haughty attitudes or behavior.

Narcissists may frequently seek to maintain or restore their self-concept through external self-affirmation (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). As such, they constantly seek evidence for their perceptions of brilliance, and the real-world may not always deliver the desired affirmations. The inflated self-esteem is fragile and requires maintenance from a variety of sources. Their demands for attention and admiration may be displayed through exhibitionistic behaviors and expectations of special treatment. Interpersonal relationships may be exploitative in nature. Ultimately, the grandiose self becomes an impossible goal that is incessantly pursued with little regard for interpersonal consequences.

Recently, organizational psychologists have developed an interest in the expression of narcissistic tendencies. As an extension of the clinical criteria, *subclinical narcissism* incorporates NPD-reflective tendencies that can be better understood as the expression of a normal personality trait (Raskin & Hall, 1979). Like other personality traits, social and personality psychologists regard subclinical narcissism as normally distributed across populations and lacking of a qualitative "too much" cut-off (Foster & Campbell, 2007). This subclinical conceptualization of narcissism allows researchers and practitioners to determine where an individual lies on a continuum of the personality trait and make relevant predictions based on its assessment.

At the level of personality structure, NPD and subclinical narcissism are quite similar (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2011). The substantial convergence between the DSM-IV NPD construct and measures of subclinical narcissism allows researchers to consider how individuals that lack a clinical diagnosis may still possess the relevant personality traits and tendencies associated with NPD (Miller, Gaughan, Pryor, Kamen, & Campbell, 2009). This is evident in research that indicates measures of subclinical narcissism

are linked to the behaviors that are often associated with NPD, including self-serving and aggressive reactions to self-esteem threats (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998), exaggerated evaluations of the self (Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002), higher affect to downward comparisons, and increased hostility to upward comparisons (Bogart, Benotsch, & Pavlovic, 2004). It is this subclinical nature of trait narcissism that is the focus of the present study. For the purpose of this study, all remaining references to subclinical narcissism are referred to as "narcissism."

Within academia, narcissism has been positively associated with a tendency to cheat in graduate school (McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2006), engage in academic dishonesty with a lack of subsequent guilt (Brunell, Staats, Barden, & Hupp, 2011), and attribute noncontingent success to personal ability (Rhodewalt, Tragakis, & Finnerty, 2006). The rising level of collegiate narcissism has prompted concerned instructors to examine their personal role in preparing a generation of employees that are more narcissistic than the last. A recent examination of university majors revealed that business majors score significantly higher in narcissism than other majors (Sautter, Brown, Littvay, Sautter, & Bearnes, 2008). A focused comparison of business majors to psychology majors revealed the same trend (Westerman, Bergman, Bergman, & Daly, 2012). Alarmingly, a recent study found that the number of business ethics courses completed does not significantly impact the narcissistic traits of general business undergraduate students (Traiser & Eighmy, 2011). It has been proposed that a clearer understanding of narcissistic students may aide management instructors in their goal of preparing graduates that are capable of entering organizations to effectively and productively pursue goals in collaboration with other individuals and groups (Bergman, Westerman, & Daly, 2010).

In response to such findings, and because today's college students are tomorrow's employees, the business literature is rapidly developing its own views on narcissism. While acknowledging the benefits of self-confidence, Kets de Vries (2004) has argued that narcissists do not learn from failures because they take little personal responsibility and pass the majority of blame to others. The business world attracts self-confident people that seek and maintain power, but it is narcissistic individuals that may extend this attraction to self-importance and the abuse of authority (Furnham, 2008). Many individuals with a diagnosis of NPD have been known to experience high levels of professional achievement (Ronningstam & Gunderson, 1990), and the success of those with subclinical personalities is likely to be further widespread.

Twenge et al. (2008a) have alerted researchers and practitioners of the growing prevalence of narcissism across recent generations, and organizations have shown their concern by joining psychologists in an increased level of focus on its implications. Recent business literature is indicative of the field's apprehension with the trait, including pessimistic hypotheses regarding the interpersonal weaknesses assumed to accompany it. In his explanations of NPD in organizational settings, Furnham (2008) claims the shining view of the self renders the narcissistic individual blind of clear judgments and perceptions, whether personal, social, or business-related. The sense of self is omnipresent and is evident in exaggerated expressions of self-confidence, self-certainty, self-assertion, self-possession, self-aggrandization, self-preoccupation, and self-loving. The ultimate consequence, however, is self-destruction as organizational relationships will suffer due to a heightened sensitivity to criticism, poor listening skills, a lack of subordinate/coworker empathy, extreme independence, and intense desires to compete with others (Maccoby, 2004). Duchon and

Drake (2009) have argued that a significant increase in the number of narcissists within an organization may result in a warped organizational culture that enables an accepting attitude towards and frequent expressions of self-obsession and rationalization of unethical behavior.

Perhaps most troubling to organizations are the potential costs related to highly narcissistic employees. If interactions and communication among colleagues and subordinates becomes difficult, then organizations may fail to achieve their desired goals (King, 2007). The presence of influential narcissists that devalue others may impair overall morale and performance and may deter talented employees from remaining in their positions (Lubit, 2002). Empirical research continues to suggest that narcissists may be more likely than other coworkers to engage in behaviors that are inconsistent with organizational goals, including increased participation in white-collar crime (Blickle et al., 2006) and the rapid depletion of resources (Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005).

Research demonstrating positive links between narcissism and self-focused attention (Emmons, 1987) and a need for power (Carroll, 1987) imply that narcissistic individuals possess traits that may impede effective team functioning. The negative relationships found between narcissism and perspective taking and empathetic concern underscore the need for research investigating the influence of narcissistic team members on individual and group performance (Zhou, Zhou, & Zhang, 2010). Narcissists are likely to underachieve when tasked with work that offers little opportunity for self-enhancement (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002), which suggests possible decreases in overall group performance when a narcissist's efforts are diffused among group members. An in-depth understanding of how narcissists perform in team settings may guide organizational practices related to improving work group effectiveness.

It is noteworthy that the respondents of a study examining the characteristics of effective organizational teams indicated interpersonal conflict as the best predictor of perceived team effectiveness (Devine, Clayton, Philips, Dunford, & Melner, 1999). An organization cannot afford to allow one or more group members to cause unnecessary and costly conflict. The inconsiderate behavioral tendencies of narcissistic team members may destabilize and disrupt group dynamics (Furnham, 2008). The DSM-IV acknowledges the likelihood of deteriorating relationships among colleagues and peers due to the strain that occurs after the exploitative nature of relationships and self-centered egocentrism becomes evident to coworkers (APA, 1994). The narcissistic group member may take more credit than deserved, remain overbearing and pompous in team member interactions, and take little or no responsibility for failures, resulting in perceptions of abuse that may alienate the other members over time (Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

In summary, narcissism is characterized by self-absorbed traits that may impair interpersonal processes (Maccoby, 2004; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Moreover, the generational increases in narcissism are likely to be represented across the enrollment of undergraduates and recruitment of employees (Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008b). Organizations that ignore the recent generational changes may be unprepared to handle the behaviors associated with these future workers (Twenge & Campbell, 2008).

**The Dimensionality of Narcissism**

The most widely-employed measure of subclinical narcissism, the 40-item Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988), has been described as the dominant assessment of subclinical narcissism of social/personality research over the past 20 years

(Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008), having been the focal measure of narcissistic traits in the organizational research literature . The NPI is considered to be a more useful measure for subclinical narcissism, also referred to as "normal narcissism," than that of pathological narcissism (Maxwell, Donnellan, Hopwood, & Ackerman, 2011). This preference among researchers of narcissism likely stems from its high levels of test-retest and internal consistency reliability (del Rosario & White, 2005).

While some debate exists with regards to the underlying factor structure of the global narcissism construct (for a review, see Ackerman et al., 2011), most researchers conceptualize narcissism as having adaptive components that reveal facets of leadership, authority, and surgency and maladaptive components that assess perceptions of entitlement and exploitative behavior. Thus, personality researchers have at their disposal a measure that comprehensively taps the narcissism construct with sufficient breadth as to reflect the entire scope of its multidimensional nature, a critical issue when operationalizing a given construct (Spector, 1992).

Importantly however, in the broader literature there is considerable debate regarding the relative merits of examining discrete dimensions or broader constructs during theory development and hypothesis testing (for a review, see Edwards, 2001). As noted by several critics, the use of global, multidimensional measures of focal constructs treats the causal force of each component dimension as equal, confounding relationships between constructs and their dimensions by obscuring effects that may be due to one dimension rather than another. Thus, in order to decrease conceptual ambiguity and thereby increase theoretical utility, advocates of the discrete dimension approach argue for the assessment of theoretical models that clearly specify the influence of discrete dimensions on relevant outcomes at the

same level of abstraction (e.g., Paunonen, Rothstein, & Jackson, 1999; Schneider, Hough, &

Dunnette, 1996).

Based on the above rationale, in order to advance our understanding of how

multidimensional personality constructs such as narcissism influence organizational

outcomes, researchers should test models incorporating broader constructs in a more targeted

and precise manner. This assertion is consistent with recent research that examines the

maladaptive dimensions of narcissism (i.e., exploitativeness, exhibitionism, entitlement) and

their stronger associations with antisocial and aggressive behavior than the adaptive

components of narcissism (i.e., surgency and leadership; Barry, Grafeman, Adler, & Pickard,

2007; Washburn, McMahon, King, Reinecke, & Silver, 2004). As such, in order to clarify the

nature of the relationships between the multidimensional narcissism construct and

performance, this study seeks to investigate how a relevant, specific facet of narcissism

(Exhibitionism/Entitlement) influences performance outcomes.

According to the Ackerman et al. (2011), conceptualization of narcissism, the

*Exhibitionism/Entitlement* subscale reflects the socially toxic elements of narcissism,

including grandiosity (self-absorption, vanity, superiority, and exhibitionism) and entitlement

beliefs (a strong sense of deserving respect; a willingness to take advantage and manipulate

others). Moreover, they demonstrated that Exhibitionism/Entitlement was found to predict

counterproductive behaviors and impulsive antisocial tendencies. While the above results are

enlightening to those that focus on the maladaptive effects of narcissism, to date little

research has attempted to investigate the influence of maladaptive narcissistic tendencies on

performance in a team context (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000). An

examination of narcissism (specifically Exhibitionism/Entitlement) and team member

interactions may further our understanding of the consequences recent college graduates may bring to the construction and management of future teams. Importantly, results of such endeavors must be based on outcome variables that are readily measurable and relevant to both researchers and practitioners if useful conclusions are to be drawn from them.

**Task vs. Contextual Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Research in team composition has examined how team processes and outcomes are affected by the characteristics of individual members, suggesting that strategically designed teams are valuable to organizational effectiveness (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). In his review of personality and performance, Johnson (2003) acknowledged industrial and organizational psychologists' long held interest in utilizing personality assessments to describe, explain, and predict the behaviors of employees. Modern organizations have begun to accept that they may obtain a greater understanding of the predictors for effective performance by looking beyond traditional assessments (e.g., cognitive ability; Barrick & Mount, 2005). Indeed, recent meta-analyses have revealed the substantial benefits of utilizing personality to aid practitioners in their prediction of on-the-job-performance (Barrick, Mount, Judge, 2001; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Salgado, 2002).

However, as noted by others, researchers should carefully consider the constituent elements of the job performance domain when developing empirical hypotheses that test its antecedents. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) have argued that performance is separable into two large components: task performance and contextual performance. As an organizational goal, *task performance* is a work-criterion that is frequently studied among modern academics and practitioners (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010) and defined by job-specific

behaviors that include the job's core responsibilities and the knowledge, skills, and abilities

that are required for successful completion (Conway, 1999).

*Contextual performance* refers to the voluntary job behaviors that go beyond the specific

task behaviors required for performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). These are extra-role,

unrewarded behaviors that have a positive effect on the psychological and social aspects of

the organization by contributing to overall organizational functioning (Borman &

Motowidlo, 1997). Depending on the source and slight nuances in definitions, these

behaviors have also been referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs; Spector

& Fox, 2002).

OCB, as an extra-role discretionary behavior in the workplace, occurs when an employee

acts with the intention to help others in the organization or demonstrates a consistent

behavioral tendency of support for the organization. Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie

(2006) argue that factor analyses consistently reveal two distinct factors of OCB ratings that

appear in the form of altruism and generalized compliance, implying a distinction between

OCBs that reflect behaviors that either focus on helping other individuals or OCBs that focus

on generally benefiting the organization, respectively (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Smith,

Organ, & Near, 1983).

The distinction between two factors of OCB was supported when Williams and Anderson

(1991) also performed a series of factor analyses and found factors representing the

consistent distinction between these two forms of OCBs, referring to individual-focused

citizenship as OCB-I and organization-focused citizenship as OCB-O. Williams and

Anderson also noted that, despite an immediate focus on specific individuals, a high

prevalence of OCB-Is may have broader organizational implications due to their collective

ability to indirectly benefit the organization. Based on relevant tenets of self-enhancement theory (Alicke & Sedikides, 2009), the present research seeks to determine if the prevalence of narcissism in a team context has a detrimental impact on team task performance and the expression of OCB-Is between team members.

**Self-enhancement, Team Task Performance and Team OCB-Is**

Self-enhancement theory refers to an individual's focus on attaining, maximizing, or regulating his or her positive self-view (Hepper, Gramzow, & Sedikides, 2010). These tendencies may be expressed via cognitive, affective, and behavioral patterns. The typical individual is motivated to possess a positive self-concept. While the typical individual may engage in self-enhancement through realistic, healthy strategies, a narcissist displays an urgent need to constantly self-enhance and protect his or her ego (Sedikides & Gregg, 2001).

Unfortunately for organizations, some employees likely place self-enhancement concerns over long-term organizational goals (Crocker & Park, 2003). This suggests that some individuals may be preoccupied with enhancing the self instead of focusing on long-term commitments, such as a team project deadline. Narcissistic individuals may possess these preoccupations because they appear to develop an addiction to their own self-esteem (Baumeister & Vohs, 2001). Because narcissists are characterized by their constant self-maintenance, it is likely that they would be the most preoccupied team members, and commitment to long-term goals would suffer. It is also unlikely that narcissists would encourage the optimal performance of their team members. Indeed, in the presence of a high performer, narcissists have been known to derogate in an effort to maintain their own high self-esteem (Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993).

In the contemporary workplace, the focus on work performance has shifted from that of the individual to that of the work team (Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi, & Beaubien, 2002). Work teams, by their nature, are groups of individuals in an organizational setting that are tasked with collaborating and interacting in the pursuit of some common, defined goals (Levi, 2007) and are typically limited to a small number of people who will interact directly to accomplish their desired task through integration and coordination (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

Effective teams are more than just a collection of competent individuals. Positive team functioning has been shown to increase the effectiveness of the group (Guzzo & Dickinson, 1996). In addition, task interdependence has been shown to moderate the relationship between cohesion and performance (Gully, Devine, & Whitney, 1995), suggesting that group performance is improved when team members interact often due to a shared responsibility for achieving the goal. Teams are also more effective when they have a high collective efficacy, or a belief that "we can do the task" (Gully et al., 2002). Acquiring and maintaining an ideal collective efficacy requires the coordination of actions, reasonable evaluations of the performance of others, and an ability to empathize with the other team members. Narcissistic team members may experience difficulty in coordinating with and relating to other team members due to their lack of empathy and maladaptive drive to self-enhance, ultimately disrupting team performance.

Recent research has examined the usefulness of assessing personality variables in the selection of ideal team members (Morgeson, Reider, & Campion, 2005). It has been argued that social cohesion and team-level task performance may be influenced by team compositions based on the personality traits of individual team members (Stewart, Fulmer, & Barrick, 2005).  For example, team-level conscientiousness has been found to be a useful

predictor of effective team performance, suggesting that dispositional traits are useful in understanding performance within work groups (O'Neill & Allen, 2011). In contrast, narcissistic team members are self-absorbed and may negatively affect group task performance due to ineffective information exchange and a maladaptive orientation to self-enhancement (Nevicka, Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011).

Suggesting that a narcissist's pursuit of praise and approval may have detrimental effects on team performance may seem counterintuitive to an understanding of effective team development. On the surface, these traits appear to provide support for an organizational approach that heavily utilizes narcissists within work groups because it could be assumed that narcissistic employees would work harder to please his or her fellow team members due to a narcissist's concern with using others to maintain an inflated self-concept. However, researchers have argued that this approach of acceptance is erroneous due to a narcissist's general lack of concern for social approval during his or her construction and conveyance of a grandiose self (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Narcissists tend to only care about the approval of high-status individuals (APA, 2000); thus, it is unlikely that narcissists perceive other team members as high-status, and behavioral tendencies will reflect this perception. The methods a narcissist employs to self-regulate and bolster the self are unlikely to be related to the goals of the group due to the lack of empathy and the absence of genuine concern for the thoughts of others (Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984). Assuming that group membership always involves a member's willingness to abandon some aspects of individualism for the benefit of larger organizational purposes (Ott et al., 2008), a narcissist's inability to do so may hinder a team that has been tasked with a goal. As such, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1: Team-level narcissism will be negatively related to team task

performance.

In addition, we expect high levels of team-level narcissism to negatively impact the

expression of OCB-Is over time. Borman and Motowidlo (1997) suggest that the selection of

personnel should incorporate predictors of contextual performance criteria due to its

importance for organizational effectiveness and the ability to use personality as a predictor of

its prevalence (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).  Previous research suggests significant

relationships exist between personality dimensions and OCBs (Hattrup, O'Connell, &

Wingate, 1998; Sackett, Berry, Wiemann & Laczo, 2006). In addition, contextual

performance and related constructs (e.g., OCB-Is) are becoming increasingly important for

organizations to understand due to a rapidly changing global economy that is defined by

international competition and team-based organizations (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, &

Blume, 2009). However, the behaviors associated with narcissistic self-enhancement may

impede effective interpersonal team processes and, therefore, team level OCB-Is.

Teams that are assembled in academic settings are known to operate similarly to those in

the organizational context because they also rely on cooperation and assistance between team

members in the pursuit of important goals (Hayes, 1997). As noted in the previous sections,

narcissists characteristically demand more attention and expect "special" treatment in the

name of self-enhancement. Behaviorally, these perceptions and expectations manifest

themselves in exploitative interpersonal relationships with others, a heightened sensitivity to

criticism, poor listening skills, a lack of other-oriented empathy, and arrogance. These

behavioral patterns likely result in a warped team culture that enables an accepting attitude towards frequent expressions of self-entitlement, self-aggrandizement, denial, and rationalizations of counterproductive interpersonal behavior (Duchon & Drake, 2009; Maccoby, 2004). Based on the above, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2: Team-level narcissism will be negatively related to the expression of team-level OCB-Is over time.

**Social Exchange and Peer Ratings of the Individual**

It is also important to understand how team members ultimately evaluate themselves and others in the team. Self- and peer-ratings of the effectiveness of narcissistic and non-narcissistic team members may provide insight into how the possession (or lack thereof) of narcissistic tendencies are viewed by other members of the work group. Individuals with high levels of narcissism may be quite certain that they are essential team members due to a tendency to have a very high opinion of their own traits and abilities (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001).  For example, high narcissism  scores have been correlated with overestimations in attractiveness (Gabriel, Critelli, & Ee, 1994). Narcissists have also been known to overestimate their current and final course grades, engage in overly optimistic expectations, and self-enhance personal attributions in relation to a past event (Farwell & Wohlwend-Loyd, 1998). This tendency to apply self-enhancement to their predictions of the future, their perceptions of the present, and their framing of the past may not be "accurate" in comparison to judgments of relative contributions by the other team members.

In their study of biased self-perceptions and narcissism within student work groups, John and Robins (1994) found that people are less accurate when evaluating their own performance in comparison to evaluating others and that narcissistic individuals are more likely to provide unrealistically positive self-evaluations. Thus, although everyone is less accurate at self-evaluations in comparison to other-evaluations, narcissistic individuals are the most inaccurate and unrealistic, and narcissists will adopt a self-serving standard for self-evaluation. Their call for further research to examine others' evaluations will be partially accomplished by this study.

A later study by Robins and Beer (2001) also found that narcissistic individuals are more likely to engage in unrealistic self-enhancement and that narcissists are aware that their self-ratings are not reflective of the ratings they will receive from their peers. A disregard for the opinions of peers (e.g., "talents not recognized") was suggested as a way of maintaining a positive self-view in the presence of lower peer ratings. Narcissists were found to be more likely to base perceptions of success on ability and perceptions of failure on excuses. But what of the other team members' ratings of the narcissist?

While self-enhancement theory suggests that narcissists will engage in characteristically maladaptive behaviors in order to maximize self-enhancement, a narcissistic team member's dispositional tendencies would likely become evident to the other members within a team over time. Unfavorable peer assessments of his or her narcissistic traits may be revealed within subsequent evaluations of performance. Social exchange theory suggests that interpersonal interactions are based on interdependent obligations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), and it is the narcissistic individual's violation of social exchange norms that may be the source of negative peer evaluations.

According to social exchange theory, interdependent social exchanges are characterized by obligatory arrangements that are mutual and complementary (Molm, 1994). Reciprocity is one of the defining characteristics of true social exchange. For example, research has indicated that OCBs are strongly correlated with the quality of an individual's work exchanges (Cardona, Lawrence, & Bentler, 2004). These exchanges also affect the quality of work relationships, as evidenced by teams with a high number of effective exchanges among team members that develop trust, resulting in more acts of OCB (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000). The norm of reciprocity for exchanges makes it likely that the occurrence of OCBs will affect performance evaluations because previous research has demonstrated that employees consider it fair to be rated on their OCB tendencies (Johnson, Holladay, & Quinones, 2009). Narcissists focus on constructing a grandiose self instead of gaining genuine social approval (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001), and it is likely that a disregard for others would become apparent in peer performance ratings as a function of social exchange. Based on the extant literature and the tenants of self-enhancement and social exchange theories, we propose the following:

Hypothesis 3: Individual-level narcissism will be negatively related to peer performance ratings.

In summary, teamwork is a necessary strategy and work groups are likely to remain a pervasive feature of modern organizations (Devine et al., 1999). The construction of teams should be strategic and guided by empirical conclusions, but individual differences and outcome variables must be monitored and analyzed to determine if the traits of team

members have a significant influence on relevant processes. The implications of research on individual differences (e.g. dispositional traits) and the dimensions of group performance may provide organizations with the competitive advantages required to survive in a rapidly changing world. Contemporary organizations that utilize a strategic selection of work groups could benefit from an understanding of team composition due to its relationship to effective performance (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998).

It is the goal of this research to gain a clearer understanding of the relationship between a specific team-level personality trait (narcissism) and group performance in a project that requires teamwork. Performance will be evaluated by assessing the prevalence of OCB-Is (as rated by all team members) and the group's overall task performance (as determined by an instructor's evaluations of project success), and team members ratings of performance (assessed by each individual's team members). The researchers intend to examine this relationship within an academic scenario that is analogous to the teamwork tasks currently utilized by organizations, inasmuch that it involves delegation to a group of "employees" and evaluation by a "supervisor." Based on the implications of the previously discussed literature, we propose that a presence of narcissism within a team and the narcissists' common methods of self-enhancement will have detrimental effects on multiple outcomes related to the teamwork task. Specifically, we expect team-level narcissism to be negatively related to the team prevalence of OCB-Is, task performance ratings, and team members ratings of performance.

# Method

## Participants

Participants were 89 undergraduate students from a mid-sized public university in the southeastern United States. Participants were enrolled in an Introduction to Organizational Behavior course, and three separate sections of the same course were represented in the study. The mean age of the participants was 20.79 years old ($SD$ = 1.30 months). The sample was 57.5% male, 42.5% female, 93.1% Caucasian, 1.1% African-American, and 5.7% Asian American, Hispanic American, or Other. The 89 students were separated into 29 groups of 2-3 team members. Due to unforeseeable circumstances, one team failed to complete the project and was omitted from further analysis. Work groups remained the same throughout the course of the semester.

## Procedure

A research proposal, copies of the measures, and a formal request to begin the research were submitted to an institutional review board for approval. The study was determined to meet all necessary ethical guidelines, and permission was granted to proceed (Appendix A). Participants were asked to respond to a survey that evaluated Maladaptive Narcissism (facets of Grandiose Exhibitionism and Entitlement/Exploitativeness narcissism; Ackerman, et al., 2011) and demographic description (e.g., sex, ethnicity, etc.; Appendix B). Following this, participants were separated into their assigned project groups and informed of the study. Participants received the task assignment (Appendix C), the rubric for project success (Appendix D), and a timeline for completion of the teamwork task. Participants were given

five weeks to prepare for their class presentations. During this interval, in order to ensure that

teams worked together in an interactive way to construct a team deliverable, the instructor

required regular updates on team progress from the project participants in the form of brief

weekly reports outlining progress and the relative contribution of each team member.

Moreover, two weeks after assigning the project (three weeks before the project due date) the

instructor allocated one lecture day (75 minutes) for students to work together on their

project, further ensuring interaction among team members.  At this time, Time 1 dependent

variable (OCB-I; Appendix E) data collection occurred. A second round of OCB-Is and the

peer performance ratings were collected two weeks following the project presentations.


**Measures**

*Maladaptive narcissism.*

Ackerman et al.'s (2011) factor structure of the 40-item NPI (Raskin & Hall, 1979)

indicated a two-part higher order structure. Maladaptive narcissism could be measured

utilizing a 14-item subscale that assessed Grandiose Exhibitionism and

Entitlement/Exploitativeness, collectively referred to as Exhibitionism/Entitlement. Each

item of the scale consists of a dichotomous pair of phrases, and participants are asked to

choose the one that they feel best represents themselves (e.g., "I am no better or no worse

than most people" or "I think I am a special person"). The narcissistic response from each

pair of phrases was coded with a score of 1, and an average score was computed to reflect a

proportion of maladaptive narcissism (e.g., a score of .85). Team-level

Exhibitionism/Entitlement was computed as the average of each team member's individual

NPI-subscale score.

***Organizational citizenship behaviors – Individual.***

A self-report scale of OCB directed towards fellow employees (OCB-I; Williams & Anderson, 1991) was slightly modified to include language that was reflective of the task assigned to the students. The scale consisted of nine items ($\alpha = .85$) designed to determine the prevalence of OCB-Is (e.g., 'Takes time to listen to teammates' problems and worries.'), and items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with a range of "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." In order to gauge the extent to which levels of OCB-Is changed over time, a difference score variable was created wherein teams' Time 2 OCB-I scores were subtracted from their Time 1 OCB-I scores. As such, a positive difference score indicated that OCB-Is had decreased over the duration of the project while a negative difference score indicated that OCB-Is had increased in prevalence.

***Peer performance ratings.***

Team member evaluations were determined by the utilization of an instructor-designed rubric for the distribution of points among team members. All participants had the chance to provide a written evaluation of their team member's relative contributions, strengths, and weaknesses. All participants were asked to rate themselves and the other individual team members on a 1- to 10-point scale of "value to the team" in a rating system that stipulated no two members could receive the same score (e.g., each group could only have one '10').

***Task performance.***

Following completion of the teamwork task, all projects received a grade based on the instructor's evaluation of project success. Evaluations were guided by instructor-designed rubrics and the previously discussed Peer Performance Ratings. Task performance was a work group's final grade for the teamwork task.

# Results

Means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities, and intercorrelations among the variables are reported in Table 1. The bivariate correlations were largely consistent with the hypothesized relationships. The relationship between team-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement and team task performance was marginally significant and negative ($r = -.34$, $p < .10$), as was the relationship between individual-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement and individual-level peer ratings ($r = -.18$, $p < .10$).

For Hypotheses 1 and 2, all variables were aggregated to team-level means because this was the unit of analysis. To justify this aggregation, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on each of the variables to determine whether between-teams differences were significantly greater than within-team differences (Chan, 1998). A Bartlett–Box $F$ test for homogeneity of variance was also calculated. All of the variables passed these tests beyond the .05 level of significance. The data was left disaggregated for Hypothesis 3 as analysis for this hypothesis was at the level of the individual.

Table 2 reports the regression results used to test the hypotheses for the longitudinal team project performance variables. Team size was included as a control variable because prior findings have shown it to be related to internal team communication, team performance, and supportive behaviors (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Bass, 1990). As shown in Table 2, team-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement was negatively related to team task performance ($\beta = -.32$, $p < .10$) and the expression of team-level OCB-Is ($\beta = .39$, $p < .05$), providing partial support for Hypothesis 1 and fully supporting Hypothesis 2. Table 3 presents the regression results

for longitudinal individual narcissism on performance. As expected, the relationship between

individual-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement and peer performance ratings were negative,

albeit marginally significant ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .10$).

## Discussion

Organizational practitioners will be better prepared to respond to the generational increases in narcissism when they have a clearer understanding of its effects on performance. As suspected by Ackerman et al. (2011), a NPI-subscale analysis of narcissism and performance yielded a meaningful demonstration of maladaptive narcissism's correlates with costly interpersonal consequences. Our results suggest that, for our sample, (a) team-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement has a moderate negative relationship with task performance, (b) team-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement has a moderate positive relationship to changes in OCB-Is over time, and (c) individual-level Exhibitionism/Entitlement has a marginal negative relationship with peer performance ratings. Generally, our results provided some support for the view that traits of team members have an influence on relevant processes and outcomes.

Previous investigations of individual-level narcissism's ability to predict interpersonally dependent aspects of task performance have demonstrated significant negative relationships (Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008; Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006). The results of our investigation of team-level narcissism's relationship to task performance are indicative of an ability to observe these effects at the analysis-level of work groups. This is an appropriate focus due to the shift of responsibility for task completion from individuals to work groups. Our results suggest that increases in team-level narcissism may impede effective team functioning. As a result, task performance suffers.

Task performance was not the only performance considered by our study. Our investigation of team-level narcissism's relationship to OCB-Is over time demonstrated a decrease in perceived prevalence during the later stages of the teamwork task. This is relevant because practitioners should take notice of factors that deter contextual performance due to its relationships with effective processes. The individual- and organizational-level beneficial outcomes associated with OCB prevalence were recently addressed in a meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2009). Specifically, due to relationships with "bottom line" outcomes such as unit productivity and efficiency, it is important for practitioners to understand which individual differences may be useful in guiding predictions of citizenship behavior prevalence. The results generally support the notion that narcissism should be considered as a predictor for fewer occurrences of OCB-I.

Our examination of peer ratings suggests that the presence of narcissistic team members did not go unnoticed by other members of the group. Individual-level narcissism was marginally influential with regards to a decrease in peer evaluations. It appears that team members are not rewarding maladaptive narcissistic tendencies; rather, they are taking these tendencies into account when completing evaluations of other members.

Our results have several potential implications for academia and practitioners. We recommend the following:

**Academia**

It has been well documented that employers are seeking incumbents that can effectively work within team settings (Hernandez, 2002). We also know that the simple assignment of students into work groups does not mean skills automatically develop (Barker & Franzak, 1997). Higher education institutions can address the employer demand for employees that are

capable of working in teams by incorporating the development of these competencies into existing curricula. Some schools are answering the call by incorporating team projects into their courses (Hansen, 2006); however, little guidance on how teams operate effectively has been provided to students. Strategic efforts must be made to determine if narcissistic tendencies can be addressed via a well-designed curriculum.

We know that the use of group projects is an effective tool for adult learners (Ashraf, 2004). As argued by Hansen (2006), curriculum could address the development of teamwork knowledge by (a) emphasizing the importance of teamwork, (b) teaching specific teamwork skills, (c) incorporating team-building exercises, (d) determining methods for effective team formation, (e) assigning reasonable workloads with clear goals, (f) incorporating specific or assigned roles within groups, (g) providing time in class for team meetings, (h) requesting multiple feedback points for assess team problems, (i) requiring team members to journal individual contributions, and (j) utilize detailed peer evaluations in the assignment of grades. These steps can ensure that instructors are not merely placing groups of individuals together and calling them "teams"; rather, this will provide a means of determining the emergence of interpersonal impediments to effective performance. Combined with our awareness of narcissistic trends, the strategic incorporation and guidance of teamwork activities may help prepare graduates for effective organizational performance.

It is also important to mention that negative behaviors of college students become the negative behaviors of employees. Previous research has demonstrated that a student's academic dishonesty may predict future unethical business practices (Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, & Passow, 2004; Sims, 1993). As such, a student's narcissistic tendencies can be expected to follow them into their jobs. It has been shown that participation in a semester's

worth of ethics training does not have a significant influence on the development of ethical behavior (Davis & Welton, 1991; Weber, 1990); rather, business schools should incorporate such training across all curriculums during a student's development. To echo the challenge extended by Westerman et al. (2012), the time has come for business schools and other practical disciplines to address narcissistic tendencies as they are presented in higher education.

**Interviewing/Selection**

It has been argued that citizenship behaviors, such as cooperation, are likely to influence performance at the unit-level (Waldman, 1994). Organizations should carefully select their employees for the jobs that have a significant degree of team work and cooperation required. A useful method for determining the competencies of applicants is to utilize structured interviews that incorporate teamwork situations. Latham and Skalricki (1995) have demonstrated that structured, situational interviews can be useful in predicting peer ratings of organizational citizenship behaviors directed towards other individuals. As such, it can be expected that the incorporation of situational interviews into selection procedures will aid practitioners in determining the best candidates for jobs that benefit from consistent organizational citizenship. However, it is important to remember that job relatedness should still be a paramount goal in the development of situational interviews because there is difficulty in demonstrating the legality of hiring strategies that attempt to select individuals for organizations rather than for specific jobs (Werner, 2000). The level of teamwork required for any specific position should be identified by a thorough job analysis, which would address the minimum competencies required of any potential employee, including those with narcissistic tendencies.

**Coaching**

Based on our results, we recommend that narcissistic employees receive extensive coaching in an attempt to develop them into effective team members. For the coaches and supervisors of narcissists, it is recommended that every attempt is made to lead by example. Assuming that supervisors are considered to be of higher status and viewed with a considerable level of respect, narcissistic individuals may respond positively to their influences (APA, 2000); thus, practitioners should be strategic in their pairing of subordinate narcissists with organizational leaders and monitor the subordinate-supervisor relationship accordingly.

It should be noted that some of the recommended methods for dealing with narcissists are rooted in clinical theory. As such, it is important to note the unreliable success rate in the treatment of NPD. Some individuals are successful while others fail to respond to the efforts of intervention (O'Donohue, Fowler, & Lilienfeld, 2007). This is due to difficulties in admitting weaknesses, appreciating the effects of their behavior on other individuals, and difficulty incorporating feedback from others into behavioral outcomes. Thus, coaches should be selected based on their ability to address these issues in relation to subclinical narcissism.

Unfortunately for practitioners, O'Donohue et al. (2007) note that there is a lack of data for the determination of appropriate guidelines for addressing narcissistic tendencies. As such, it is expected that narcissistic employees are to be treated no differently by coaches and supervisors than other employees with regards to adherence to organizational policies and procedures.  However, Bergman et al. (2010) suggest that those tasked with mentoring narcissists may incorporate tenets of cognitive behavioral therapy into their interactions with

narcissists to address issues related to grandiosity, hypersensitivity to evaluations, and the
lack of empathy. By focusing on increasing responsibility for behaviors, decreasing cognitive
distortions and dysfunctional feelings, and constructing new attitudes, a narcissistic
individual may experience adjustments in their grandiose self-view, enhance their empathy,
and eliminate exploitative behaviors (Beck, Freeman, & Associates, 1990). Sperry (2006)
notes that the development of clinically narcissistic individuals represents a difficult task for
addressing current behavioral patterns and altering them towards new, acceptable patterns,
but that a flexible, resourceful, and competent mentor may achieve a degree of success. It
should be expected that the difficulties of NPD will be similar to that of the trait form of
narcissism and that the aforementioned strategies might be useful in guiding narcissistic
employees towards better organizational citizenship and task performance.

**Team-Level Training**

When a competency that is necessary for team success is expected of all team members,
it is appropriate to train at the team level (Swezey & Salas, 1992). The prevalence of
narcissism in the latest generation of students and the subsequent expectation of their
inclusion within teams that are utilized by organizations suggest that it may be appropriate
for practitioners to identify and develop their team members' interpersonal competencies via
team-level training. Addressing behaviors related to task performance and organizational
citizenship at the team level may provide narcissistic members with clear goals and
expectations.

**Culture**

It is important for organizations to maintain a culture that does not reward narcissistic
tendencies. Lubit (2002) claims that culture, as the result of behaviors performed by

organizational role models, will define the norms, values, behaviors, and beliefs of an organization's individuals. Organizations should recognize the influence this has on behavioral expectations, including the prevalence of organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Constructing Teams**

Having a task that requires teamwork is only the first step in constructing a team. As a prerequisite to measuring performance at the team level, practitioners should conduct a thorough team task analysis. The purpose of this step is to determine the objectives and to aid in identifying key interpersonal interactions required for performance, including actions, coordination demands, and communication flows (Paris, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). This allows for the identification of necessary competencies and will help practitioners determine whether or not a narcissist may be likely to hamper team performance. We recommend incorporating determinants of maladaptive narcissism into assessments of prospective individual team members. The inclusion of valid individual difference measures may provide incremental utility in efforts to determine the likelihood that a group of individuals will perform well together.

**Performance Management/Appraisal**

Assessment tools should be constructed to discriminate between ineffective and effective teamwork. Well-constructed tools will guide practitioners in assessing, diagnosing, and addressing skill deficiencies as they occur. In addition to being theoretically based and psychometrically sound, these tools become practical when they (a) identify the processes related to key team outcomes, (b) distinguish between deficiencies at the individual- and team-levels, (c) evaluate the interactions among team members to determine when changes occur, (d) provide assessments that are useful for delivering specific performance feedback,

(e) produce reliable, defensible evaluations, and (f) support operational use (Paris et al.,
2000). Tools that meet the aforementioned criteria may be useful in recognizing the impact
of narcissistic team members and addressing any relevant issues before overall team
performance suffers.

**Limitations**

The study exclusively relied upon undergraduate samples at one university. As such, a
notable limitation to the study was the utilization of a small sample size derived from a
convenience sampling method. Our hierarchical multiple regression analyses would benefit
from a larger sample size. Because our ability to generalize is limited when small sample
sizes impede the collection of reliable results, future researchers should aim for a more robust
examination of our effects and incorporate studies across separate higher education
institutions and outside organizations.

Another limitation to our current study related to sample size is the reduction in statistical
power as a result of utilizing a small sample size. The current study violated many past and
recent "rules of thumb" for sample sizes by incorporating only 28 teams in our multiple
regression analyses. As such, we have increased our likelihood of failing to find a significant
effect when one actually exists. Therefore, the parameters of influence generated by our
current study may be understated. We have limited our ability to assess the true relationship
between team-level narcissism and performance outcomes, and these limitations create a
demand for robust sample clarifications in future research.

Undergraduate sampling may limit our ability to generalize our findings to the employees
of organizations. Our sample was comprised of undergraduate students, and the majority of
participants lacked substantial employment exposure and business experience. Thus, they

have likely had less experience with organizational teams than they have had with academic teams. As previously discussed, higher education can address these limitations by attempting to replicate the organizational team experience, but such standardization across curriculum does not yet exist. Until further research addresses this issue, it is debatable whether our findings extend to the dynamics of organizational teams.

The short-term nature of the project should also be mentioned. The project utilized by this study was limited to one semester. As such, it may fail to provide an accurate representation of emerging teamwork dynamics and narcissism's relative influence. The tendency for narcissists to make great first impressions before eventually undermining interpersonal developments has been well-documented (Back, Egloff, & Schmukle, 2010; Holtzman, & Strube, 2010); therefore, it is important to note that the short-term nature of the project may have limited this ability for narcissists to show their "true" selves via interpersonal interactions.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

This research represents a small step towards a deeper understanding of the implications narcissism has on modern organizational processes. We echo Campbell et al.'s (2011) assertion that the best strategy for addressing practical concerns and building a stronger theoretical foundation is to continue conducting purposeful examinations of narcissism's ability to predict performance and other relevant criteria. As such, we broadly suggest future research addresses this demand.

Future studies should increase the duration of time that individual team members are expected to collaborate with one another. The short-term likeability of narcissistic individuals has been well documented (Oltmanns, Friedman, Fiedler, & Turkheimer, 2004; Paulhus,

1998). It has been suggested that a practitioner's focus on short-term performance variables, likeability, rapid leader emergence, and self-confidence would likely benefit any evaluation of the narcissist (Campbell et al., 2011). To determine the long-term implications and presence of a fragile self, assessments of individual differences should continue to be related to long-term variables that only become salient after repeated collaborations.

Research that utilizes undergraduate project teams should not focus only on management education settings. Rather, narcissism's effects on interpersonal functioning can be expected to be observed in other applied settings. Future research should incorporate teams composed of other disciplines, including curriculum characterized by multidisciplinary attendance.

Future studies should incorporate interpersonal activities that are more analogous to the work setting. It was the researchers' intent to examine the relationship between narcissism and performance within an academic setting that was analogous to the teamwork tasks currently utilized by organizations, inasmuch that they involve delegation of tasks to a group of "employees" and evaluations by a "supervisor." Though it can be argued that our intentions were addressed by our methods, it must be noted that the design of our teamwork task possibly violated workplace expectations of future collaborations. It is likely that individuals in our study were under the impression that they would never have to work with their specific team members again. Future studies may address this issue by focusing on teams that are comprised of members who possess reasonable expectations of continued collaborations.

It should be the intent of future studies to focus on potential solutions to the organizational problems caused by prevalent narcissism. As demonstrated by the cross-temporal meta-analysis conducted by Twenge et al. (2008a), the significantly higher mean

levels represent a current issue that has also been extensively publicized within the media and business periodicals (Green, 2007; Kelley & Kliff, 2009). However, there has been little focus on the strategies organizations can utilize to reduce the interpersonal costs incurred by incorporating narcissistic individuals into teamwork settings. As previously stated, an argument has been made for focusing on mitigating the detrimental tendencies of narcissistic undergraduates while they are still in school (Westerman, et al., 2012), but it is unrealistic for organizations to solely rely on the expectation of mitigation at the university-level.

Due to the defensive nature of the narcissistic ego, practitioners are unlikely to benefit from traditional approaches of providing performance feedback. Research with a focus on assessing the viability of clinical procedures in the organizational setting is nonexistent. There is a demand for evidence-based solutions that effectively address how narcissists should be trained, assessed, and integrated. Future research should incorporate evaluations of various strategies and their ability to quell narcissistic tendencies.

In summary, this research is one of the first to contribute to our understanding of team-level narcissism's ability to predict relevant organizational factors. As we broaden our understanding of the correlates of individual-level narcissism, we must also consider the implications of incorporating narcissistic individuals into collaborative work groups. Proactively examining the potential consequences of these recent developments is a far more lucrative endeavor than waiting to react and pick up the pieces.

# References

Ackerman, R. A.,Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the narcissistic personality inventory really measure? *Assessment, 18,* 67–87.

Alicke, M., & Sedikides, C. (2009). Self-enhancement and self-protection: What they are and what they do. *European Review of Social Psychology, 20,* 1–48. doi:10.1080/10463280802613866

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

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.

Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 634–665.

Ashraf, M. (2004). A critical look at the use of group projects as a pedagogical tool. *Journal of Education for Business, 79,* 213–216.

Back, M. D., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (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

Barker, R. T., & Franzak, F. J. (1997). Team building in the classroom: Preparing students for their organizational future. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 27,* 303–315.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Yes, personality matters: Moving on to more

important matters. *Human Performance*, *18*(4), 359-372.

doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1804_3

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the

beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next?.

*International Journal Of Selection And Assessment*, *9*(1-2), 9-30. doi:10.1111/1468-

2389.00160

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., Neubert, M. J., & Mount, M. K. (1998). Relating member

ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of

Applied Psychology*, *83*, 377–391.

Barry, C. T., Grafeman, S. J., Adler, K. K., & Pickard, J. D. (2007). The relations among

narcissism, self-esteem, and delinquency in a sample of at-risk adolescents. *Journal of

Adolescence, 30,* 933–942.

Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the

vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, *18*(3), 19-31.

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Narcissism as addiction to esteem. *Psychological

Inquiry*, *12*(4), 206-210.

Beck, A. T., Freeman, A., & Associates. (1990). *Cognitive therapy of personality disorders.*

New York: Guilford Press.

Bergman, J. Z., Westerman, J. W., & Daly, J. P. (2010). Narcissism in management

education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 9*(1)*,* 119-131.

Blair, C. A., Hoffman, B. J., & Helland, K. R. (2008). Narcissism in organizations: A

    multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance, 21*,

    254−276.

Blickle, G., Schlegel, A., Fassbender, P., & Klein, U. (2006). Some personality correlates of

    business white-collar crime. *Applied Psychology, 55,* 220–233.

Bogart, L. M., Benotsch, E. G., & Pavlovic, J. (2004). Feeling superior but threatened: The

    relation of narcissism to social comparison. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, *26*(1),

    35-44. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp2601_4

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include

    elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel*

    *selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance:

    The meaning for personnel. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 99-109.

Brunell, A. B., Staats, S., Barden, J., & Hupp, J. M. (2011). Narcissism and academic

    dishonesty: The exhibitionism dimension and the lack of guilt. *Personality and*

    *Individual Differences*, 50(3), 323-328. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.006

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.

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. K., Bush, C. P., 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.

Campbell, W., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in

    organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*(4), 268-284.

    doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.007

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

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

    329–347.

Campbell, W., 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*(3), 358-368. doi:10.1177/0146167202286007

Cascio, W. F. (1995). Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world

    of work? *American Psychologist, 50,* 928-939.

Cardona, P., Lawrence, B. S., & Bentler, P. M. (2004). The Influence of Social and Work

    Exchange Relationships on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Group &*

    *Organization Management*, *29*(2), 219-247. doi:10.1177/1059601103257401

Carroll, L. (1987). A study of narcissism, affiliation, intimacy, and power motives among

    students in business administration. *Psychological Reports, 61,* 355–358.

Chan, D. (1998). The conceptualization and analysis of change over time: An integrative

    approach incorporating longitudinal mean and covariance structures analysis (LMACS)

    and multiple indicator latent growth modeling (MLGM). *Organizational Research*

    *Methods, 1,* 421-483.

Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(1), 3-13. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.3

Crockatt, P. (2006). Freud's 'On narcissism: An introduction.' *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, *32*(1), 4-20. doi:10.1080/00754170600563638

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2003). Seeking self-esteem: Construction, maintenance, and protection of self-worth. In M. R. Leary, J. Tangney, M. R. Leary, J. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity* (pp. 291-313). New York, NY US: Guilford Press.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal Of Management*, *31*(6), 874-900. doi:10.1177/0149206305279602

Davis, J. R., & Welton, R. E. (1991). Professional ethics: Business students' perceptions. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, *10*(6), 451-463.

del Rosario, P. M., & White, R. M. (2005). The narcissistic personality inventory: Test-retest stability and internal consistency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*(6), 1075-1081. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.08.001

Devine, D. J., Clayton, L. D., Philips, J. L., Dunford, B. B., & Melner, S. B. (1999). Teams in organizations: Prevalence, characteristics, and effectiveness. *Small Group Research, 30,* 678-711. doi:10.1177/104649649903000602

Devonish, D., & Greenidge, D. (2010). The effect of organizational justice on contextual performance, counterproductive work behaviors, and task performance: Investigating the moderating role of ability-based emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *18*(1), 75-86. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00490.x

Duchon, D., & Drake, B. (2009). Organizational narcissism and virtuous behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *85*(3), 301-308. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9771-7

Edwards, J. R. (2001). Multidimensional constructs in organizational behavior research: An integrative analytic framework. *Organizational Research Methods*, *4,* 144-192.

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

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

Gordon, J. (1992). Work teams: How far have they come? *Training, 29,* 59-65.

Farwell, L., & Wohlwend-Lloyd, R. (1998). Narcissistic processes: Optimistic expectations, favorable self-evaluations, and self-enhancing attributions. *Journal of Personality, 66*(1), 65-83. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00003

Foster, J. D., & Campbell, W. (2007). Are there such things as 'Narcissists' in social psychology? A taxometric analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*(6), 1321-1332. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.04.003

Furnham, A. (2008). *Personality and intelligence at work: Exploring and explaining individual differences at work*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Gabriel, M. T., Critelli, J. W., & Ee, J. S. (1994). Narcissistic illusions in self-evaluations of intelligence and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality*, *62*(1), 143-155. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00798.x

Gordon, J. (1992). Work teams: How far have they come? *Training, 29,* 59-65.

Green, E. (2007). It's all about me. *U.S. News & World Report*, *142*(9), 22.

Gully, S. M., Devine, D. J., & Whitney, D. J. (1995). A meta-analysis of cohesion and

    performance: Effects of levels of analysis and task interdependence. *Small Group*

    *Research*, *26*(4), 497-520. doi:10.1177/1046496495264003

Gully, S. M., Incalcaterra, K. A., Joshi, A., & Beaubien, J. (2002). A meta-analysis of team-

    efficacy, potency, and performance: Interdependence and level of analysis as

    moderators of observed relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(5), 819-832.

    doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.819

Guzzo, R. A., & Dickson, M. W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on

    performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, *47,* 307-338.

    doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.307

Hansen, R.S. (2006). Benefits and problems with student teams: Suggestions for improving

    team projects. *Journal of Education for Business, 82*(1), 11-19.

    doi:10.3200/JOEB.82.1.11-19

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic

    dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study.

    *Science & Engineering Ethics*, *10*(2), 311-324.

Hattrup, K., O'Connell, M.S., & Wingate, P.H. (1998) Prediction of multidimensional

    criteria: distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 11,* 305–

    320.

Hayes, N. (1997). *Successful team management.* London: Thomson Business Press.

Hepper, E. G., Gramzow, R., & Sedikides, C. (2010). Individual differences in self-

    enhancement and self-protection strategies: An integrative analysis. *Journal of*

    *Personality*, *78*, 781–814. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00633.x

Hernandez, S. (2002). Team learning in a marketing principles course: Cooperative structures that facilitate active learning and higher level thinking. *Journal of Marketing Education, 24,* 73–85.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal Of Selection And Assessment*, *9*(1-2), 40-51. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00162

Holtzman, N. S., & Strube, M. J. (2010). Narcissism and attractiveness. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44,* 133–136. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.10.004

Jackson, L. A., Ervin, K. S., & Hodge, C. N. (1992). Narcissism and body image. *Journal of Research in Personality, 26*(4), 357-370. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(92)90065-C

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

Johnson, J. W. (2003). Toward an understanding of the multilevel role of personality in teams. In M. R. Barrick, & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Toward a better understanding of the relationship between personality and individual job performance* (pp. 83–120). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, S. K., Holladay, C. L., & Quinones, M. A. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior in performance evaluations: Distributive justice or injustice?. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, *24*(4), 409-418. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9118-0

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 765-780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 762−776.

Katzenbach, J. R. & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Kelley, R., & Kliff, S. (2009). Generation me. *Newsweek*, *153*(17), 48.

Kets de Vries, M. (2004). Organizations on the couch: A clinical perspective on organizational dynamics. *European Management Journal, 22*(2), 183–200.

King, G. (2007). Narcissism and effective crisis management: A review of potential problems and pitfalls. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 15*(4), 183-193.

Latham, G. P., & Skalricki, D. P. (1995). Criterion-related validity of the situational interview and patterned behavior description interviews with organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance, 8*, 67-80.

Levi, D. (2007*). Group dynamics for teams* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2000). An examination of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relations between the job, interpersonal relationships, and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(3), 407-416. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.407

Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic managers. *Academy Of Management Executive*, *16*(1), 127-138. doi:10.5465/AME.2002.6640218

Maccoby, M. (2004). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, *82*(1), 92-101.

Maxwell, K., Donnellan, M., Hopwood, C. J., & Ackerman, R. A. (2011). The two faces of narcissus? An empirical comparison of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*(5), 577-582. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.031

McCabe, D., Butterfield, K., & Trevino, L. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 5(*3), 294-305.

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*(3), 482-488. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.02.001

Mohrman, S. A., Cohen, S. G. & Morhman, A. M. (1995). *Designing team-based organizations: New forms for knowledge work.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Molm, L. D. (1994). Dependence and risk: Transforming the structure of social exchange. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *57*(3), 163-176. doi:10.2307/2786874

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Explorations in object relations. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*(6), 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.

Morgeson, F. P., Reider, M. H., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Selecting individuals in team

    settings: The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork

    knowledge. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*(3), 583-611. doi:10.1111/j.1744-

    6570.2005.655.x

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be

    distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475-

    480.

Nevicka, B., Velden, F., De Hoogh, A. B., & Van Vianen, A. M. (2011). Reality at odds with

    perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science*,

    *22*(10), 1259-1264. doi:10.1177/0956797611417259

O'Donohue, W., Fowler, K. A., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2007). *Personality disorders: Toward

    the DSM-V.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Oltmanns, T. F., Friedman, J. N., 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.

O'Neill, T. A., & Allen, N. J. (2011). Personality and the prediction of team performance.

    *European Journal Of Personality*, *25*(1), 31-42. doi:10.1002/per.769

Organ, D. W., & Konovosky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of

    organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 157-164.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship

    behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

    Publications.

Oswald, F. L., & Hough, L. M. (2010). Personality and its assessment in organizations: Theoretical and empirical developments. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 2. Selecting and developing members for the organization* (pp. 153-184). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ott, J. S., Parkes, S. J., & Simpson, R. B. (2008). *Classic reading in organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Paris, C. R., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2000). Teamwork in multi-person systems: A review and analysis. *Ergonomics, 43*(8), 1052-1075.

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

Paunonen, S. V., Rothstein, M. G., & Jackson, D. N. (1999). Narrow reasoning about the use of broad personality measures for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20,* 389-405.

Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems?. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*(1-2), 126-134. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00199

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 122-141. doi:10.1037/a0013079

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

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 890-902.

Rhodewalt, F., Tragakis, M. W., & Finnerty, J. (2006). Narcissism and self-handicapping: Linking self-aggrandizement to behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(5), 573-597. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.05.001

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*(2), 340-352.

Ronningstam, E., & Gunderson, J. G. (1990). Identifying criteria for narcissistic personality disorder. *The American Journal Of Psychiatry*, *147*(7), 918-922.

Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczo, R. M. (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance, 19,* 441-464.

Salgado, J. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal Of Selection And Assessment*, *10*(1-2), 117-125. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00198

Sautter, J. A., Brown, T. A., Littvay, L., Sautter, A. C., & Bearnes, B. (2008). Attitude and divergence in business students: An examination of personality differences in business and non-business students. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*, *13*(2), 70-78.

Schneider, R. J., Hough, L. M., & Dunnette, M. D. (1996). Broadsided by broad traits: How to sink science in five dimensions or less. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17,* 639-655.

Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2001). Narcissists and feedback: Motivational surfeits and motivational deficits. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*(4), 237-239.

Sims, R. L. (1993). The relationship between academic dishonesty and unethical business practices. *Journal Of Education For Business*, *68*(4), 207.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 653-663.

Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction.* Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-082. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Spector, P. E. and Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 269–292.

Sperry, L. (2006). *Cognitive behavior therapy of DSM-IV-TR personality disorders: Highly effective interventions for the most common personality disorders* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stewart, G. L., Fulmer, I. S., & Barrick, M. R. (2005). An exploration of member roles as a multilevel linking mechanism for individual traits and team outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*(2), 343-365. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00480.x

Sundstrom, E., DeMeuse, K. P. & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. *American Psychologist, 45,* 120-133.

Swezey, R. W. & Salas, E. (1992). Guidelines for use in team-training development. In Swezey, R. W. & Salas, E. (Eds.), *Teams: Their training and performance.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Traiser, S., & Eighmy, M. A. (2011). Moral development and narcissism of private and

public university business students. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *99*(3), 325-334.

doi:10.1007/s10551-011-0809-x

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, S. M. (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits

and their impact on the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*(8), 862-877.

doi:10.1108/02683940810904367

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. W., & Bushman, B. J. (2008a). Egos

inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the narcissistic personality

inventory. *Journal of Personality*, *76*(4), 875-902. doi:10.1111/j.1467-

6494.2008.00507.x

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W., & Bushman, B. J. (2008b). Further

evidence of an increase in narcissism among college students. *Journal of Personality*,

*76*(4), 919-928. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00509.x

Waldman, D. A. (1994). The contributions of total quality management to a theory of work

performance. *Academy of Management Review, 19*(3), 510-536.

Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls

with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,

*82*(5), 819-834. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.819

Washburn, J. J., McMahon, S. D., King, C. A., Reinecke, M. A., & Silver, C. (2004).

Narcissistic features in young adolescents: Relations to aggression and internalizing

symptoms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33,* 247–260.

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

    empathy: Validity evidence for the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of*

    *Personality Assessment, 45,* 159–162.

Weber, J. (1990). Measuring the impact of teaching ethics to future managers: A review,

    assessment, and recommendations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 9,* 183-190.

Werner, J. M. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource

    management. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 3-24.

Westerman, J. W., Bergman, J. Z., Bergman, S. M., & Daly, J. P. (2012). Are universities

    creating millennial narcissistic employees? An empirical examination of narcissism in

    business students and its implications. *Journal of Management Education, 36*(1), 5-32.

    doi:10.1177/1052562911408097

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as

    predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management,*

    *17*, 601-617.

Zhou, H., Zhou, H., & Zhang, B. (2010). Relationships among narcissism, empathy, and

    prosocial behaviors. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18*(2), 228-231.

Appendix A - IRB Approval

**From:** Dr. Stanley Aeschleman, Institutional Review Board
**Date:** 8/31/2011
**RE:** Notice of IRB Approval by Expedited Review (under 45 CFR 46.110)
**Study #:** 12-0026

**Study Title:** Narcissism and Performance in a Management Education Teamwork Project
**Submission Type:** Initial
**Expedited Category:** (7) Research on Group Characteristics or Behavior, or Surveys, Interviews, etc.,(5) Research Involving Pre-existing Data, or Materials To Be Collected Solely for Nonresearch Purposes
**Approval Date:** 8/31/2011
**Expiration Date of Approval:** 8/29/2012

This submission has been approved by the Institutional Review Board for the period indicated. It has been determined that the risk involved in this research is no more than minimal.

**Investigator's Responsibilities:**

Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to request renewal of approval before the expiration date. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without IRB approval.

Any adverse event or unanticipated problem involving risks to subjects must be reported immediately to the IRB. You are required to obtain IRB approval for changes to any aspect of this study before they can be implemented. Best wishes with your research!

CC:
Brian Whitaker, Management
Shawn Bergman, Psychology
Jacqueline Bergman, Management

Appendix B - Narcissistic Personality Inventory and Informed Consent

**SUBJECT'S NAME:** _____        **DATE:** _____

**PROJECT TITLE:** Narcissism and Performance in a Management Education Teamwork Project

**INVESTIGATORS:** Ryan Felty; Brian Whitaker Ph.D., Shawn Bergman, Ph.D., Jacqui Bergman, Ph.D.

**RESEARCH PURPOSE:** To further understand the influence of personality on teamwork effectiveness.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES:** Procedure – Participants (18 and older) will complete a 71-item questionnaire. Results will be matched to peer assessment data to investigate the link between personality and peer evaluation.

**TIME COMMITMENT INVOLVED:** 15 minutes.

**RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:** Minimal risk. Note: You are not required to take part in the research and you may decline to participate without any penalty. All identifying information will be kept in a secure location on a password-protected computer by the Principal Investigator. Once data collection is complete (December, 2011), participants' identifying information will be coded to ensure anonymity and any forms bearing identifying information will be destroyed.

**BENEFITS:** An increased understanding of personality and teamwork.

**ALTERNATIVES:** You may discontinue your participation at any time.

I have been fully informed of the above-described procedure with its possible benefits and risks. I understand that I may view my responses at a later date and be fully de-briefed on them if I so desire. I also understand that my responses will be maintained in a confidential manner by the researcher. I voluntarily give permission for my participation in this study. Participation or refusal to participate will have no impact on the grade you receive in this class. I know that the investigator and his/her associates will be available to answer any questions I may have. If, at any time I feel I have questions, I may request to speak with the investigator for this research (Ryan Felty, 304-532-5946), the advisor for this research (Dr. Brian Whitaker, 828-262-7445). Questions regarding the protection of human subjects may be addressed to the IRB Administrator, Research and Sponsored Programs, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608, (828) 262-2130, irb@appstate.edu. I understand that I am free to withdraw this consent and discontinue participation in this project at any time without penalty. I am also aware that within one year of my participation a copy of this Informed Consent form will be provided to me upon request.

_____
**Signature of Subject**

Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

Age (years)
_____

Ethnic Background

☐ African American  ☐ Hispanic/Latino  ☐ Caucasian

☐ Asian  ☐ Native American  ☐ Pacific Islander

☐ Other _____

*Instructions:* In each of the following pairs of attitudes, choose the one that you MOST AGREE with. Mark your answer by writing EITHER A or B in the space provided. Only mark ONE ANSWER for each attitude pair, and please DO NOT skip any items.

1. _____  A. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
        B. I am not good at influencing people.

2. _____  A. Modesty doesn't become me.
        B. I am essentially a modest person.

3. _____  A. I would do almost anything on a dare.
        B. I tend to be a fairly cautious person.

4. _____  A. When people compliment me I get embarrassed.
        B. I know that I am a good person because everybody keeps telling me so.

5. _____  A. The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
        B. If I ruled the world it would be a better place.

6. _____  A. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
        B. I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.

7. _____  A. I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
        B. I like to be the center of attention.

8. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I will be a success.
                         B. I am not too concerned about success.

9. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I am no better or no worse than most people.
                         B. I think I am a special person.

10. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
                         B. I see myself as a good leader.

11. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I am assertive.
                         B. I wish I were more assertive.

12. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I like having authority over other people.
                         B. I don't mind following orders.

13. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I find it easy to manipulate people.
                         B. I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people.

14. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
                         B. I usually get the respect I deserve.

15. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I don't particularly like to show off my body.
                         B. I like to show off my body.

16. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I can read people like a book.
                         B. People are sometimes hard to understand.

17. \_\_\_\_\_       A. If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
                         B. I like to take responsibility for making decisions.

18. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I just want to be reasonably happy.
                         B. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.

19. \_\_\_\_\_       A. My body is nothing special.
                         B. I like to look at my body.

20. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I try not to be a show off.
                         B. I will usually show off if I get the chance.

21. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I always know what I am doing.
                         B. Sometimes I am not sure what I am doing.

22. \_\_\_\_\_       A. I sometimes depend on people to get things done.
                         B. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.

23. \_\_\_\_\_       A. Sometimes I tell good stories.
                         B. Everybody likes to hear my stories.

24. _____       A. I expect a great deal from other people.
                       B. I like to do things for other people.

25. _____       A. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
                       B. I will take my satisfactions as they come.

26. _____       A. Compliments embarrass me.
                       B. I like to be complimented.

27. _____       A. I have a strong will to power.
                       B. Power for its own sake doesn't interest me.

28. _____       A. I don't care about new fads and fashion.
                       B. I like to start new fads and fashion.

29. _____       A. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
                       B. I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in the mirror.

30. _____       A. I really like to be the center of attention.
                       B. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.

31. _____       A. I can live my life anyway I want to.
                       B. People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want.

32. _____       A. Being in authority doesn't mean much to me.
                       B. People always seem to recognize my authority.

33. _____       A. I would prefer to be a leader.
                       B. It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.

34. _____       A. I am going to be a great person.
                       B. I hope I am going to be successful.

35. _____       A. People sometimes believe what I tell them.
                       B. I can make anyone believe anything I want them to.

36. _____       A. I am a born leader.
                       B. Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.

37. _____       A. I wish someone would someday write my biography.
                       B. I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason.

38. _____       A. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.
                       B. I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public.

39. _____          A. I am more capable than other people.
                   B. There is a lot I can learn from other people.

40. _____          A. I am much like everybody else.
                   B. I am an extraordinary person.

Appendix C - Student Presentation assignment
*This is a 3-member team assignment that will be presented near the midpoint of the semester.*
As a team, you will have 20 minutes to teach to the other students in class one of the motivation theories discussed in Chapter 8 of the text. In doing so, you will design a presentation related to your assigned topic and teach it in some creative way to us. A few ways to be creative: brief in-class exercise, summarized case studies, links to news stories that illustrate your motivation theory, scholarly articles, etc. Or just think about a time in a current or past class when the professor really grabbed your attention and effectively presented on a topic - use that technique. The key here is to engage the class, be informative, and help the other students understand your theory and its implications for managers.

In order for you to fully understand your theory so that you can effectively teach it, you're going to need to be able to put it in context. This means that you will need to understand how your theory fits with the other theories in Ch. 8. As such, you will need to read Ch 8 *before* you plan your presentation. In other words, you won't be able to simply read your section of Ch 8 and throw together a quick presentation. These theories are interrelated and you'll need to understand how in order be able to teach to others. In a related vein, the theories outlined in the text are just that – outlines. In order for you to be able to speak intelligently on your topic and respond to any questions that might arise from the class, you'll have to dig a deeper to fully understand your topic and round out your comprehension. You are required to attain at least two additional sources that discuss your theory, integrate them into your presentation, and cite them.

Plan on 15 minutes of presentation time for your topic with about 5 minutes for fielding questions from the class, me, and the outside expert I will be bringing in. I don't care how you split up the responsibilities as long as the final product is engaging and accurate and all team members feel as though they have contributed equally. BTW, peer assessments will be collected and used for grading.

For you to receive maximum points, your presentation must be well outlined, *rehearsed*, and accurate, so plan your carefully! I have a motivation expert coming to evaluate your presentations. While my evaluation will factor into the final presentation grade, his reaction to your team's accuracy and clarity will be weighted more heavily.

Do not go over the allotted time. You have 15 minutes total for presentation. Don't go over and don't come in short, as this will really hurt your performance. Focus on connecting the presentation to management theory.

Important notes: I will randomly assign members to each group and randomly assign each group to a presentation day. I will be asking about your progress (see the syllabus). You will not be expected to dress in business attire for the lectures. On the next page you find the rubric that will be used to grade your lectures. **Pay attention to it.**

## Appendix D - Student Presentation Grading Rubric

**Group #:**_____ **Date:** _____

| Grading Category | 4/4 = Outstanding | 3/4 = Accomplished | 2/4 = Developing | 1/4 = Needs work | Score & Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Time Limit adherence – 15 points** | Well-rehearsed. Lecture is within 1 minute +/-of allotted time. | Evidence of rehearsal. Lecture is within 2 minutes +/- of allotted time. | Some evidence of rehearsal; flow was choppy. Lecture is within 3-4 minutes +/- of allotted time. | No evidence of rehearsal. Lecture is 5 or more minutes above or below the allotted time. | |
| **Teamwork - 15 points** | Presenters worked as part of a team, providing effective transitions to next/previous speaker or topic | Evidence of team work; transitions made to next/previous speaker or topics | Some evidence of team work; some transitions made to next/previous speaker or topics | No evidence of team work; no transitions made to next/previous speaker or topics | |
| **Content Organization – 30 points** | Strong and engaging introduction provides overview of presentation; presentation supports introduction; conclusion reinforces main points | Introduction provides overview of presentation; presentation supports introduction and ends with appropriate conclusion. | Some overview is given; connection between introduction and presentation is sometimes unclear; conclusion is limited. | Introduction does not give overview; organization is unclear, or presentation ends without conclusion. | |
| **Clarity of supporting materials – 30 points** | Using the materials, management theory and its application are represented with depth and effectively support topic under consideration. | Management theory and its application are represented at an appropriate level. | Management theory is marginally supported with materials. | Applicability unclear or inaccurate. | |
| **Question & Answer - 10 point** | Presenters answer questions confidently and accurately. | Presenters are able to respond to questions. | Presenters have difficulty responding to questions. | Presenters' answers to questions are incorrect or incomplete. | |

## Appendix E - OCB-I Scales

*Instructions:* Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

| | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41. I often make suggestions about better work methods to other team members. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 42. The members of my team usually let me know when I do something that makes their jobs easier (or harder). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 43. I often let other team members know when they have done something that makes my job easier (or harder)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 44. My team members recognize my potential. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 45. My team members understand my problems and needs. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 46. I am flexible about switching job responsibilities to make things easier for other team members. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 47. In busy situations, other team members often ask me to help out. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 48. In busy situations, I often volunteer my efforts to help others on my team. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 49. I am willing to help finish work that had been assigned to others. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 50. Other members of my team are willing to help finish work that was assigned to me. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

*Instructions:* Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

| | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51. Team members are hard to communicate with. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 52. Team has strong sense of togetherness. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 53. Team members generally trust each other. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 54. Team appreciates my efforts. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 55. Team lacks team spirit. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

*Instructions:* Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

| | Not True at All | Somewhat Not True | Neither True or Not True | Somewhat True | Totally True |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 56. Team members adjust to the changes that happen in their work environment. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 57. When a problem occurs, the members of this team manage to solve it. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 58. New members are easily integrated into this team. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 59. The members of this team could work together for a long time. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

*For the following items, please rate each individual member of our team.*

Your first team member:

Name:_____

*Instructions:* For the team member listed above, please rate him/her on the following items:

|  | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60. Helps others who have been absent. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 61. Helps others who have heavy workloads. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 62. Takes time to listen to teammates' problems and worries. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 63. Goes out of his/her way to help teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 64. Takes a personal interest in other teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 65. Passes along information to teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 66. Gives advance notice when unable to come to team meetings. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 67. Spends a great deal of time with personal phone conversations. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 68. Complains about insignificant things. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Your second team member:

Name:_____

*Instructions:* For the team member listed above, please rate him/her on the following items:

|  | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 69. Helps others who have been absent. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 70. Helps others who have heavy workloads. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 71. Takes time to listen to teammates' problems and worries. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 72. Goes out of his/her way to help teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 73. Takes a personal interest in other teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 74. Passes along information to teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 75. Gives advance notice when unable to come to team meetings. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 76. Spends a great deal of time with personal phone conversations. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 77. Complains about insignificant things. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Lastly, please rate yourself:

Name:_____

*Instructions:* Please rate yourself on the following items:

| | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 78. Helps others who have been absent. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 79. Helps others who have heavy workloads. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 80. Takes time to listen to teammates' problems and worries. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 81. Goes out of his/her way to help teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 82. Takes a personal interest in other teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 83. Passes along information to teammates. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 84. Gives advance notice when unable to come to team meetings. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 85. Spends a great deal of time with personal phone conversations. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| 86. Complains about insignificant things. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

# Your participation is appreciated. Thank you very much for your time!

Please direct any questions you may have to Dr. Brian Whitaker or Ryan Felty. You may utilize the addresses or phone numbers below:

Brian G. Whitaker, Ph.D.
Department of Management
Appalachian State University
Raley Hall Office 4078
Boone, NC 28608
Email: whitakerbg@appstate.edu
Office: 828.262.7445

Ryan Felty
Department of Psychology
Appalachian State University
Smith Wright Hall Office 311
Boone, NC 28608
Email: feltyrj@appstate.edu
Office: 828.262.7092

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities of all Variables

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Team-Level Narcissism (EE) | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Team Task Performance | -.34$^\dagger$ | - |  |  |  |
| 3. Team-Level OCB-I | .23 | .06 | - |  |  |
| 4. Individual-Level Narcissism (EE) |  |  |  | .85 |  |
| 5. Individual-Level Peer Ratings |  |  |  | -.18$^\dagger$ | - |
| Mean | .31 | 83.62 | 3.64 | .32 | 8.39 |
| SD | .13 | 5.39 | .99 | .18 | 1.37 |

*Note. N* = 28 project teams in team-level analyses *N* = 85 for individual-level analyses.
$^\dagger p < .10$, $* p < .05$. EE = Exhibitionism/Entitlement. Alpha reliabilities on diagonal (where appropriate)

Table 2. Regression Results for Team-Level Project Performance Variables

| Variable | Team Task Performance | | | Team-Level OCB-I | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ |
| Control | | | | | | |
| Team Size | .04 | | -.20 | .00 | | -.02 |
| Independent | | | | | | |
| Team-Level Narcissism (EE) | .14 | .10 | -.32† | .15 | .15 | .39* |

*Note.* $N = 28$ project teams. The $R^2$ and $\beta$ values were derived from hierarchical regression analyses. EE = Exhibitionism/Entitlement.

†$p < .10$, *$p < .05$.

Table 3. Regression Results for Individual-Level Project Performance Variables

| | Peer Performance Ratings | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | $R^2$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ |
| Control | | | |
| Gender | | | .04 |
| Race | | | -.01 |
| Age | .04 | | $.21^{\dagger}$ |
| Independent | | | |
| Narcissism (EE) | .08 | .04 | $-.18^{\dagger}$ |

*Note.* $N = 85$ participants. The $R^2$ and $\beta$ values were derived from hierarchical regression analyses. EE = Exhibitionism/Entitlement. $^{\dagger} p < .10$.

VITA

Ryan James Felty was born and raised in Ripley, West Virginia. Once he graduated from Ripley High School in 2006, he attended the University of Charleston in Charleston, West Virginia where he studied Business Administration and Psychology. While at the University of Charleston, he was inducted as a member of the Psi Chi psychology honors society and served as President of the campus organization during his senior year.

He presented undergraduate research at the regional level at an Undergraduate Research Day in Charleston, West Virginia and served as a Teaching Assistant for statistics during his final year. After graduating in May, 2010, he enrolled at Appalachian State University to pursue his Master's degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology and Human Resource Management. While at Appalachian State University, he served as a Graduate Teaching Instructor and presented research at the regional level at an Annual River Cities I-O Psychology conference in Chattanooga, Tennessee and at the national level at an Organizational Behavior Management Network Conference in Tampa, Florida. He received his Master of Arts in May 2012 and will be seeking gainful employment upon graduation.